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Abstract
Network approach in policy making, stresses on government dependencies on individuals, groups, and organizations that are in its frame of decision making. This research deals with the basic part and the necessity of dealing with the policy networks, all kinds of policy networks, the approaches of governmental encountering with policy making networks (I.o organizational, interactive and instrumental approaches) have been discussed and studied then concluded that the chosen approach of governments in facing with policy making networks depends on those government power rates; in sectors that the government is powerful, the duty groups, controller committees and work meditation groups encourage the independent thought and take a wide visual horizon that is required for compiling the policy. On the contrary in sectors that the government structure is weak, the majority of policy makers and top officials have their own specific domain and there aren’t any organizations or references to relate their activities to and as a result the traditional methods of labor – division are used. Finally, at the end of this study we look at the three future orientations in policy networks areas, that is, rational choice, networks analysis, and case study.
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Introduction
Traditional approaches of government policy making assume that the policy making processes must be centralized and hierarchical. These views contrast with the increasingly needs of nowadays developed and divided governments to participate the beneficiary individuals, groups, and organizations in policy making process. The different processes have caused the fundamental and rapid changes in different community political and economic life that reminds the necessity of creating variation in traditional decision making systems.
And the most important ones are as follows:
1. The change of spaces nature and concept that has caused the changes to happen easily among communities and nations;
2. Changes acceleration rate, because of quick developments of technology that challenge the policy making traditional and bureaucratic methods;
3. Coming to existence of complex and correlative issue domains such as business and environment;
4. Further emphasis on the generations’ equality concept in policy making decisions;
5. Global emerge that there are numerous activists and efficacier in and often the role of non-governmental activists is more important and highlighted, and leads to the operational and participatory gaps in policy making. The operational gap occurs because of the government policy makers and organizations lack of necessary knowledge and facilities for facing with absolutely complicated policy making domains; and the participatory gap also occurs as a result of disability to participate the increasingly number of non-governmental activists in decision making process (Megregors, 2004).

In spite of such a background history, one cannot claim that the policy making specialized and technical knowledge can be obtained and/or managed in a best way through hierarchical structures; especially that in private sector many tough and bureaucratic structures have been replaced by autonomous networks to manage the complexity of mutual dependency.

With due attention to the above said pressures, the rational approach isn't efficient anymore. Many authors have written in this area;

It’s clear that mutual effort of governments and people is the critical element for the progression of cooperative companies and actual promotion of their activity levels (Gilaninia, Shahraki, 2011). “Governments are not able to govern the society from an above stance and be separated from people like the legend gods and with unlimited power. Governments are a part of society themselves, and they only count as one of the numerous impressioners on public policy making process. In fact, nowadays, instead of origining the policies from a central power like government/administration or parliament, they from through a processes that contains a wide spread participation of public and private organizations.

(Rhodes, 1992).

In today's business environment is characterized by increasing competition, more forward fighting is going to win every day (Gilaninia &et al, 2011). In recent years the idea of networks has been used not only in political sciences but also in many other sciences. Microbiologists describe the cells as information networks. Ecologists modify the environment as network systems; computer scientists have developed the nerve nets along with capabilities of self-organizing and self-studying.

In new sociology, the network is studied is new forms of social organizations sociology orientation, economic science. Technology of network industries and network technologies. Work and business management and general policy making.

Therefore, it seems that the network expression has become the new paradigm of architecture of complexity (Yamagushi; 1996).
The networks concept has occupied the public policy making scientists minds for many years. Since the general decision making is a complicated affair, the networks as proper figuratives that are capable to refine many important aspects of policy making process are used by researchers and interpreters.

To sum up, this concept points to the technique of relation that powerful individuals who are activate in depth of public and private organizations and manage a specific policy making domain (such as health or education).

Bureaucrats, politicians, specialists, and representatives of beneficiary groups argue the general problems and offer solutions to solve them and over time, such relations cause the formation of mutual relationships and identical expectations.

Today, the company with severe challenges and competitive market pressures (Gilaninia, Kouchaki & et al., 2011). These networks, the some extent, have borders, and they are separate from other networks, meanwhile to a limit they are also out of people's care and sight. Researchers usually attribute a number of relatively fixed characteristics to a network such as all kinds of exchanges and/or sum of values, that in terms of domain have been studied by, for example, the different policies relate to health, education and/or agriculture (Van Waorden, 1992).

