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Puzzling versus powering
How Great Expectations in Washington
Are Dashed in Oakland; Or,
Why It’s Amazing that
Federal Programs Work at All,
This Being a Saga of the
Economic Development Administration
as Told by Two Sympathetic Observers
Who Seek to Build Morals on a
Foundation of Ruined Hopes

The Oakland Project
CAPHRI School for Public Health and Primary Care

The rationalist approach (Simon, 1950)

- Grounded in theory
- Prescriptive
- Forward Mapping: solution oriented
- Select the most urgent problem
- Select the most salient solution
- Formulate goals and objectives
- Design implementation plan
- Evaluate goal achievement

‘logic of consequence’
Policy cycle
Top down policy implementation

- Mazmanian & Sabatier (1983, simplified)

**Problem solvability**
(technology, diversity, proportionality)

**Capacity**
(goal clarity, resources, hierarchy)

**Context**
(support, technology, socioeconomic status)

**Output Compliance Impact**
Powering explanation I: State-centered theories
Incrementalist approach (Lindblom, 1959, 1969)

- Grounded in observation
- Descriptive
- Backward mapping: problem oriented
- Messy, garbage can, ‘muddling through’
- Continuous competition of ideas, interests and institutions
- Bottom up

‘Logic of appropriateness’
Bottom up policy design by street level bureaucrats (Lipsky)
Explanation II: State-society relationships:

The implementation gap results from the political pressures of private interest groups on the state.
Interactions in the policy process

The political game

Political actors

Sociopolitical Actors

Advisory councils
Labour unions
Branch org’s
‘ZBO’s’ eg. Supervisors
Prof. + providers Assoc.
Patients’ Assoc.
Patients and insured
Professionals

The socio-political context

Citizens’ Associations
Political parties’ members
Interest groups Business Insurance
Prof. + providers Assoc.

Entrepreneurs and workers
Schools and students
Local business, retail and consumers
Church
Cultural, sports, etc. volunteers

The social context

(Adapted from Rico & Helderman, 2005)
Levels of policy influence

(Adapted from Rico & Helderman, 2005)

INPUT

SOCIAL CONTEXT

Social groups

Sociopolitical actors

Institutions

Pluralist system

Corporatist system

THE POLITICAL SYSTEM

POLICY SYSTEM

Interactions

State actors

Policy (change)

Healthcare SYSTEM

OUTPUT

a. Demands and supports
b. Access to the political system
c. Veto points (end of decision process)
d. Decision-making
e. Institutional change
f. Social impact of policy
## Classification of implementation (Matland 1995)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Views on successful implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOP DOWN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOP DOWN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOTTOM UP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOTTOM UP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Low
- Administrative implementation
- Political implementation
- Resources
- Power

### High
- Experimental implementation
- Symbolic implementation
- Context specificity
- Coalition strength

### Ambiguity
- Low
- High
Shifts in public health power and governance

Capacity for strategic action - +

State & Municipal Hierarchy

Services: disease prevention, youth health care, health promotion

Legislation Health Protection

Network Negotiation

Covenants, Agreements, Negotiated self-regulation

Market Contract

Lifestyle coaching in additional care insurance package

Civil society Private initiative

Personal lifestyle coaches, apps, eHealth self-diagnosis and treatment, Total Body Scan

Collectivisation of lifestyle and behaviour

Level of governmental involvement
Shifts in accountability: from NPM supervision and control towards NPG learning and improvement

1. New Public Management: control-based
   - Decentralise SMART defined goals objectives
   - Centralise supervision and control structures
   - System of agreed performance indicators
   - Incentivise through subsidies and sanctions: negative coordination

2. New public governance: trust-based
   - Decentralise responsibilities
   - Incl horizontal structures for monitoring and feedback, learning, and improvement
   - Mobilise decentral sense of ownership: positive coordination
Policy learning by monitoring in Collaborative, Pragmatist and Adaptive governance for sustainable change

1. Social order
2. Goals
3. Metrics, procedures

‘Central’ and ‘local’ institutions develop joint goals & metrics

Discretionary implementation by lower-level providers

Regular monitoring, peer review, improvement plans

Periodic revision of

= an iterative, multi-level process architecture for continuous improvement and responsiveness (Sabel & Zeitlin, 2012)
Implementation and evaluation: narrow policy goal achievement or social problem solving?
## Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationalist view</th>
<th>Incrementalist view</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationalist view</strong></td>
<td><strong>Incrementalist view</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top down approach</td>
<td>Bottom up approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Federal) state-centred explanations</td>
<td>State—society centred explanations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Public Management</td>
<td>New Public Governance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= *useful when no ambiguity of goals and instruments*

= *useful when clarity cannot be provided*

‘Adaptive governance’ goes beyond dichotomies:
Combine the delegation of decisionmaking power with continuous monitoring, reflection and improvement