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Introduction

Facilitating learning in health policy analysis

Health policy analysis is a small but growing field of study. It is increasingly recognised as an important area within health policy and systems. However, there is still limited training in the discipline internationally. This is perhaps the only course of its kind that is provided in Africa. These materials have been provided in order to encourage the development of courses in this area and to share experience with interested colleagues.

An evolving programme

It is envisaged that others working in the field of health policy will adapt and refine this programme as appropriate to suit their participants’ needs. In the spirit of collective learning and development, feedback on the use of the module is encouraged. Feedback may be sent to the course developers, Lucy Gilson and Ermin Erasmus, at the Centre for Health Policy, School of Public Health, University of the Witwatersrand (Tel: +27-11-242-9900 Email: lucy.gilson@nhls.ac.za or lgilson@iafrica.com / ermin.erasmus@nhls.ac.za).
Overview of the course

This course is designed around 13 sessions comprised of activities woven together with theoretical inputs (interactive presentations), and three Group Work Sessions in which participants apply what they have learned. Sessions 2-3, paint the ‘big picture’ as key concepts relating to policy and policy analysis are outlined. Subsequent sessions focus on specific parts of this picture as participants examine key elements and interactions in more detail. (See below for a summary of the sessions.)

In the Group Work Sessions participants analyse a policy scenario. At the end of the course each group presents their analysis and consolidates their learning through a process of peer and self-assessment. An individual assignment completes the course.

The course has been taught as a five-day module, with the individual assignment and an examination being carried out after this period. Although it is not recommended that the course be taught over less than five days, it is expected that other facilitators will structure the sessions to suit their needs and the time and other resources available.

Summary of the sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction to Policy and Policy Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduces some key concepts relating to policy and policy analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides a brief overview of the course so participants know what to expect and the work required of them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduces the varied and complex nature of ‘policy’; and how the study of policy can help to explain the successes and failures of current and past policies as well as inform future policy development and implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses a case study approach to introduce participants to the process of policy analysis: the identification of key factors influencing policy and the use of theoretical frameworks to explain how the interactions between different factors affect the policy outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduces the three Group Work Sessions. These involve each group analysing a different policy scenario.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Actors in the Policy Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focuses on the central role that actors play in policy processes. Participants discover that there are different types and roles of actors and that their actions are influenced by power relationships, beliefs and value systems and self-interest (what they seek to gain from the policy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduces some of the key theoretical concepts relating to actors and their role in policy processes. Participants develop their understanding of the theory as they analyse a given scenario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduces participants to stakeholder analysis, an analytical tool that can help to assess the political feasibility of a policy and its implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Work 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants work on their group scenarios, focusing on the actors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Context and Content**

Focuses on the analysis of policy context and content and the influence of these elements on the actors in the policy process.

**Session 7**
Shows how theoretical frameworks can be used to categorise different contextual factors in order to understand how they influence actors and policy processes.

**Session 8**
Introduces a characteristics analysis and language analysis approach to the study of policy content. Such analyses can show that different actors may interpret policy in different ways, and this has implications for policy process and outcomes.

**Session 9**
As participants complete the stakeholder analysis begun in Session 6, they realise how factors relating to policy content, context and actors are interlinked.

**Group Work 2**
Participants develop their understanding of the actors in their scenarios, by identifying the ways in which policy content and context influenced the actors’ interests and power relationships. They will also conduct a stakeholder analysis for their scenario.

**Planning and Managing Policy Processes**

Shows how analysis of actors, content and context can help to inform the policy process.

**Session 10**
Explains how understanding actors’ interests, values, beliefs and ideas can inform strategies to build support for and/or reduce opposition to a proposed policy. Understanding the interrelationships between content, context, actors and process is crucial for strategy development.

**Session 11**
This session focuses on the interactions between all the elements that influence policy – actors, content, context and process.

**Group Work 3**
Participants identify the key strategies used in their policy scenario. They also plan their presentations.

**Policy Scenario Presentations and Assignments**

Each group now has an opportunity to show how they have applied what they have learnt during the course to their analysis of a particular policy scenario. The feedback they receive will inform the individual assignments, which will be based on the same scenario that they studied in their group.

**Session 12**
Focuses on the groups’ analysis of their policy scenarios and their application of the concepts and principles learned during the course.

**Session 13**
Provides information to support participants in their assignments, and clarifies their exam task if relevant.
Educational approach

This module follows a constructivist approach to learning which is based on the understanding that learners are not ‘empty vessels’ to be filled with ‘knowledge’, but that their understanding of new information is built upon and shaped by their existing knowledge, skills, values and attitudes. Therefore, many of the activities in the module have been designed to encourage participants to think through issues for themselves before providing them with new information or theory. In this way learning can be more effective as participants relate the ideas and concepts to their own experience and existing knowledge. This is also the reason why the ‘theoretical inputs’ are designed as ‘interactive presentations’ rather than ‘lectures’.

During the presentations, asking relevant questions can help to draw out what participants already think about certain issues or terms. In this way new information can be provided in a way that helps to either reinforce participants’ understanding, or correct any misunderstanding they may have. Questions can also be used to encourage participants to apply their knowledge and to assess their understanding of new concepts and theories. However, if time is short it is easy to let a lecture-mode of imparting knowledge dominate. To avoid this, facilitators are encouraged to use the activities to guide discussion and draw out key themes or concepts and to be flexible in when, and how, theoretical input is given.

A key challenge of this style of teaching is time-management, which involves the ability to keep the discussions to the point and manage the group dynamics (i.e. encouraging contributions from quieter participants and avoiding discussions being dominated by the more vocal participants). Such skills are developed through practice; however, some tips are given in the Guide where appropriate.

Learning through ‘doing’

An active-learning approach also informs the module. The Group Work Sessions allow participants to apply what they have learnt and grapple with some of the complexities of policy analysis. It is worth emphasising to participants that this is a valuable learning opportunity and the more time and effort they put into it the more they will gain from the learning experience.

An outcomes-based approach

Outcomes-based education involves identifying clear learning outcomes that can be shown, and assessed, at the end of the learning programme. Participants need to know what they are expected to work towards at the beginning of the learning programme. To facilitate this, relevant learning outcomes (for the course as a whole, and for specific sessions) and assessment guidelines and criteria have been provided. It is suggested that these are referred to at the beginning of each session as appropriate.
Assessment
At the end of the course there are two formal opportunities for assessment: (a) the group work presentation; and (b) the individual assignment. There may also be an examination, especially if the module forms part of a larger course, such as a diploma or master’s course.

Throughout the course, observe participants as they work in groups, reflect on the progress they are making towards the learning outcomes and provide feedback and support as needed. It is also recommended that participants’ reflect on their own progress. A self-assessment process they could follow for this is outlined in the Session 2 overview sheet (Appendix 1).

Preparation and resources
For each session, the facilitator will need to prepare one to three short presentations to provide theoretical background and to reinforce and/or supplement information shared during the activities. This input will need to be adapted as necessary to meet the needs and concerns of participants. Where relevant, guidelines are provided for such presentations, suggesting key points to include and questions to ask so participants can relate the ideas to their own experience and session activities.

Participants’ file
If resources allow, it is recommended that participants are given photocopies of session overview pages (learning outcomes, key points covered and key readings) (see Appendix 1) and activity-related handouts (Appendix 2) which they can file as the course progresses. You may decide to supplement these with your own notes from overheads or slides used in the presentations, as well as copies of essential readings.

Scenarios for Group Work Sessions
You will need to compile a few policy scenarios for the Group Work Sessions. Each group (of a maximum of six participants) will work on a different scenario. One scenario that you could use is provided as an example in Appendix 3.
Other resources

For each session you will need flip-chart (or newsprint/large sheets of paper) and marker pens to record key points during discussion. It is helpful if these are displayed on the walls and left for participants to refer to as needed during the course.

Certain activities may require additional resources and these are indicated in the relevant section as needed.

Managing the group work

Unless otherwise specified, the optimum size for group activities is about four participants. To allow greater opportunity for participants to meet and share ideas with each other and so learn from one another’s experiences, it is recommended that during the activities participants work with people who are not part of their larger group for the Group Work Sessions.

As you observe the group work, particularly the longer Group Work Sessions, watch out for the following and intervene as needed.

Examples of interventions to facilitate the group work

- If one person dominates the group:
  ask questions to encourage other participants to contribute.

- If the group gets ‘stuck’ on one issue:
  ask questions to encourage them to think of other issue, prompt them to move on.

- Remind participants to record their ideas or the consensus reached.

- Remind them of the time and help them pace themselves, for example: Use the last 10 minutes to focus on question X or plan your presentation.

Stylistic conventions used in this Guide

For ease of reference, throughout most of the Guide the reader is assumed to be a potential course facilitator and is referred to as ‘you’.

For ease of reference, the Handouts (relating to specific activities) have been numbered consecutively throughout the Guide (1 – 20, see Appendix 2). However, the Activities, Tables, Boxes and Theoretical input sections have been numbered consecutively within each section, using a decimal numbering system.