Despite the kinds and numerate definition of the networks, the expression of the policy networks has been defined clearly by many governmental management researchers.

Otoole, for the first time defines the network as mutual dependencies structure among different organizations or sectors. His opinion suggests the networks structural relative stability and includes the network links that have been firmed by organizational glue (Watts, 1999).

Leter on kickert et. al. define the policy making networks as more or less fixed patterns of actors relationships that from around the axis of problems and/or policy making programs.

Kenis and Schneider were the third group that studied the networks and found the policy making networks as the networks that are relatively sustainable, fixed, and in flux relationships that gather the dispense sources in one place and make them move till group function can be organized in line with a solution that is that very common policy.

Later, borzel with a comprensive viewpoint suggests the policy making networks as "a number of relatively fixed relationships that have non–hierarchical nature and relate to each other and all kinds of actors that have common interests concerning one specific policy, and exchange their sources to achieve this common interest, meanwhile they accept that the cooperation is the best way of achieving the common goals."

Kantzentein illustrates the policy network as a political structure that is mobilizer of different forms meditating of beneficiaries and governing and the relationships creator based on the government and the community’s co–exist in policy making (kim, 2001).

Common concepts in policy literature.

In this section we briefly define and explain expression like = policy community, issue networks, iron triangle, advocacy coalition, and actor network.

A) Policy community, issue networks.
Policy community in its general concept includes different kinds of relationships among beneficiary groups, issue networks and policy community are two opposite connected poles of policy networks. According to Rhodes and marsh definition, the specification of a policy community, the limited numbers of members, intentional prevention of some groups entering, having common viewpoint about "play principles" of members interaction, haggling about sources, and leaders capabilities are in leaving decision making to members.

Overall, according to the above mentioned scientists policy community has a relative stability and participation or entering into is difficult (Wilks & Wright, 2000).

Kenis and Schneider believe that community forms based on policy problem solving that requires economic, political, and technical complex duties and the source dependency.

In such a policy community, some subordinate of actors that usually called small governments, directly participate in creating policy options.

These actors that strategically interact. They get involved in exchanging which are necessary for interchanging information, and specialized and political supports (Kenis & Schneider, 1989).

Issue networks origin from helco idea. He believes that iron triangle or small government is a small circle of members that are able to achieve a lot of independencies.

According to helco's point of view, an issue network consists of members that have mutual commitment or dependency that identifying its continuing and/or from where its environment begins is very difficult.

The specification of issue networks is lacking of stability, numerous members, and access to free entering. In such a network no group overcomes the others, none is under control or other's policies or programs command. Policy making process in these networks is fluent and affects by many beneficiary groups and it is closed and non-penetrated by external factors.

B) Iron triangle

Several decades ago one of the researchers in governmental policy making domain used the iron triangle figurative to explain the way of making agricultural policies. Based on his model, the three strong points in policy making triangle are as follows:

1. Executive managers: agriculture ministry, the managers of organizations subordinate to agriculture ministry, budget manager;
2. Congress: congress agriculture and related committees chief.
3. Agriculture counselors: key organization leaders and agriculture crops groups.

Based on this model, agriculture national policies will be discussed, the legislator instructions will be determined, office regulations will be announced and performed, and the programs will be codified. Over time it proved that this model can be spread and transferred to other governmental policy making sectors such as housing, medicine, transportation and also army forces (Cockerl, 2000).

According to Reinick the other characteristic of iron triangle is that this network involves the different activists in policy making process, and through this supplies its skills and sources requirements which are vital in their success.
The current business environment is very different from the past and the competition has a special role (Gilaninia & Zia Khosoosi et al, 2011). For example governments bring power along with themselves, non-governmental organizations and constitution bring legitimate, and private sectors bring financial sources. In the meantime, all of these actors bring knowledge to the network that in creases its capability and efficiency (Reinicke et. al; 1997).

c) Advocacy coalition

bizpro site, defines the advocacy coalition as a group of organizations that cooperate in a harmonious way to achieve a common goal. The hypothesis of that concept is that by creating or joining to advocacy coalition, an advocate can achieve his/her own goal more effectively (bizpro, 1994).

in policy making discussion, the advocacy coalition approach deals with coalition members relationship (the under system's surface) and the factors that affect this relationship, and it has two purposes: first, it wants to realize whether a change happens in policies or not, second it determines why and how the policy change. Sabatier and Jenkins believe that a long period of time must pass to be aware of changes occurrence. If a change through analyzing policy subsystems occurs its reason and quality can be studied these analyses must cover all of the active actors and groups in the subsystem either public or private. Finally this pile of actors and groups can be reduced to only few and beliefs because of them they have formed the coalition; this also determines the subsystem internal dynamic rate (the enthusiasm) regarding its change or sustainability. In other words, it is the common beliefs in a policy subsystem that motivates the action or interaction. The above mentioned researchers believe that the common beliefs are like the glue which blocks the advocacy coalition to change its fundamental values. These scientists believe that only in a case the network dynamic can be identified that at least the policy subsystem be studied for a decade.

Complicated effects among members and structure by studying less than this amount of time will remain unknown (Montpetit, 2003).

D) Actor network

This expression along with colon and latour, the two French authors, studies was suggested in 1991, its analysis of a number of debates described the networks developed structures, where the human and non-human actors in terms of their interaction strategies will be recognized.

The actor's identities and merits will also be defined during debates between the human an non-human actants in this view "Actant: in its political dimension defines as the submission process. The most important parameter of these debates is multilateral translation or interaction where actors

1. Create common definitions and meanings.
2. Define their representativeness and
3. Invite each other to cooperate in persuading individual and collective goals.

In this theory both actors and actants play roles in common to reconstruct the interactive network that leads to the system stability (Stokman, & Evelien, 1996).

Actor networks analysis takes the structures as factors successful translation originally. in this approach community is not a structure or an organization anymore, but it is realized as a position where the actors
success rate can be measured in terms of their capabilities in organizing, reorganizing the whole or parts of community.

This approach emphasizes on member actors hard work kind and being studious to obtain and preserve power stances, and it studies and analyzes the strategies and tactics used by scientists to affect on community.

Actors network analysis reminds us that the power stance achievement is the main and basic goal of members and the networks (Borzel, 1997).

Various policy networks

Coleman and skogstad identified various policy networks that their most important characteristics are the state independence against the business and non-business beneficiaries, the state's independence considers as its capability to achieve its goal. The state capacity (the ability to compile and perform the general policy options) and mobilizing business and non-business association include the key factors of understanding the available various networks.

These networks and their characteristics are shown in table 1:

Compete independently to draw government attention.

If the government is autonomous, the network is called pressure pluralist.

This class in the best possible way matches with pluralist traditional theories of power, and it is an indication of cases that business beneficiaries must join their effects on policy making with non-business beneficiaries, under these policy networks, groups involve in policy coalition and not policy participants.

The clientele pluralist network exists when the government is a little independence relative to more organized beneficiaries. These relations continue till it involves the bureaucratic independent institute with relevant strict level business associations. In such a network, the business beneficiaries in subordinate governments consider as a type of participant in policy, and governmental institution stresses on consulting with business beneficiaries, and advocates the policy role delivery to other organized beneficiaries. Clientele pluralist network before 1960s, dominated in many decision making parts in most industrial countries. They explained more decision making dimensions relevant to forestry with due attention to federal forest in the united states in 1960s (in British states Columbia to late 1980 s) while pressure and clientele pluralist networks take in to consideration the unequal relationship between government and the beneficiaries of the government, the corporatist network exists in cases that there is a high level of governmental independency through state decision making structure that "well centralized and concertated" and/or organized beneficiaries as representative of producer or consumer groups along with government participate in compiling and performing policy this network describes the state social relationship system in a strict level where environmental groups and other social beneficiaries cooperate in policy making and hope to find a degree of unanimity, and while the government preserves its right to choose the final policy, it gives opportunities to social beneficiaries to work on different opinions to reach an agreement on solutions.
concertation network is different from corporatist network because only "one beneficiary association" involves in policy making. These types of networks in cases tend to come to existence that business associations and their organizations accept or refuse the policy options work with a governmental agency. Unlike customer network, the government is independent from business beneficiaries in concertation networks and cooperates with the business and jobs for compiling the options acceptable to both sides. Thus, government has a room to inject ideas and these ideas are aware of clientele pluralist networks that they have a little independency from business beneficiaries, which are not able to be applicable.

Again, there is an important similarity between clientele pluralist and concertation networks, because the ability of participant considers the policy in finally, state directed networks are those that government agencies control the policy making process there, and impose solutions on them.