For clarity, in the text the first (or main) reference to Handouts, Activities, Tables and Boxes is highlighted in bold.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Activities and interactive presentations</th>
<th>Learning outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>Introduction to Policy and Policy Analysis</td>
<td><strong>Session 1: Welcome and Introduction</strong>&lt;br&gt;Activity 2.1  A policy brainstorm (10 minutes)&lt;br&gt;Activity 2.2  What's your policy? (40 minutes)&lt;br&gt;Theoretical input 2.1 What is policy? What is policy analysis (45 min)</td>
<td>Identify different uses of the term policy&lt;br&gt;Distinguish between policy as intent and policy as understanding and practice&lt;br&gt;Describe different types of policy analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.30-9.00</td>
<td><strong>Session 2: What is Policy? What is Policy Analysis?</strong>&lt;br&gt;Activity 2.1  A policy brainstorm (10 minutes)&lt;br&gt;Activity 2.2  What's your policy? (40 minutes)&lt;br&gt;Theoretical input 2.1 What is policy? What is policy analysis (45 min)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.30-12.00</td>
<td><strong>Session 3: Analysing Policy Processes</strong>&lt;br&gt;Activity 3.1 South Korean case study: First impressions (40 minutes)&lt;br&gt;Theoretical input 3.1 A framework for analysing policy processes (50 minutes)&lt;br&gt;Activity 3.2 South Korean case study: Looking deeper (1.5 hours)&lt;br&gt;Theoretical input 3.2 Applying theory to analysing policy processes (30 minutes)</td>
<td>Understand the focus and nature of policy analysis applied to processes&lt;br&gt;Recognise the complexity of the overall policy process&lt;br&gt;Understand the inter-linkage of policy development and implementation processes&lt;br&gt;Identify the key elements interacting within these processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00-12.40</td>
<td><strong>Session 5: The Central Role of Actors</strong>&lt;br&gt;Theoretical input 5.1 Actors' roles and influence (1 hour 40 minutes)&lt;br&gt;Activity 5.1 What drives you? Recognising belief systems in policy decisions (20 minutes)&lt;br&gt;Activity 5.2 A policy story: Getting to know the actors (1 hour 10 minutes)</td>
<td>Identify key categories of actors in the policy process&lt;br&gt;Explain how actors may influence the policy process&lt;br&gt;Recognise actors' practices and sources of power&lt;br&gt;Identify the factors influencing actors' behaviours and roles in the policy process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00-16.00</td>
<td><strong>Session 6: Stakeholder Analysis: Part 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;Theoretical input 6.1 Introduction to stakeholder analysis (10 min)&lt;br&gt;Activity 6.1 Conducting a stakeholder analysis: Part 1 (30 minutes)</td>
<td>Understand the purpose and approach of stakeholder analysis&lt;br&gt;Apply frameworks for conducting stakeholder analysis&lt;br&gt;Assess the strengths and weaknesses of stakeholder analysis as a management tool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00-16.30</td>
<td><strong>Session 1: Welcome and Introduction</strong>&lt;br&gt;Theoretical input 2.1 What is policy? What is policy analysis (45 min)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session / Activity</td>
<td>Activities and interactive presentations</td>
<td>Learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.30-10.00</td>
<td>Session 7</td>
<td><strong>Activity 7.1</strong> Brainstorming contextual factors at a national level (10 minutes)</td>
<td>Categorise the main contextual features that influence policy change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Theoretical input 7.1</strong> Categorising contextual factors (30 minutes)</td>
<td>Discuss how contextual factors influence policy actors, content and processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Activity 7.2</strong> Categorising contextual factors: South Korean case study (30 minutes)</td>
<td>Recognise the particular roles of institutions and broader political systems in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Theoretical input 7.2</strong> Actors and context (20 minutes)</td>
<td>shaping actors’ power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Theoretical input 7.3</strong> Micro-level context (20 minutes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30-12.00</td>
<td>Session 8</td>
<td><strong>Activity 8.1</strong> Brainstorming content (30 minutes)</td>
<td>Recognise different forms of policy content and their varying influence over the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Theoretical input 8.1</strong> Policy characteristics (15 mins)</td>
<td>policy process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Activity 8.2</strong> Policy characteristics analysis: South Korean case study (30 minutes)</td>
<td>Apply policy characteristics analysis to assess how policy design influences actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Theoretical input 8.2</strong> Language analysis (15 mins)</td>
<td>Recognise different forms of policy instruments and determine the degree to which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>policy complexity and/or simplicity impacts on implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00-13.00</td>
<td>Session 9</td>
<td><strong>Activity 9.1</strong> Conducting a stakeholder analysis: Part 2 (1 hour)</td>
<td>Understand the purpose and approach of stakeholder analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Stakeholder Analysis:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Part 2</strong></td>
<td>Apply frameworks for conducting stakeholder analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assess the strengths and weaknesses of stakeholder analysis as a management tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00-16.30</td>
<td>Group Work Session</td>
<td>Analysing policy: Focus on context and content (2 hours 30 minutes)</td>
<td>Recognise how content and context influence the experience of the selected policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>scenario and, specifically, actors’ roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undertake a stakeholder analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Activities and interactive presentations</td>
<td>Learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Planning and Managing Policy Processes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8.30-10.30   | Session 10: Developing Strategies to Support Policy Change | Theoretical input 10.1: Studying strategies (20 minutes)  
Activity 10.1: Actor management Part 1: Taking account of interests (40 minutes)  
Theoretical input 10.2: Developing a communication strategy (10 min)  
Activity 10.2: Actor management Part 2: Taking account of values and beliefs (40 minutes)  
Theoretical input 10.3: Other strategies for policy processes (10 min) | Recognise the importance of strategy to policy change  
Apply frameworks in identifying actor management strategies  
Identify other types and forms of strategies  
Recognise key factors influencing the processes used in policy development and implementation  
Understand the relevance of policy analysis to managerial action and strategic planning |
| 10.30-11.00  | Tea-break                        |                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| 11.00-12.30  | Session 11: Thinking in an Integrated Way | Activity 11.1: What would have happened if …? Introducing a change to the South Korean policy experience (1.5 hours) | Recognise the ways in which elements of the policy analysis triangle combine to influence policy processes  
Recognise that understanding the policy process requires an integrated and synthesized analysis of problems and experiences. |
| 12.30-13.30  | Lunch                            |                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| 13.30-16.30  | Group Work Session 3            | Analysing policy: Focus on strategies (3 hours)                                                             | Identify the main strategies used in the selected policy scenario and how they influenced the overall success or failure of the experience described  
Recognise how features of content and context influenced processes |
| **Day 5**    | **Policy Scenario Presentations and Assignments** |                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| 8.30-9.45    | The groups finalise their presentations |                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| 9.45-12.15   | Session 12: Policy Scenarios     | Part 1: Group Work presentations (15 minutes per presentation, plus time for questions)  
Part 2: Comparing the scenarios (30 minutes) | Present a clearly argued, factually correct and integrated analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the policy process in the policy scenario  
Recognise the ways in which elements of the policy analysis triangle combine to influence policy processes  
Conduct an integrated and synthesised analysis of policy process problems and experiences |
| 12.15 -13.00 | Session 13: Assignment briefing  | Part 1: Tips for writing assignments (30 minutes)  
Part 2: Group self-assessment (10 minutes)  
Part 3: Evaluation of the course (5 minutes) | Appreciate the need to present their argument in a clear and logical way, using evidence from the scenario and theoretical frameworks where appropriate  
Draw on the concepts and principles outlined in the course to inform their assignment  
Identify the structural elements required in their written assignment  
Reflect on their own group work skills |
# Introduction to Policy and Policy Analysis

Provides an overview of the course. Outlines key concepts relating to policy and policy analysis.

## Summary of sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th>Welcome and introduction to the course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>What is policy? What is policy analysis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 2.1: A policy brainstorm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 2.2: What’s your policy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theoretical input 2.1: What is policy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is policy analysis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td>Analysing policy processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 3.1: South Korean case study:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First impressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theoretical input 3.1: A framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for analysing policy processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 3.2: South Korean case study:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Looking deeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theoretical input 3.2: Applying theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to analysing policy processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td>Introduction to the group policy analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preparation for Group Work 1 (individual work after Session 4)
Each participant to read their policy scenario and develop a time line to show the key events in the policy story.
Resources

- Participants’ files with relevant overview sheets
- A5 pieces of card or scrap paper (Session 3, Activity 3.2)
- Handouts 1-6 (one per participant)

Essential readings

What is policy? What is policy analysis?


*For the really interested*


Other references


Analysing policy processes


*For the really interested*


Other references


Session 1  Welcome and introduction to the course

Provides a brief overview of the course so participants know what to expect and the work required of them.

Key points to cover in your introduction to the course:

- the module objectives
- the fact that participants will learn about the processes that underlie the development and implementation of all policies; and an approach to policy analysis that can be applied to any policy
- the overall timetable and key topics covered
- the key tasks for assessment (i.e. group work presentations and individual assignment based on the group work scenario), including the allocation of marks for each piece of work
- the information that will be provided for their files (such as summary notes and readings for each session, criteria for assessment)
- relevant textbooks which they may consider purchasing (such as Making Health Policy and Health Policy: An Introduction to Process and Power)
- choice of scenarios for their group work sessions. Briefly outline the focus of each scenario and explain that participants may choose the one that interests them most. However, everyone may not get their first choice as you may need to limit the group size (a maximum of six people in a group is recommended).

Distribute the course files and draw participants’ attention to the module overview page when appropriate.

If your group does not already know each other, and is small enough, it is worth providing an opportunity for participants to introduce themselves. At the minimum, it is useful to get a sense of the range of health professionals present and the region/country in which they are based. Also provide name tags.

A process for dividing participants into groups for the Group Work Sessions

Put up on the wall a short paragraph about each scenario with a table (with no more than six spaces) so participants can sign up for it. Participants can choose their scenario during the tea and lunch breaks.
Session 2  **What is policy? What is policy analysis?**

Introduces the varied and complex nature of ‘policy’ and how policy analysis can help to explain policy successes and failures as well as inform future policy.

---

**Introduce the session**

Briefly state the focus of Session 2, draw attention to the learning outcomes.

By the end of Session 2, participants will be able to:

- identify different uses of the term policy
- distinguish between policy as intent and policy as understanding and practice
- describe different forms of policy analysis.

---

**Activity 2.1  A policy brainstorm**

1. Ask participants: ‘What is policy?’ Encourage them to share any words, ideas or concepts that they relate to the word ‘policy’. To encourage a variety of ideas, ask participants to put themselves in their home or office setting and ask if any unwritten policies apply there.

2. Record all the suggestions on flip-chart. As the purpose of a brainstorm is to generate as many ideas as possible, avoid any discussion or criticism of the ideas.

---

**This activity:**

- allows participants to share their existing understanding of ‘policy’ – the foundation from which their ‘new’ learning will grow
- generates a list of words related to policy that can be referred to and amended throughout the course as previous assumptions and definitions are clarified and new links or ideas developed.

---

You may find that people tend to use different words for similar concepts (e.g. duty and responsibility). Point this out to participants as an example of how policy may be communicated, and understood, in different ways. During the module participants will become more aware of this as they consider why intended policy outcomes do not necessarily match what happens in practice.
Activity 2.2  What’s your policy?

1. Divide participants into groups of three or four.

2. Assign each group a particular environment, for example a home, a school, a well-known supermarket chain or other company. Make sure that you include the home and avoid health sector-specific environments.