Business beneficiaries, environment, and other social beneficiaries don't get involve in policies as participants, so a policy advocating role will be given to all participants.

Even though there are similarities between state directed and pressure pluralist networks, their main difference is that in the former government doesn't limit its range of options for organization beneficiaries suggestions, and doesn't feel any needs to balance social pressures or reflection of social pressures demands.

Coleman suggests 6 types of policy networks and counts their important specifications as follows:
(Montpetit, 2003)

Network type: the most important characteristics.
Corporatis network: is relatively closed to new actors,
The relatively applicable ideas prevent the policy, social and governmental actors communicate closely with each other, the policy capacities to some extent distribute among the community and government actors.

State corporatist networks: is closed to new actors, the government actors opinions are in priority, the community and government actors communicate closely with each other, the policy capacities distribute in a way that is in the favor of governmental actors.

Clientele networks: is closed to new actors, one community actor ideas are only in priority, the community and governmental actors communicate with each other closely, the distribution of policy capacities in favor of community actors.

The pressure pluralist networks: is opened to new actors, the actors partition and their community and governmental Policy ideas are weakly related, the policy capacities to some extent distribute, but the government Acts necessarily as a judge or mediator among The competitive ideas.

State directed networks: is opened to new actors, actors division, governmental, and community actors policy ideas are related, related weakly, the policy capacities are distributed in a way that governmental actors ideas predominate the community actors ideas.

Issue networks: is opened to new actors, being divided and government and community actors policy ideas have been linked weakly, te policy capacities have been distributed in a way that they are in favor
of divided community actors and the government actors merit reduces in decision making. Table 2, policy network (Montpetit, 2003).

Coleman in terms of whether public actors share their political power with private actors and depend on what amount of sources makes the two above mentioned actors balance or not, classifies the different kinds of policy networks as follows:

Policy networks as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civilized community – state relationship</th>
<th>Policy support</th>
<th>Policy participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>Pressure pluralist</td>
<td>Corporatist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In favor of public actors</td>
<td>State directed networks</td>
<td>State corporatist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In favor of civilized community actors</td>
<td>Issue networks</td>
<td>Clientele networks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3, policy networks types (Coleman, 1999).

The government approaches to policy networks

In theory, networks are structures without hierarchical, and they create their own disciplines and orders. “Rhodes believes that networks act in an environment that governments don't play a higher role anymore. Networks resist against the government leader role and regulate their own policies and create their typical environment. Nowadays we don't live in a one way community, instead these days societies should be counted as decentralized communities that their important characteristic is containing numerous centers. As it mentioned the traditional approaches were assumed that policy making process should be centralized and hierarchical. these views are in contrary with increasingly needs of today's developed and divided governments to participate individuals, groups, and beneficiary organizations in policy making process, that is, not one only group stays in the center to command (Alvani & Danaie fard, 2005).

By the way, do we live in an actual decentralized society? and aren’t any fixed and focal points that we use as a support and a pillar? The pluralist approaches are more willing to show the governments’ role? Less than what it is, these view points consider the government as social demands and challenges focal point. According to these views those demands and interests will that they are the most organized and have enough specialties and support sources, therefore, governments don't follow their own demands. In fact, instead, the mentioned characteristics are found in governments, so they remain powerful and organized.

In many cases the policies which emerge are actually state officials decisions that tend to follow a typical policy or only consult with special groups.

In other cases governments even can simply ignore the views that aren't in their interests. The governments always attempt to achieve a balance between participation and achieving the complete control. For modern governments the achievement of one of these two cases: that is "having complete control and in the meantime attracting the social participation: have translated to a problem. State officials tend to be away from blame and meanwhile receive well – known and desirable publicity. But to achieve such a demand they must first mobilize the social forces (Kling, 1998).
By getting involved in networks the governments can achieve their own important goal to invite the experts of policy making process to cooperate. Therefore, they can give a role to struggling groups, persuade them to follow well – behave in policy making process, and ask them to be effectively sociable.

The governments by cooperating with networks can make changes without facing or emerging any disputes.

On the other hand, tracing the policy making in a relatively closed situation also has its own advantages. According to Jordan and Richardson, this type of policy making facilitates the creation of a common language and understanding of the subject in hand (one that is under studying); even if there is disagreement about policy priorities.

Furthermore, the facilities of public participation can be designed for revealing incorrect irresponsible and trouble making viewpoints and through this the undesirable impression of unrest (chaos) and unstable political events on public policies could be prohibited.