3. Ask participants: ‘What policy/cies are there in your group’s environment?’ Allow them to think of some examples.

   If participants find it hard to think of policies, ask questions such as: Can anyone in your home/clinic/company just do as they please? What influences behaviour or how things are done?

4. The groups report back, focusing on each environment in turn. To save time, you could ask each group to give two examples. Make a list of the examples on flip chart paper.

   Encourage the groups to give specific examples of policy in their environment. These may be written or unwritten conventions, codes of conduct, cultural practices or other influences on behaviour (See Box 2.1 for examples.)

5. After all the groups have made a contribution, facilitate a plenary discussion. Compare the list of ideas from the initial brainstorm (Activity 2.1) with the list of practical examples for different environments. Were participants surprised by the variety/number of the suggestions? What does this tell you about the nature of ‘policy’?

   One obvious difference may be that the ideas generated in Activity 2.1 focused on written documents, whereas the last exercise generated examples of policy in practice. In practice (especially in the home) policy is not necessarily written down and it may be implicit or explicit.

   You could ask participants: if policies are not written down, how are they communicated? This will lead into discussion of how polices are developed and by whom, and how they are influenced by people’s values and beliefs.

   There will not be time to talk about the issues in detail. Keep the discussion focused. Use the examples that participants provide to show how policy may be:
   - written or unwritten, explicit or implicit
   - developed and implemented in different ways depending on the situation and the values and beliefs of the people involved.

   You can refer back to the examples given in this session during the theoretical presentation that follows.

This activity:
- encourages participants to think about what ‘policy’ means in practice
- helps to develop a broader understanding of the term ‘policy’.
If there is time, some participants may benefit from the *individual reflection activity* described on page 19. This could also form part of a self-assessment process.

**Box 2.1 ‘What is policy?’ Some suggestions …**

*Policy may take different forms*

*Policies can be* … laws, documents, procedures, guiding principles, statements of intent, working frameworks to achieve certain objectives, rules and regulations ….

*Policy is* … a way of working, a vision, a programme of action, duties, responsibilities, accountability, an unwritten cultural or ethical code that guides behaviour.

*Different environments have different polices*

For example:
- In a supermarket: a dress code; how to deal with customers’ demands
- In an office: a procedure for booking leave; pay policy
- In the home: the times children should be in bed; who helps with the household chores

*Policy can be developed in different ways*

Policies may be negotiated as a way of resolving conflict
- They may developed through repetition and habit
- They may be cultural practices or traditional ways of doing things

*Policy can be implemented in different ways*

Through decree (‘because Dad says so’)
- Through convention (‘because that’s what everyone else in the office does’)
- Through negotiation (‘if you do this you will get …’)
- Through a shared understanding of an ethical code of conduct (for example the implementation of a Patient’s Rights Charter may be influenced by people’s expectations about how things should happen even though the details may not be written down)

*How policy is described in the theoretical literature, some examples*

“Health policy is about process and power … it is concerned with who influences whom in the making of policy, and how that happens” (Walt 1994)

*Health policy …*

“Embraces courses of action that affect sets of institutions, organizations, services and funding arrangements of the health care system. It goes beyond health services, however, and includes actions or unintended actions by public, private (*including households*) or voluntary organizations that have impact on health.” (Walt 1994)
Reflecting on ‘policy’ in your own experience

Draw participants’ attention to the individual reflection exercise on the Session 2 overview sheet (Appendix 1). Explain that it is a tool that they may find useful during the course. During the lunch break or tea sessions, a few minutes spent relating what they have learned to their own experience of policy will help to consolidate their learning. It can also prompt them to record any points they would like clarified during the course.

This activity:
- Encourages participants to see themselves as actors in a policy process and to begin to analyse their own role in that process
- Provides an opportunity for individual self-assessment during the course.

What is policy? What is policy analysis?

As you present some theory from the policy analysis literature, bring it alive by referring to the examples discussed during Activities 2.1 and 2.2, and asking questions as appropriate. See Table 2.1 for suggested topics to cover and relevant questions. End the session with a summary of the key points (also listed on their session overview sheet).

Key points for the end of Session 2
- The term policy has a very wide range of different meanings.
- Governments, organisations and even households have policies.
- Public policy is government policy.
- Policy can be formal and informal, and can include non-decisions.
- Policy arises from a process and policy problems are often generated by that process.
- Policy analysis can be applied to understand or to intervene in policy processes.

This may be the first time participants have heard about policy analysis, so keep the presentation simple and to the point. Avoid giving too many theoretical terms and detail at this stage. More of this will be uncovered in later sessions. Aim to end this session with participants feeling motivated and keen to learn more about the topic. An enthusiastic and energetic style in your presentation will help with this.
### Table 2.1 What is policy? What is policy analysis?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key points</th>
<th>Suggested questions and examples for prompting discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The varied nature of ‘policy’</strong></td>
<td>Refer to the examples participants’ identified in Activities 2.1 and 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defining ‘policy’</strong></td>
<td>Would this definition cover all the examples of policy given in Activities 2.1 and 2.2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy = A set of decisions and non-decisions taken by those responsible for a particular policy area</td>
<td>Can you give an example of a non-decision that influenced a policy process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It may be a decision to deliberately not address an issue; or it may be that a certain issue was not considered at all, in which case the ‘non-decision’ was the result of an oversight. In either case, the ‘non-decision’ can have consequences for the policy process. Non-decision making can also work through the rule of anticipated reaction: person A does not raise an issue because he/she anticipates the negative reaction of person(s) B. Hence there is a non-decision because the issue was never actively debated or decided upon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who are ‘those responsible’?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They may not just be those working in the health sector. For example, patients may be expected to take some responsibility for their health.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What is policy? Some different forms of policy**

Policy as an intended process of change

The intentions of a policy – *policy as intent* (the vision, goals, understandings, principles and plans that seek to, for example, guide activities, establish accountability and responsibility)

Policy as reflected in the way things are done

Policy is experienced through what happens in practice – *policy as practice* (routine decisions, activities, understandings and achievements)

Policy as written documents

Policy as people’s understandings and actions

**Provide a definition of health policy** (for example “Embraces courses of …” from Walt, 1994 (See Box 2.1)

**Sometimes what a policy intends to do does not happen in practice. Can you think of any examples?**

For example, there may be a Patient’s Rights Charter but the attitudes and behaviour of health workers do not necessarily reflect the intentions of the Charter.

**To what extent does this go beyond the idea of ‘health’ policy as merely government policy?**
Table 2.1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Key points</strong></th>
<th><strong>Suggested questions and examples for prompting discussion</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A short overview of the history of policy analysis</strong> (shows a trend from thinking of policy making as a purely technical process to one about creating shared social meanings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The value of studying policy processes</strong> Policies often don’t achieve what was intended because of <strong>power and processes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Is what a policy intends to do the same as what happens in practice?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The nature of the policy process</strong> (who makes the decisions, what influences what issues get addressed, who/what influences policy design, implementation …)</td>
<td><strong>Can participants give you any examples of the use or source of power related to health policy?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is policy analysis?</strong> (retrospective studies of policy and/or studies of policy during the development/implementation process)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is a policy ‘success’ or ‘failure’?</strong> An analysis with a focus on policy content and impacts may consider a policy ‘successful’ if the ‘problem’ has been adequately addressed by the policy action. However, whose view/s determines the ‘problem’ and ‘success’? An analysis that focuses on process would consider the processes that establish the conditions for successfully addressing problems through policy action. This involves considering the ‘software’, such as people’s understanding of the policy, and not just the ‘hardware,’ such as the resources available.</td>
<td><strong>Can you think of a successful policy? Why do you think it ‘succeeded’?</strong> <strong>Can you think of an example of a policy that failed?</strong> <strong>Did it fail because the original intention was not worthwhile or for other reasons?</strong> For example, was it due to lack of resources or a problem with the process which alienated a key group of people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who does policy analysis?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Who may find the results of this sort of analysis useful?</strong> You may find participants at first only associate policy analysis with academics but they may find that they have been doing it themselves or working with people who consider such issues, albeit in a less formal way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Session 3  Analysing policy processes

A case study approach is used to introduce participants to the process of policy analysis – identifying key factors and using theoretical frameworks to explain how the factors interact to influence policy.

Introduce the session
Briefly state the focus of Session 3, draw attention to the learning outcomes.

By the end of Session 3, participants will be able to:
- understand the focus and nature of policy analysis applied to processes
- recognise the complexity of the overall policy process
- understand the inter-linkage of policy development and implementation processes
- identify the key elements interacting within these processes.

Activity 3.1  South Korean case study: First impressions

1. Give each participant a copy of the case study about the separation of drug prescription and dispensation in South Korea (Handout 1) and the record sheet (Handout 2).

2. Explain that they need to read the case study and then complete the record sheet, or as much of it as they can in the time available. The aim is to capture their initial understanding or impressions of the case study. They do not need to write detailed notes. They will refer to this sheet later when they consider the case study in more detail in Activity 3.2.

3. Facilitate a plenary discussion to make sure that participants have understood the reading and identified appropriate kinds of factors or issues. Avoid discussing the issues in detail here – there will be opportunity for that later.

Some questions to help guide the discussion:
- What was the policy trying to change?
- Did it achieve its goals?
- Who was involved in the policy process?
- What were the key steps, or key elements, in the process?
- Were there any unintended outcomes?

This activity:
- allows participants to read about a real policy process to which they can relate the ideas and concepts discussed in Session 2 and the new information you are going to present
- develops participants’ critical reading skills
- prepares participants for the group work in Activity 3.2 (ensures that all members of the group have read and thought about the case study).
Polices are, in effect, the outcome of a series of decisions (and/or non-decisions). Therefore, you could refer to decision-making theory and then use the policy analysis triangle framework to explain more about the interrelated factors (actors, content, context and process) that influence policy processes. Wherever possible, give examples and ask questions to encourage participants to link the theory to the South Korean case study and/or their own experience. See Table 3.1 for some key points to cover and examples of questions to ask.

### Table 3.1  A framework for analysing policy processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key points</th>
<th>Suggested questions and examples for prompting discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remind participants of what comprises a policy process and the types of questions that policy analysis seeks to answer.</td>
<td>What type of questions does policy analysis seek to answer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making models/approaches (e.g. compare the rational decision-making and the planning cycle model with the incremental approach to decision-making; discuss the limitations of the models, in terms of their ability to reflect what actually happens)</td>
<td>Who aims to follow a rational decision-making approach in their work?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Highlight the type of information you need in order to better explain policy processes (e.g. which actors influence decisions and what influences the type of decisions they make) | Does it always work as you intend it to?  
Yes/No?  
(e.g. other people have different ideas, unexpected things happen, never time to involve everyone or to think about all the factors affecting the problem; the rational decision-making model works best in ‘simple’ cases where you have control) |
| The Policy Analysis Triangle (like the two decision-making models, this framework also emphasises the central role of actors in the policy process, yet it also highlights the links between actors and three other factors that influence decision-making: context, content and process) | To what extent does this framework take into account the factors that you identified as influencing the policy process?  
(refer to examples given in discussion of previous models) In Activity 3.2 participants will explore how the different factors interlink, which may not be as neatly as the triangle diagram suggests. |
### Table 3.1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key points</th>
<th>Suggested questions and examples for prompting discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who the ‘actors’ are in policy processes and their roles</strong></td>
<td>Who were the actors in the South Korean case study?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(encourage participants to consider the less obvious players in the process, e.g. members of the general public and how they may influence policy by their ‘non-action’)*</td>
<td>In what ways did they influence the policy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can you give examples of actors in other policy processes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Participants may understand the term ‘actors’ as being the same as ‘stakeholders’. If possible, avoid using the term ‘stakeholder’ as it does not take account of ‘hidden’ actors – those who may influence policy but have no obvious ‘stake’ in the process.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is meant by policy ‘context’</strong></td>
<td>Can you give any examples of how context influences policy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(the setting or situation in which policy processes occur, international, national and local settings; it includes structures, resources as well as ideas, values)</td>
<td>In what way can values shape the content of a policy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ways in which context influences policy</strong></td>
<td>In the South Korean example, how did past policies affect the current problem of over-prescription of drugs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. gives some actors power, constrains others; influences the feasibility of implementing content (e.g. through affecting resource availability); affects decision-making processes (e.g. governance structures and practices))</td>
<td>How did content influence the policy process in South Korea?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is meant by policy ‘content’</strong></td>
<td>Can you give examples of the micro-processes used in the South Korean policy experience?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(it includes policy objectives, underlying values and design details; it is reflected in written documents as well as in practice and knowledge)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ways in which content influences policy processes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. influence of past policies on current problems, how the design of new polices shape actors’ interests and concerns)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Micro-processes and strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific processes and strategies that are incorporated within the overall policy process (e.g. in policy formulation: routine committees, consensus building; in implementation and routine service delivery: dedicated implementation units, top-down instructions). Formal and informal tactics are often important. Issues of speed and scale are always important. Who is and who is not involved matters.</td>
<td>Can you give examples of the micro-processes used in the South Korean policy experience?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity 3.2  

South Korean case study: Looking deeper

1. Give each group five A5 sheets of paper (or card) and one copy of Handout 3.

2. Each group needs to decide whether or not the overall policy process was a success or failure and to identify five main issues to report back on. They should summarise each issue on a separate piece of paper.

   Their initial reading (Activity 3.1) focused on what happened, in this discussion they need to consider why the policy developed in that way and how the process affected the outcomes.

3. Ask the groups to give a brief report back on the issues they identified (about two minutes each). If time is short, the groups can report back on two or three of their five issues.

   After (or during) each report back, group their ‘issue sheets’ on the wall according to whether or not they relate to the policy content, actors, context or process.

   Encourage participants to take the analysis further by:
   - grouping similar issues together
   - making connections between different factors
   - considering why particular factors had the effects they did.

   See Handout 4 for a summary of some of the main issues drawn from the South Korean case study.

4. You could end the activity by asking participants if they can think of any other factors related to policy that are not covered by the four elements: content, actors, context and process. If none can be identified this is a measure of the ‘usefulness’ of these elements as concepts in a framework or tool for policy analysis.

5. Distribute Handout 4 for participants’ reference.

The main aim of this activity is not to make a detailed analysis of all the issues, but rather for participants to discover how different factors affect each other in the policy development process. It is often the relationships between the various factors that shape the policy outcomes, rather than the policy content itself. In addition, there may not always be a clear distinction between different phases in the process.

This activity:
- allows participants to distinguish between four key elements in policy processes
- shows the complexity of policy processes
- develops analytical and critical thinking skills, as participants link pieces of information derived from the case study to broader, conceptual terms that have relevance beyond this particular study
- allows participants to practice a process they can use when they analyse their scenario in the Group Work Sessions
- encourages the development of group work and presentation skills.
Applying theory to analysing policy processes  

By this stage, participants should have a sense of what policy analysis involves – the types of questions to consider and the challenges of explaining how different factors influence each other. Hopefully, Activity 3.2 will have stimulated some interesting debate about a variety of issues. This theoretical input provides another opportunity to show how theory can help to bring some clarity to what may appear to be an overwhelmingly complex set of factors and processes. In particular, it focuses on agenda setting and policy implementation.

See Table 3.2 for suggestions of key points to cover and questions to help engage participants with the theory. End the session with a summary of key points.

**Key points**

- Policy analysis is interpretive and different theoretical frameworks emphasise different ways of understanding experiences.
- The policy process is rarely rational and linear, but always evolutionary and, often, conflictual.
- Policy analysis is concerned not only with agenda setting (the development of policies to tackle identified solutions) but also with implementation of new policies and routine service delivery.
- The policy process always combines, and is influenced by, four key factors: content, context, actors and micro-processes.

**Reviewing Session 3**

As at the end of Session 3, you may like to reflect on how the session went, as well as to remind participants of the readings and their individual reflection exercise.
### Table 3.2 Applying theory to analysing policy process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key points</th>
<th>Suggested questions and examples for prompting discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| You could begin by:  
  - reminding participants of the policy analysis triangle framework, which may look simple but its complexity lies in the interaction between the factors  
  - referring to the stages model of policy process to remind participants of where agenda setting comes in the process  
  - discussing the role of theory in understanding policy process |  

**Kingdon’s agenda setting model**  
(issues move on the policy agenda when the three streams (problem, solution and political) come together; has a focus on actors but also highlights the importance of processes and context)  

- Why do some issues get on the policy agenda and others do not?  
- Do you think Kingdon’s model reflects what happened in South Korea? If so, how?  

**Implementation theories**  
*Top-down compared with bottom-up*  
(neither theory may sufficiently explain what happens in practice, both have their limitations)  

- Can you think of any examples of policies that were implemented in a top-down or bottom-up manner?  
- Why do some policies that are implemented in a top-down manner ‘succeed’ whilst others ‘fail’?  
- Which theory do you think best fits the South Korean experience?  
  (it could be seen from both perspectives, although it was initiated in a top-down manner by government, the bottom-up action of the doctors succeeding in changing the original proposals)  

**Linking implementation theories to the policy analysis triangle**  
(the framework can be used to show the complex ways in which different factors interact)  

**The importance of policy analysis**  
(through a focus on power and processes, it can help to explain why policies do, or do not, achieve what was intended)  

- Are technically sound documents/ideas about new ways of addressing problems enough to bring about change in practice? Why/why not?  
- Do existing practices always support the achievement of the policy goal? Why/why not?  

Point out that future sessions of the course will focus in more detail about each of the elements of the policy analysis triangle framework
Session 4  Introduction to the group policy analysis

Explains the Group Work Sessions.

Introduce the session

The rest of the course is structured around three Group Work Sessions. These involve each group analysing a different policy scenario. There will be no daily report backs after these sessions. In Session 12, each group will give a presentation that:

- shows their judgement about the success or failure of the policy change experience (the scenario they studied); and
- explains their judgement with reference to the main strengths and weaknesses of the policy process in their scenario.

1. Explain the group work to participants and go through Handout 5. Emphasise that they will need to:
   - use the questions on their handout sheet to guide their discussions and analysis
   - make sure they cover the assessment criteria for the presentation (Handout 6)
   - use what they have learned from all sessions of the course, but focus on what they have identified as being most important for their particular scenario
   - remember that the term ‘policy process’ covers the various stages in the development and implementation of a policy and the micro-processes, mechanisms and strategies through which actors engage in these stages
   - they should be prepared to do additional reading or other work in the evenings in order to get the most from the sessions and their group discussions.

2. Make sure that participants understand what they have to do and clarify any details as needed.

3. Explain the individual work in preparation for their first Group Work Session.

Individual preparation

Each participant must read their group’s policy scenario and develop a time line to show the key events in the policy story (see Form 1, Handout 5). This timeline will be useful to refer to throughout the group work process. They should bring it to all the sessions.

Emphasise that everyone needs to contribute to the Group Work Sessions as 20% of their individual mark will be based on their presentation.
The Actors in the Policy Process

Focuses on actors and how their actions are influenced by power relationships, beliefs and value systems and self-interest.

Summary of sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 5</th>
<th>The central role of actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical input 5.1</td>
<td>Actors’ roles and influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 5.1</td>
<td>What drives you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 5.2</td>
<td>A policy story: Getting to know the actors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 6</th>
<th>Stakeholder analysis: Part 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical input 6.1</td>
<td>Introduction to stakeholder analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 6.1</td>
<td>Conducting a stakeholder analysis: Part 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Group Work 1 | Analysing policy: Focus on actors |
Resources

- Handouts 7-10 (one copy for each participant)

Essential readings

The central role of actors


For the really interested


Other references


Stakeholder analysis


Session 5  The central role of actors

Introduces some of the key theoretical concepts relating to actors and their role in policy processes.

Introduce the session
Briefly state the focus of Session 5, draw attention to the learning outcomes.

By the end of Session 5 participants will be able to:
- identify key categories of actors in the policy process
- explain how actors may influence the policy process
- recognise actors’ practices and sources of power
- identify the factors influencing actors’ behaviour and roles in the policy process.

Actors’ roles and influence

Actors form the central element in the policy analysis triangle framework. Key questions to consider about actors are: Who are they? What drives them? What roles do they play in the policy process? From where do their derive their power?

During your presentation, encourage participants to relate the concepts to their own experience and to identify examples from the South Korean case study examined in Session 3. Some key points to cover are given in Table 5.1.

Towards the end of your presentation, use Activity 5.1 to help participants understand how values and belief systems underlie actors’ positions on policies. Conclude the presentation with a summary of key points.