One of the networks administrating methods in making difference between own and alien groups, the own groups have job relation with ministries and ministries, so their needs and interests are a permanent and basic part of job schedules.

These groups members have governmental jobs and participate in public programs and policies performance. Their leaders are familiar with the minister and top officials and these leaders can access to those top officials by phone regarding or in presence whenever they will.

The alien groups don't have such a relation and have been removed from policy making process effectively. Koppenjan and Khchert name three approaches that governments in facing with a policy network adopt them (Thatcher, 1998).

Instrumental approach supports governmental strategic application and it considers the networks as the facilitating factor for government to achieve the goals, otherwise their access is impossible.

In such an attitude the non-government actors are given a small importance, unless to a point that their goals harmonize with government's objectives.

Instrumental approach is just one of the three approaches that is available in government encountering areas with policy making networks and explains the participating methods in problem-solving. The other two approaches, namely, interactive and institutional, offer a challenger and different viewpoint that the priority there is not with the fixed government objectives.

Anyway, the significance is with the collective action and none alone actor will be able to fulfill his own solution.

Under interactive approach, the governments must deal with the enter network management "game", interactive management, that is, debate and controversy, facilitating meditation and judgment. There is no room here to discuss the aspect of being control or control others, but there is a number of actors that they interact. The strategies and objectives of interaction among the actors that have common interest and explicit their differences in viewpoints will change. The government plays a vital role in meditation and debate on results until identifying new solutions.
In institutional approach governments get involve less in interaction with actors and show less tendency towards special objectives. Rather, they concentrate their attentions on compiling interaction rules and a type of organizational frame toward regulating compiling stages and interactions of strategies. Here the governments’ objectives are to create genuine structures and regulate rules for facilitating interactions instead of involving in the interactions themselves.

Therefore, the interactive and institutional approaches emphasize on work process. These two approaches, consider the policy making in networks as cooperation among independent sectors that have different and at times struggling logic, interests and strategies, and consider the policy processes not as performing the pre-compiling objectives, but as interactive process, where actors interchange their information about problems, preferences and instruments and create a kind of harmony among goals and sources. Determining the common goals and taking steps towards them is the result of this approach.

Actichinson and Coleman express that the governments selective approach in encountering policy networks depends on their power rate.

In the parts that government is powerful, duty groups, the coordinator committees and work liaison groups encourage independent thought and decide a wide visual horizon that is required for policy programming. Instead, in sections that have weak structure, a great number of policy makers and top officials can claim a self-domain, whereas there are no institution and association to link their activities, and consequently the traditional procedures of labor-division are used.

Such an authorized pluralist encourages gradual and short-term decision making, that based on the lowest dominant criterion has common share and for introducing political calculation is always a volunteer partisanship (Kim and Dong Won, 2001).

This shows an interesting paradox. The sections that government feels more control may a lot rely on interactive and institutional approaches (the effective reduction of its pressure one policy instruction). While if the government has no confidence in typical sectors, presumably adopts the instrumental approach to network management, which for achieving government goals changes the networks relationships.

By the way, the networks management is fruitful and effective that leads to a win-win result for the members (even though all members may not meet their needs demands equally).

Including other networks management effective criteria are the source and all members activity rates with the least interaction cost, the beneficiaries commitment gaining rate and the transparency of the resulted decisions.

Based on these criteria many reasons can be given for justifying the institutional and interactive approaches use.

1. These approaches imply the commitment guarantee (and sources) of the majority of the network members.

2. These approaches increase the potential of compiling new solution for old problems.

3. These approaches increase the possible decisions making that politically stronger.

4. These approaches are more transparent (Hazlehurst, 2001).
Future orientations: Peter John has studied the various approaches of policy networks researchers and authors and also investigated the differences of surveys in Europe and the United States literature, then analysed the research deficiencies in this area.

By surveying the performed researches he mentions three policy networks studying future orientations as: Attention to rational choice theory, network analyzing and case studies (John, 1999).

1) Rational choice

The first studies orientation is the rational choice use.

According to Dowling the haggling model and theory games can be used for comprehending the nature of policy networks productively.

Because the networks arise from haggling and strategic interactions, researchers may study institutions which create a kind of refinery for members' participation and study the effects of games on actors preferences. The games are very complicated and cannot be showed by two or even more people. The most likely result of studying policy rational choice is that the games language can be used as a figurative for appreciating the interactions inside domains. Such an approach doesn't test the model, but it seems that it is our direct appreciation of what happens.