Key points
- Actors can drive or support policy change, prevent new ideas even getting on the policy agenda, influence which policies are taken forward and how they are designed, support or resist implementation of new policies.
- Actors can exercise power to shape or resist policy-making, or to influence others in the process.
- Actors’ power within policy-making is influenced by personality, process, content and context.
- Actor understandings of, positions on and responses to policies are partly shaped by their beliefs and contexts (as well as their interests and how these might be affected by policy content).
### Table 5.1  Actors’ roles and influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key points</th>
<th>Suggested questions and examples for prompting discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **The different types of actors and their roles**<br>Those who:  
  - formulate: policy elites (national & international)<br>  - try to influence: interest groups, media (national & international)<br>  - broker: policy entrepreneurs (those who play a connecting role, linking people, ideas, problems to solutions, may include civil society activists)<br>  - implement: bureaucrats, professionals, street level bureaucrats (local) (their actions and ways of working directly influence how policy is experienced by service users)<br>  - benefit: patients, citizens (local) | Ask participants to give examples of actors who play these different roles.<br>Which groups played these roles in South Korea?<br>Can one actor play more than one role?<br>What’s the difference between professionals and bureaucrats?<br>How did the professionals influence policy in South Korea?<br>What kind of challenges do street-level bureaucrats face?<br>Is the media neutral? (the media both shapes public opinion and reflects it)<br>Should policy implementers be involved in the early stages of policy development? If so, how? |
| **The features all actors have in common**<br>(ability to influence policy, operate in a context that may facilitate or constrain their use of power, interests, value and beliefs that influence their use of power) | |
| **Actors’ power**<br>(their ability to influence and control resources)<br>The power to take things forward, to block or resist, to shape other people’s minds. The source of actors’ power (may be related to personality, context or the policy process or content) | Ask for examples of hidden power (e.g. control of the media, shaping the way people see the world, those who resist policy (e.g. bureaucrats who do not implement policy correctly or who implement it slowly); cultural values adding weight to certain views (e.g. gender biases))<br>“As the facilitator for this course, I have the power to …”<br>What type of power do you have? Where does your power lie?<br>How did the professionals use their power in South Korea? |
Table 5.1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key points</th>
<th>Suggested questions and examples for prompting discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actors’ values and beliefs</strong>&lt;br&gt;Values: criteria for selecting what is good in life&lt;br&gt;Beliefs: something accepted as fact (even though it may not be scientifically proven)&lt;br&gt;(Values and beliefs inform actors’ judgements. They are shaped by personality; personal experiences, childhood, training; arguments of others; cultural norms; organizations roles and norms)&lt;br&gt;Values and beliefs underlie different actors’ positions on a policy. Can you think of any examples from the South Korean study or elsewhere?&lt;br&gt;Is it possible to change actors’ interests if you appeal to their values and beliefs?&lt;br&gt;What type of things influence our values and belief systems?&lt;br&gt;What happened in South Korea?&lt;br&gt;Civil society groups believed ‘for profit’ medicine was morally wrong – could that view be linked to political ideology?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actors’ use of power to influence the policy process is affected by:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• their potential to gain or lose from the policy design or process in relation to their interests (stakeholder analysis can help to reveal this)&lt;br&gt;• how closely the policy design or process matches their values and beliefs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activity 5.1  
**What drives you?**  
Recognising belief systems in policy decisions

1. Give each participant a copy of Handout 7.

2. Participants consider whether or not the given scenario is fair, and identify the values and beliefs that inform their judgement.

3. Invite participants to share their ideas. Have a brief discussion about the issues raised. (See Box 5.1 for some examples of ideas that this discussion may generate.)

4. Briefly summarise the key points relating to actors from your presentation.

**This activity:**  
- shows how policies often evoke emotional responses that are rooted in people’s values and beliefs.
Box 5.1 Recognising belief systems in policy decisions

Examples of reactions to a health insurance system in which higher income groups pay more than lower income groups (scenario in Handout 7)

“It’s not fair that higher income groups should pay more than lower income groups. Some poor people are just lazy.”

“Ideally, one should have a maximum level of service for all but if the government cannot afford it, they have to do what’s feasible.”

“It’s not fair. Poor people are more vulnerable to ill health.”

“Health care is not a commodity that can be bought. Some health conditions are out of people’s control and affect rich and poor alike.”

“Everyone should have access to the same standard of health care.”

“It’s OK if the basic health services provided are the same for the rich and poor, and those that can afford it pay extra for a higher standard of catering and accommodation.”

“If some people can pay for better services they should get it.”
The Actors in the Policy Process

Activity 5.2  A policy story: Getting to know the actors

1. Distribute copies of Handout 8 A Policy Story. Allow a few minutes for participants to read the scenario on their own.

2. Briefly explain their group’s task: to identify the key actors in the policy scenario and choose two actors (a policy formulator and a policy implementer) to analyse in detail, considering the questions on their sheet.

3. Point out that the scenario may not include all the information they need, so they may have to use their own judgement about the actors’ interests and belief systems and how they are likely to behave in relation to the policy experience.

4. Observe the groups as they work, providing guidance where necessary.

5. At the start of the report-back session, ask each group to say which actors they chose. Make a list of these on the flip chart. If some groups chose the same actors, you could ask one to give the report-back whilst the other groups listen and then give a critique of it, based on their own analysis.

As the groups report back, make a list of the key points raised on the flip chart. Prompt them as necessary to think more deeply about the issue. Can they identify examples of the different roles actors may play in the policy process (formulators, influencers, brokers, implementers, beneficiaries)? (Refer to Handout 9 for a list of key points that can be drawn out from the story.)

6. Distribute Handout 9 so participants can compare the differences between the actors in their own time. This scenario shows how actors’ power influences the policy process.

This activity:
- allows participants to analyse the actors’ role in a particular scenario, to which they can relate the ideas and concepts about actors that you presented
- develops participants’ critical reading skills
- develops group work skills and prepares participants for the stakeholder analysis exercise to follow.

Reviewing Session 5
As at the end of Session 5, you may like to reflect on how the session went, as well as to remind participants of the readings and their individual reflection exercise.
Session 6  Stakeholder analysis: Part 1

Introduces participants to stakeholder analysis, an analytical tool that can help to assess the political feasibility of a policy and its implementation.

**Introduction to stakeholder analysis**  
About 10 minutes

Provide a brief introduction to stakeholder analysis. Key points to cover include:

- what stakeholder analysis is and how it can be used
- the key factors to consider when doing a stakeholder analysis
- the limitations of stakeholder analysis.

See Table 6.1.

**Activity 6.1**  
Conducting a stakeholder analysis: Part 1  
A social health insurance policy development process

1. Distribute Handout 10 (one copy per participant).
   Point out the three types of information provided for the case study and the record forms for participants to complete.

2. Allocate each group two actors from the policy scenario presented in the handout.

3. In this session, participants read the scenario and identify factors that they think impact on the actors’ interest in the policy and their power to influence the process. Participants may like to do this individually, and complete Form 1 of the handout. Forms 2 and 3 can be completed in their groups in Session 9.

Make sure participants understand that their task is to make a judgement about different actors’ level of support or opposition to the 1997 social health insurance proposals (Table 1 of Handout 10), rather than any earlier or subsequent proposals.
Table 6.1  Stakeholder analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key points</th>
<th>Suggested questions and examples for prompting discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder analysis is an approach or set of tools for generating knowledge about actors</strong></td>
<td>Ask if anyone has used this management tool before. <em>How useful did they find it?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The purpose of stakeholder analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To analyse past experience: to understand how policies have developed, and how actors have influenced that process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A strategic management tool: to assess the feasibility of future policy directions; to facilitate the project implementation; to develop strategies for stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder analysis can help you to understand actors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine, for example, actors' concerns about an issue, their level of interest and power, how much they know about the issue, whether or not they are likely to support or oppose the policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limitations of stakeholder analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It reflects experience at only one point in time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It may be difficult to make judgements and reconcile different interpretations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The analysts become ‘stakeholders’ themselves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It focuses on actors’ interests, but these are not the only influences over policy change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduce the session by referring participants to **Handout 5, page 2**. All participants should have previously read through their group’s scenario. Remind participants that:
   - some of the questions on their sheet may not be relevant to their particular scenario
   - all the information they need to answer the questions may **not** necessarily be provided in the scenario reading, so they will need to identify any additional information required
   - they must look for evidence and examples to explain or justify their responses to the questions on the handout, and the conclusions they present in Session 12.

2. Visit each group as they work, providing clarification as needed. See below for some common issues that may arise and suggestions for dealing with the group dynamics.

**By the end of the session participants will be able to:**
- show an understanding of the basic outline of their group’s policy change scenario
- identify which actors had the most influence in the scenario, and why
- explain how the actors influenced the success or failure of the policy experience/scenario.
## Context and Content

Focuses on the analysis of policy context and content and the influence of these elements on the actors in the policy process. Participants use what they have learnt to complete the stakeholder analysis exercise.

### Summary of sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 7</th>
<th>Considering context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity 7.1</td>
<td>Brainstorming contextual factors at a national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical input 7.1</td>
<td>Categorising contextual factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 7.2</td>
<td>Categorising contextual factors: South Korean case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical input 7.2</td>
<td>Actors and context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical input 7.3</td>
<td>Micro-level context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 8</th>
<th>Considering content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity 8.1</td>
<td>Brainstorming content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical input 8.1</td>
<td>Policy characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 8.2</td>
<td>Policy characteristics analysis: South Korean case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical input 8.2</td>
<td>Language analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 9</th>
<th>Stakeholder analysis: Part 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity 9.1</td>
<td>Conducting a stakeholder analysis: Part 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Group Work 2 | Analysing policy: Focus on context and content |
Resources

Handouts 11-14 (one for each participant)

Essential readings

Considering context


Other references


Considering content


Other references


Stakeholder analysis


Session 7  **Considering context**

Shows how theoretical frameworks can be used to categorise different contextual factors in order to understand how they influence actors and policy processes.

---

**Introduce the session**

Briefly state the focus of Session 7, draw attention to the learning outcomes.

By the end of Sessions 7 participants will be able to:

- categorise the main contextual features that influence policy change
- discuss how contextual factors influence policy actors, content and processes
- recognise the particular roles of institutions and broader political systems in shaping actors’ power.

---

**Activity 7.1  Brainstorming contextual factors at a national level**

1. Participants write down as many factors as they can that relate to the context in which national policy may be developed and implemented.

   If participants struggle to think of factors, remind them of their previous analysis of the South Korean drug policy.

2. In plenary, make a list of the factors as participants share their ideas. Prompt them to give specific examples if they can.

---

**This activity:**

- helps to consolidate participants’ understanding of the term ‘context’
- develops participants’ critical reading skills
- develops a list of examples of contextual factors that can be drawn on in later discussions.
You could use the models developed by Leichter (in Walt, 1994) and Collins, Green and Hunter (1999) as examples of ways in which contextual factors at a national or international level may be grouped together (see Box 7.1). Here are some points to cover:

- one factor may be categorised in different ways
- the impact a particular factor has on the policy process is not necessarily easy to predict (for example, the same contextual factor may lead to different outcomes in different countries)
- actors can resist a contextual factor or reshape it
- merely identifying contextual factors is not sufficient. In policy analysis you need to seek to understand which factors are significant influences on the actors, in terms of shaping the policy process. Analysis of policy outcomes can help us to understand this (a link into the next presentation, Theoretical input 7.2).

Refer to the examples participants gave in Activity 7.1, and ask participants to suggest in which category they would place them. You may find that there is some debate about where to categorise certain factors. Whilst some factors may clearly be placed in certain categories, other factors may be harder to place. Some factors may fit into more than one category, depending on how they are understood.

Point out that using the model acts as a catalyst for your own thinking. For example, it can help you to distinguish between events whose impacts may be relatively short-term (situational factors) and those that may have long-term consequences in the future (structural factors).

Activity 7.2  Categorising contextual factors
South Korean case study

1. Distribute copies of Handout 11 (a summary of the models you referred to in your presentation).

2. Ask participants to look again at the South Korean case study (Handout 1) and categorise the contextual factors, using either (or a combination) of the two theoretical frameworks shown in Handout 11.

3. In plenary, participants can share some of their ideas. Facilitate the discussion to show how the frameworks can be used as tools to deepen their understanding of the South Korean policy experience.

This activity:
- allows participants to practice categorising different contextual factors and consider their impact on the policy process.
**Box 7.1 Different ways to categorise contextual factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situational factors</th>
<th>Structural factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irregular, impermanent events</td>
<td>More permanent elements of societal organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examples</strong>: war, political instability</td>
<td><strong>Examples</strong>: politico-economic system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural factors</th>
<th>Environmental factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values of society or groups</td>
<td>Elements external to national political system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examples</strong>: gender relations, trust in government</td>
<td><strong>Examples</strong>: multinational companies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic and epidemiological change</th>
<th>Processes of socio-economic change</th>
<th>Economic and financial policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examples</strong>: percentage of elderly or young people in the population</td>
<td><strong>Examples</strong>: conflicts, moves to free market economies</td>
<td><strong>Examples</strong>: restraint on government spending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Politics and the political regime</th>
<th>Ideology, public policy and the public sector</th>
<th>External factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examples</strong>: new government with new ways of doing, political instability</td>
<td><strong>Examples</strong>: free market orientation in social policy (e.g. user fees)</td>
<td><strong>Examples</strong>: international organisations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


To follow on from the previous discussion, you could outline the model developed by Grindle and Thomas (1991) (see reading list for reference details). They studied different experiences of policy change and showed how the actors’ response to various contextual factors influenced the policy outcomes. However, actors can also take action to influence some features of the context in which they operate. They may have the power to resist or reshape the context. Although Grindle and Thomas particularly focused on the policy elites, their model can be applied to other actors.

Provide examples, and ask participants for examples, during the presentation.

Perhaps start with a short discussion of possible shortcomings of the models presented so far. Use this to lead into the point that many of the factors and examples in these models relate to the macro-level context, such as the national level. Then show how Leichter’s model can be used to categorise contextual factors at the organisational level, as well as the macro-level. For example, you could ask participants to identify structural factors (or any other factors) within an organisation. This will also help to clarify participants’ understanding of the different categories. (For example, the structural factor of a shortage of staff in an organisation may be classified as a situational factor if the staff shortage was due to a flu outbreak rather than to a policy decision not to employ more staff.)

Emphasise that for policy analysis we need to be sensitive to both the macro and micro-contexts. For example, the micro-level context is important when considering policy implementation. Policies are often implemented through local organisations, such as clinics and hospitals. The contexts in which these organisations exist might not support policy implementation. One way of thinking about this micro-context is through the concept of organisational culture. A policy may require an organisation to do something that its organisational culture does not support. This may lead to resistance to policy implementation.

Discuss the way in which contextual factors at the micro-level influence actors and the policy process. You could draw on Hofstede’s model for categorising different types of organisational cultures (Hofstede 1997 in reading list). Ask participants’ if they have experience of any of these. This could lead into a discussion of cultural change within organisations, and the processes of change.
Point out that if you want to implement a policy, or to explain the outcome of a particular policy process, you need to take into account that:

- people in different organisations may think and act in different ways
- action taken at a macro-level may conflict with what happens at the micro-level. For example, a new policy might require people to work in teams to achieve certain outcomes. However, the organisation might have a strong culture of individual work and performance, which could make it difficult to implement the policy. The article by Aitken (1994) is also a good example of how the micro-context can subvert the official policy intention.

Conclude the session with a summary of key points.

**Key points**

- There are different ways of thinking about context and categorising it.
- Context exists at a macro and micro-level, and it is relevant to all stages of the policy process.
- The interrelationships between contextual factors and other elements of the policy analysis triangle are often complex.
- Context changes: context may influence other factors, but other factors can also influence context.
- The relevance and importance of particular contextual factors will depend on how they relate to other factors.

You may like to ask the question:

Are there any types of contextual factors that the models do not cover? Participants’ answers can help you to check their understanding so far.

Emphasise that theoretical models serve to guide the analyst’s thinking. In their analysis of their Group Work scenario they can draw on elements from one or more models if they find them useful.
Session 8  **Considering content**

Introduces policy characteristics analysis and language analysis as approaches to the study of policy content.

**Introduce the session**

Briefly state the focus of Session 8, draw attention to the learning outcomes.

By the end of Session 8 participants will be able to:

- recognise different forms of policy content and their varying influence over the policy process
- apply policy characteristics analysis to assess how policy design influences actors
- recognise different forms of policy instruments and determine the degree to which policy complexity and/or simplicity impacts on implementation.

**Activity 8.1  Brainstorming content**

**In groups  About 30 minutes**

1. Begin by asking a few questions to quickly get a sense of participants’ understanding of the term ‘content’ in relation to policy analysis. Some examples are given in Box 8.1. You could ask the questions in a sequence that shows how different interpretations of policy content affects the policy process. By analysing content, policy makers can anticipate how different actors may react to the policy. They could then plan strategies to more effectively manage the policy development and implementation processes.

2. Present a scenario, such as:

   A policy maker is drafting a new policy that will directly affect you (the participants). ‘You’ may be any group of relevant actors (for example, health workers, patients or street level bureaucrats). What information about yourselves do you think would help the policy maker draft the policy in a way that would reduce your resistance to it?

   Allow participants about ten minutes to brainstorm some ideas.

3. Participants share their suggestions in a plenary discussion.

   Avoid going into detail about policy strategies here. The main point is to show that policy makers need information about the other actors in order to inform policy content. This is because the actors’ interpretation of the policy has implications for the success or failure of policy implementation.
Box 8.1 Considering the importance of content

What do you understand by the term policy ‘content’?

“The problem the policy seeks to address.”

“The aim of the policy.”

“The nuts and bolts of the policy – what the policy makers are trying to do.”

Participants may suggest that actors’ values and beliefs are also part of content. However, it may be more appropriate to examine the values and beliefs underlying policy content from the perspective of policy context and how context influences policy processes.

In the South Korean case study, how did doctors understand the content?

“As a loss of income.”

How did that affect the policy process?

“The doctors resisted the implementation of the policy.”

So, how people understand policy content has implications for the rest of the policy process.
Policy characteristics

Give a short interactive presentation to highlight the type of characteristics to look for when analysing policy content. For example:

- costs and benefits
- the administrative or technical resources needed to implement the policy
- the extent of participation needed (i.e. to what extent does the policy depend on other people to succeed? Point out the difference between this and ‘consultation’)
- the resources needed (including time) and their availability

Provide examples as appropriate and ask participants’ to suggest examples as well. You could mention that content of some policies is likely to be more controversial than others and introduce the concept of ‘high’ and ‘low’ politics.

Activity 8.2  
Policy characteristics analysis  
South Korean case study

1. Distribute Handout 12 (a record sheet for their policy characteristics analysis).
2. In their groups, ask participants to analyse the content of the South Korean ‘no margins’ policy (as it was first proposed) (Handout 1), using the characteristics given on Handout 12 as a guide. Point out that they may need to make their own judgments on some issues as they will not have all the details.
3. Facilitate a brief discussion about how participants found this analysis process. What did they find difficult? What seemed straightforward?

As there may not be time for a detailed discussion of the content characteristics they identified, you can distribute Handout 13 which highlights some key points from the South Korean case study, so they can check their own work.

This activity:
- provides an opportunity for participants to apply what they have learned about policy characteristics analysis.
Language analysis

Language, the type of words used when communicating policy, can also be analysed for the ‘hidden’ messages or ideas and associations that are conveyed. In particular, metaphor and metonymy have a subtle impact on people’s interpretation of policy and different metaphors imply different courses of action (as shown in the example of the low income suburb, Box 8.2). You could use examples from different texts to illustrate this. Participants may also contribute their own examples, perhaps drawn from expressions fieldworkers use when explaining medical conditions in a simple way.

You could provide Handout 14 as an exercise that participants could do in their own time.

Summarise a few key points to end the session.

Key points
- Policy content can have a major influence on the direction of the policy process.
- Different concepts (or characteristics) can be used in the analysis of policy content.
- Thinking clearly about the nature of a policy (for example, what it says, how it is saying it, and who it is appealing to) can help actors either to devise strategies for successful implementation of the policy or to critique an available policy option.