2. Network analyzing

The second path of policy studying orientations traces the analyzing official networks. The networks analyzing measures the occurrence or sequence of network members' relationships. This expression is a branch of mathematics called graph theory that analyses network's structures and characteristics.

The result of researches is that either the network structure determines inside network and/or without networks, is significant because it affects the information flow and, therefore, influences the power distribution among social organizations, this has emerged mostly from studying of central or local elite networks in 1970s.

It seems that the studies of policy formal networks in 1980s has led by a group of American sociologists.

The classical study of Laumann and Noke studies the differences of policy networks based on multidimensional scaling and the intervals among actors of the United States energy and health sectors. On the other hand, Hinz et. al. find a lack of basic axis for networks in Washington elites studies.

Critics to indicate the limitations of research instruments and their applications have performed well; but other critics can be suggested, too.

It is not clear what the networks are measuring. Also recognizing either these studies have caused the symbolic, ceremonial, operational problems or the policy choices is impossible.

It is possible that the networks merely reflex the policies insustainability instead of showing important relationships and omitting political power. Also the networks borders are unclear especially those of policy networks.

It seems that the used meticulous criteria in networks analysis, impose a simple judgment in the complicated world. The other critic is that the networks analysis usually carries out as cross-sectional and presents only a snapshot (an immediate picture) of a collection of very fluent communications.
If the networks change rapidly, the exact recognition of this affair that what kinds of the relations the networks criteria contain is difficult. However, many of the above critics are unfair. The real world complex and full of chaos and research instruments are incomplete. The researchers are familiar with these limitations, therefore instead of blindly use of computer networks, they use sensitive research methods and technics. Researchers should be careful about diagnosing networks and their borders, and be aware of changes that over time take place, using their knowledge around foundations for fulfilling judgment. Furthermore, many recent articles, titled “policy networks modeling”, that have been published in theory policy magazine contain articles about policy networks formation and power application to maximize policy for decision making in Amesterdam. The variety of studies and their interesting results don't show that this field is stagnant (kim & dong won, 2001).

3. Case studies
The third introduced passage path for better policy networks studying by considering the formal modeling advantages is the case studies. Full fill ment. What of some of the policy networks reportings is forgotten is:
Policy process sense complexity of personal and specialized relations and the specification of multilayer relations among individuals. Therefore some of the studies just superficially deal with the decision making basis, recognizing the major participants and discussions about the change of policy, whereas, in fact, the severity and insisting on new decision makings require an approach that can study these relations complexity, and shows how personal relations can affect the policy results from place to place. To make the long story short, researchers need to direct these theories towards the rational choice, the networks analysis modeling in a passage that they can describe them there.
Tendency towards making simple modeling and examining the hypotheses should be completed by quality view points (stok man & jaco, 1998).

Conclusion
One of the state management traditional limitations, is the procedural controlled and centralized governing and bureaucratic and hierarchical structures on administrative system. But in nowadays circumstances, with due attention to the expansion and complexity of government activities, there is no more choice for government management continuation except by participating and co – thin king with felw citizens in a joint structure. By participating the felw citizens the government activities accelerate and public duties full fill ment will be possible. To achieve such a goal efficiently the government structural patterns must be changed and inefficient methods on hierarchical basis must be replaced by collective and non- hierarchical attitudes.
Consequently government management must experience living in global and domestic networks, and it should forget the hierarchical viewpoint, therefore, the hierarchical thought necessarily must be replaced by network thought and government management must learn how to manage these networks and assume itself as an active element in networks (Alvani, 2002).

At the time being, policy networks have prepared a suitable foundation for network intellectual governing in public policy making system.

Over recent years, the "policy networks" discussion in this domain has become important, and also in the theory and practice the political sciences and government management have earned a considerable position. Even though, policy networks in other countries aren't limited to theory domain, and also this idea has been used practically in the micro and macro levels, and as a step towards making participation fundamental and modifying policy making system based on citizenship principles has been shared and assessed.

Thus, the necessary steps to make the participation fundamental and mend the participation system through introducing suitable patterns to attract citizens organized participations (the collection of individuals and groups that they activate in forms of constitutions and non-governmental organizations in different domains related to administrative system)

In country's policy and decision making system must be taken.
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