Reviewing Session 8
As at the end of Session 8, you may like to reflect on how the session went, as well as to remind participants of the readings and their individual reflection exercise.
## Box 8.2 Examples of uses of metaphor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metaphor</th>
<th>Possible interpretations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organisation is like a family</td>
<td>Caring, supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation is like a well-oiled machine</td>
<td>Efficient, all the parts work well together, no room for mistakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health workers are the heart of our health system</td>
<td>Values health workers, system should function to support them, if they do not work properly everything shuts down. Implies a people-centred approach, rather than a technocist approach. Would expect health workers’ concerns to be listened to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Metaphor used to describe the development of low-income suburb:**

**Scenario 1:** suburb described as blighted, diseased
- *Scenario 1:* Existing homes to be torn down, area to be cleared and re-built, nothing of value can be saved

**Scenario 2:** suburb described as a community, with formal and informal networks, a place of belonging
- *Scenario 2:* The development will take a people-centred approach, participatory, development needs to maintain the existing community and social structures that have developed in the area
Session 9  
**Stakeholder analysis: Part 2**

Shows how factors relating to policy content, context and actors are interlinked.

---

**Introduce the session**

Briefly remind participants of Session 6 and refer them to Handout 10.

By the end of Session 9, participants will be able to:

- understand the purpose and approach of stakeholder analysis
- apply frameworks for conducting stakeholder analysis
- assess the strengths and weaknesses of stakeholder analysis as a management tool.

---

**Activity 9.1  Conducting a stakeholder analysis: Part 2**

A social health insurance policy development process

1. In their groups, participants may like to share their ideas about the factors relating to policy content and context that influenced actors’ interest and power in the policy process.

   They then discuss **Form 2** and, for each of their actors, make a judgement about:
   - the level of impact the 1997 social health insurance proposals were likely to have had on the actor
   - the level of interest the actor was likely to have in the proposals
   - the extent to which the actor was able to influence the social health insurance policy process in 1997.

   After making their judgements, participants consider the position each actor would take on the policy (i.e. the extent to which they would support or oppose the 1997 proposals). They complete the forcefield analysis, **Form 3**, Handout 10.

2. Taking each actor in turn, ask the groups to report back, saying where they put the actor on the forcefield analysis and why. Record the actors’ positions on flip chart. If more than one group considered the same actors, discuss any different positions they may have.

3. Compare the participants’ analysis with one given in the actual study (Handout 15). Try to explain any differences. In the end, in the real scenario, the proposals were not implemented, as the most powerful actors opposed them.

   Distribute **Handout 15** so participants can consider the analysis from the real study in their own time.
4. End the session with a brief discussion about the process of doing a stakeholder analysis and its use as a strategic management tool that can be used at any stage in the policy process. Can participants identify some of its strengths and weaknesses? In this activity, participants had to use a fair amount of guesswork to make their judgements. However, in reality you need to look for evidence on which to base your judgements and be aware of your own assumptions (biases).

Some key points with which to end the session
As a tool that focuses on actors’ interests and power relationships, stakeholder analysis helps to identify actors’ roles and relative positions in a policy process.

Stakeholder analysis:
- allows policy developers to identify key potential allies and opponents
- allows the resources and power of key actors to be clarified
- provides the basis for developing strategies for managing actors.

Reviewing Sessions 7-9
You may like to reflect on how the sessions went, as well as to remind participants of the readings and their individual reflection exercise.
Participants work on their group scenarios.

1. Participants develop their understanding of the actors in their scenarios, by identifying the ways in which content and context influenced the actors’ interests and power relationships.

   Remind participants that:
   - It is not sufficient to identify factors relating to content or context, they must also look for evidence and give examples that illustrate the impact these factors had on actors and the policy processes.
   - They will need to think of ways to categorise the factors they identify, and record the key points in a structured way that will assist them in their presentation. (They can adapt the templates they have used so far in the course and/or create alternatives.)

   They will also conduct a stakeholder analysis for their scenario.

2. Visit each group as they work, providing clarification as needed.

3. Encourage them to do some additional work in the evening if necessary, as in the next Group Work Session they will prepare their presentation.

By the end of the session participants will be able to:
- recognise how content and context influence the experience of the selected policy scenario and, specifically, actors’ roles
- undertake a stakeholder analysis.
Planning and Managing Policy Processes

Focuses on actors and how their actions are influenced by power relationships, beliefs and value systems and self-interest.

Summary of sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 10</th>
<th>Developing strategies to support policy change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical input 10.1</td>
<td>Studying strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 10.1</td>
<td>Actor management: Part 1 Taking account of interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical input 10.2</td>
<td>Developing a communication strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 10.2</td>
<td>Actor management: Part 2 Taking account of values and beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical input 10.3</td>
<td>Other strategies for policy processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 11</th>
<th>Thinking in an integrated way</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity 11.1</td>
<td>What would have happened if …?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introducing a change to the South Korean policy experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Group Work 3                            | Analysing policy: focus on strategies         |
Resources

- Handouts 16 and 18 (one copy per participant)

Essential readings

Developing strategies to support policy change


Other references:


Thinking in an integrated way


Other references


Session 10 Developing strategies to support policy change

Explains how analysis of actors can inform strategies to build support for and/or reduce opposition to a proposed policy. Understanding the interrelationships between content, context, actors and process is crucial for strategy development.

Introduce the session
Clarify any matters arising from the Group Work Session 2 if needed. Briefly mention the focus of Session 10 and how it builds on from previous sessions, and the key learning outcomes.

By the end of Session 10, participants will be able to:
- recognise the importance of strategy to policy change
- apply frameworks in identifying actor management strategies
- identify other types and forms of strategies
- recognise key factors influencing the processes used in policy development and implementation
- understand the relevance of policy analysis to managerial action and strategic planning.

Studying strategies

Present some key concepts relating to the role of strategy in the policy process. Strategies are the micro-processes that make up the fourth element in the policy analysis triangle. Careful analysis of actors, content and context can inform strategy planning. Strategies play an important role in the ‘success’ of policy change. Explain how strategies that are designed to take account of actors’ interests can help to reduce opposition to and/or increase support for a policy.

See Table 10.1 for some key points to cover.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Key points</strong></th>
<th><strong>Suggested questions and examples for prompting discussion</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **What is meant by the term ‘strategy’**  
(a way of managing actors and the process of policy change) | Provide some examples, if possible drawing on the case studies participants have considered so far in the course.  
*In South Korea, what strategy did the physicians use to force government to negotiate with them?*
|
| **Why strategies are important**  
(increase the effectiveness of efforts to influence change; clarify what is possible to achieve; identify barriers to address/opportunities to maximise)  
A strategy by itself is not enough, you also need capacity to implement it, and the flexibility to adapt it when required. | |
| **The process of developing a strategy**  
(involves clarifying your goals, and analysing the situation, identifying your options) | *What do you need to assess? How can you gather the information you need?*
|
| **Take account of the interests of the different actors**  
(identify who you should involve, collaborate with, defend against or monitor) | |
| **Choose your strategies**  
(e.g. redefine policy goals to gain support of certain actors; mobilise a certain actor to support the policy; strengthen alliances; try to block the action of opponents) | |
Activity 10.1

Actor management: Part 1

Taking account of interests

1. In this activity, participants choose a strategy based on the interests of two specific actors. Distribute copies of Handout 16. Their task is to choose a strategy, giving reasons for their choice, for each of the two actors they considered for the stakeholder analysis exercise (Session 9).

   Point out that participants need to adopt a role for themselves in the policy process. For example, are they the policy formulators who want the policy to go through? Or are they a group trying to block the proposals?

2. Facilitate a brief report back session. Different actors may require different strategies and/or tactics. Emphasise the following points:

   • the actors’ interests will shape your strategy goals
   • the tactics you use will be determined by your goals, the actors’ interests and ... what else? See if participants can pre-empt the focus of the next part of this session (actors’ beliefs/values).

   You may need to clarify that in Handout 16, ‘involve’ is taken to mean direct engagement with people, whereas ‘collaborate’ is to liaise or talk to them on a more distant level. Actors that do not actively support the policy may be considered, in effect, opposed to it.

This activity:

- allows participants to use their analysis of actors’ interests to inform a strategy for a policy process.

Activity 10.1 introduces participants to a process of designing strategies and tactics with which they may already be familiar. Often strategy design stops at the level of addressing actors’ interests. What are often not given enough consideration in strategy design are actors’ beliefs and values. These fundamentally affect actors’ interpretation of policy texts and their behaviour in the policy process. This will be considered in the next part of this session.
As mentioned in Session 8, different actors interpret policy content in different ways. Actors’ beliefs and ideologies are important factors influencing their understanding of policy. Such factors (which will also relate to context) need to be considered when developing policy communication strategies.

Provide an interactive presentation to illustrate the importance of finding out about actors’ aspirations, beliefs and values systems. What messages about the policy or issue will touch their hearts? What channels of communication will reach them? (This involves thinking about what they do, where they are and their networks.) What type of materials would best carry the messages to the actors? What type of language would be most appropriate? (You can refer back to the use of metaphor here.) Such questions will inform the development of a communication strategy.

Draw on relevant examples considered in previous sessions as much as possible, and ask questions to encourage participants to give other examples.

1. Distribute Handout 17.
2. Participants design a communication strategy for one of the actors they considered in Activity 10.1. Remind them to clarify who they are in the policy process before they begin.
3. Invite the groups to present their strategies. Make sure they clarify who they are in the process, and the judgements on which their strategy is based.
4. You could end the activity with a brief discussion about the relevance of such an exercise to their own workplace. For example, some participants may already develop such strategies when dealing with donor agencies. What type of problems (if any) do they encounter? For example, when a key individual leaves an organisation the process of developing a relationship and building trust and support for a policy has to begin again with someone else.

Another factor that may arise in the discussion is the most effective use of resources. When choosing which strategy to follow, you need to prioritise those that will have the most impact given the time and resources available.

This activity:
- allows participants to practice designing a communication strategy, applying what they have learned about actors.
Other strategies for policy processes

So far this session has focussed on strategies designed to manage the support or opposition of actors in the policy process. However, there may be obstacles to policy development and/or implementation that are more directly related to other elements in the policy analysis triangle, i.e. content and context. End this session with some ideas for strategies that can help to overcome these. See Table 10.2 for some examples.

At this stage, it may also help to highlight some key principles or factors to consider when developing strategies. For example:

- a strategy may be determined by:
  - the political context (power and opportunities)
  - who you are (If you are working from the outside, do you want to engage with or oppose policy formulators? If you are working from the inside, what power do you have relative to the potential opposition?)
  - the resources you have and what is feasible, given the policy content, context and other actors
- the timing of particular events or processes is important
- the need to be flexible so that you can adapt and respond to unexpected changes in the process.

End the session with a summary of key points about policy processes and strategies for managing actors.

Key points

- Processes can be understood at a macro-level (agenda setting, formulation, implementation) and at a micro-level (strategies).
- An actor aiming to influence the policy process needs to strategise around how to take advantage of factors supporting change, and how to overcome factors inhibiting change.
- Managing other actors requires consideration of which actors to work with and which to oppose, as well as assessment of actors’ beliefs, interests and resources.
- Strategies need to take account of how different dimensions of context and content may influence policy change.
- The strategies available to an actor are influenced by the actor’s own position inside or outside the political and bureaucratic system.
- A strategy must include identification of: information needs and how to fill them; allies and mechanisms for working with them; key messages and communication mechanisms; timing of actions.
- Strategies should be constantly evaluated and changed as necessary.
Table 10.2 Examples of other strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacle or barrier to the policy change</th>
<th>Strategy to help overcome obstacle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Pilot and evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility of policy not clear</td>
<td>Conduct more analysis/research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Look at other countries’ experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Provide training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of capacity</td>
<td>Review processes and learn through experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish a dedicated unit to support implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Wait before proposing new policy or pilot changes and learn from the experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A changing, unstable situation, e.g. political instability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Go for ‘big bang’ implementation, speedy and large-scale or implement cautiously to learn lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a political opportunity or opening for change, e.g. new government recently elected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviewing Session 10
You may like to suggest that participants reflect on a policy experience from their own work experience. Can they think of any strategies to help them overcome the barriers to, or limitations of, the policy? Anyone that began the individual reflection activity (Session 2 overview sheet) could add to their notes or mind-map made previously.
Session 11  Thinking in an integrated way

Focuses on the interactions between all the elements that influence policy – actors, content, context and process.

Introduce the session
Briefly state the focus of Session 11. Refer to the learning outcomes on participants’ session overview page.

By the end of Session 11, participants will be able to:

- recognise the ways in which elements of the policy analysis triangle combine to influence policy processes
- recognise that understanding the policy process requires an integrated and synthesized analysis of problems and experiences.

Activity 11.1  What would have happened if …?
Introducing a change to the South Korean policy experience

1. Remind participants of the policy analysis triangle framework. They have now looked at each of the elements in the triangle in detail (actors, content, context and process). However, the elements do not operate in isolation, they influence each other. The policy outcomes are a result of the interactions between the different elements. One way of understanding this is to consider the consequences of a specific change in a policy process. Remind participants of the South Korean policy example they first looked at in Session 3. They are going to consider how that policy experience would have changed if certain factors had been different.

2. Give each group a copy of Handout 18. Using the South Korean policy scenario as an example, their task is to suggest how the policy experience may have changed if certain factors had been different.

3. Ask the groups to report back briefly. To save time, and avoid repetition, ask each group to report back on a different change scenario and then ask the other groups for their comments. You may find that different groups interpreted the same situation in different ways. See Box 11.1 for some examples of what may have happened. A couple of points to highlight during the discussion, are:
   - that a change relating to one element will have consequences for the others
   - the outcomes of a policy will vary depending on the situation, even though the policy’s goals may remain the same.

4. End the session with a summary of key points (see next page).
Key points

- The elements of the policy analysis triangle always interact in influencing any policy change experience.
- Understanding the policy process requires interpretation and will be contested.
- Theoretical frameworks give insights into the ways in which the elements interact and provide different ways of understanding the same experiences.

Box 11.1 Introducing a change to the South Korean policy experience

Some examples of what might have happened if …

- the government had delayed implementation of the 'no margin' policy
  The physicians’ opposition to the policy may have been reduced because the full effects of the policy on them would have been less obvious. It would also have allowed time to increase awareness of the benefits of the policy for the public.

- the private health sector had been responsible for a lower proportion of the total health care
  It would have given the opposition less power over the government. It would have been easier for the government to push through the policy in the absence of a strong, organised opposition.
Group Work
Session 3

Analysing policy: Focus on strategies

Participants work on their group scenarios.

1. Explain that participants will now need to use what they have learned from Sessions 10 and 11 to identify the key strategies used in their policy scenario.

Advise participants to leave at least one hour to plan their presentation. This will involve:
- deciding which are the key issues to present
- deciding how to structure their argument (for example, which points to make first, how they will use theory to justify or help explain their ideas)
- preparing any visual aids
- deciding who will give the presentation.

If necessary, provide additional tips for doing presentations. (For example, not putting too much information on slides or overheads, avoid giving unnecessary detail, defining any acronyms used, practicing what to say in order to check timing and that key points are clear.)

2. Visit each group as they work, providing clarification and support as needed.

By the end of the session participants will be able to:
- identify the main strategies used in the selected policy scenario and how they influenced the overall success or failure of the experience described
- recognise how features of content and context influenced processes.
Policy Scenario Presentations and Assignments

Each group gives their presentation on their analysis of a policy scenario. They receive feedback that will inform their individual assignments.

Summary of sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 12</th>
<th>Policy scenarios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1</td>
<td>Group Work presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2</td>
<td>Comparing the scenarios</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 13</th>
<th>Assignment briefing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1</td>
<td>Tips for writing assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2</td>
<td>Group self-assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3</td>
<td>Evaluation of the course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Session 12  Policy scenarios

Focuses on the groups’ analysis of their policy scenarios and their application of the concepts and principles learned during the course.

Introduce the session
Each group now has an opportunity to show how they have applied what they have learnt during the course to their analysis of a particular policy scenario. The feedback they receive will inform the individual assignments, which will be based on the same scenario that they studied in their group.

Clarify the order in which the groups will present. (Depending on the features the scenarios illustrate, it may be logical to present certain ones before others.)

By the end of Session 12 participants will be able to:
- present a clearly argued, factually correct and integrated analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the policy process in the selected policy scenario
- recognise the ways in which elements of the policy analysis triangle combine to influence policy processes
- conduct an integrated and synthesized analysis of policy process problems and experiences.

Part 1  Group Work presentations

1. Explain that each group will assess one of the other groups’ presentations. Distribute the peer review form, Handout 19. You will need to assess each presentation as it is made. You could adapt the peer review form to record your notes.

2. Time the presentations, and, if necessary, stop them after 15 minutes. It is important that each group has the same amount of time.

3. Allow a couple of minutes for questions at the end of each group’s presentation.

4. After all the groups have presented, facilitate a feedback session. Ask for the peer review first, and then complement this with your own feedback. Give your feedback in a constructive way. Acknowledge what was done well as well suggesting how some elements could be improved. If necessary, draw out points about their analysis that will inform their individual assignments. For example, suggest additional connections that they could have made, clarify the use of frameworks.

   Allow the group members to respond to the feedback if they wish.
Part 2  Comparing the scenarios

It is useful to provide a comparison of the scenarios used in the Group Work. This can provide a summary of the key principles addressed in the course and how they can be applied to real situations.

Some key points that may be illustrated from your scenarios include:

- All the policy scenarios had the elements actors, content, context and process.
- Policy analysis is a process of identifying and explaining the interlinkages between these elements and how they influence each other to enable or constrain the policy process.
- The policy analysis triangle framework can help to understand what’s happening, but it is not prescriptive – it does not explain the way in which the different factors influence each other. It is up to the analyst to use their interpretation, and find the evidence to show the linkages – in other words the story that plays out is peculiar to each setting.
- Different factors do not necessarily play out in the same way in different scenarios. For example user fees were advocated in World Health Organization policies but not all countries implemented them.
- Conflict does not always appear in the form of overt public contestation.
- The policy process is rarely linear and there may be unintended consequences.
- Policy does not just exist in documents but also in people’s values, beliefs and understandings – and these may contradict what’s stated in the policy documents.
- Actors often provide the key – what happens is related to what they think and do and what motivates them; the context or the policy process may give them the power to act in certain ways and influence the policy outcomes.
- The argument, in participants’ final analysis, will be based on showing how a set of factors worked together to create the outcome – their judgement on whether the policy was a ‘success’ or ‘failure’.
**Session 13 Assignment briefing**

Provides information to support participants in their individual assignments, and clarifies their exam task if relevant.

---

**Introduce the session**

This session is important as it clarifies what participants need to do for their assignments.

By the end of Session 13 participants will be able to:

- appreciate the need to present their argument in a clear and logical way, using evidence from the scenario and theoretical frameworks where appropriate
- draw on the concepts and principles outlined in the course to inform their assignment
- identify the structural elements required in their written assignment
- reflect on their own group work skills.

---

### Part 1 Tips for writing assignments

In plenary  
About 30 minutes

This session provides an opportunity for you to check that participants understand what is expected of them in their individual assignments (and any exam or other assessment task you may include in the course). You may also find it useful to emphasise a few points about writing in an academic way (see Box 13.1 for suggested points to explain), and provide useful sources of further information.

Give participants a list of the marking criteria for their individual assignments, an example is given in Appendix 3.

---

### Part 2 Group self-assessment

About 10 minutes

Distribute Handout 20. Allow a few minutes for each group to assess their own group functioning.

This provides an opportunity for participants to reflect on the group work experience and draw some lessons to improve their group work skills. It will also provide you with useful information that can inform how you structure such group work in the future.
Box 13.1  Tips for written work

Keep your focus

- Make your own judgement about whether or not you consider the policy experience to have been a success or failure.
- Present an argument explaining your judgement (provide evidence for it, using concrete examples from the information provided, this involves identifying relevant factors and explaining how they influence each other and the policy outcomes).
- Use theoretical frameworks where appropriate to help structure your thinking and/or back-up your own interpretations.
- Show evidence that you have understood the concepts and principles outlined in the course.
- Avoid unnecessary description of factors that are not related to your judgement.

Keep to the word limit.

Structure your writing

- **Introduction** – briefly set the scene, overview of context, state your judgement about the policy
- **Middle** – explanation of and evidence for your argument, linked to relevant theory or frameworks
- **End** – concluding summary
- **References** – follow prescribed style, for website references include the date the site was accessed

Part 3  Evaluation of the course

You may find it useful to prepare an evaluation sheet to obtain feedback from participants about the course as a whole.