

Ideas and Policy Implementation: Understanding the Resistance against Free Health Care in Africa

Daniel Béland and Valéry Ridde

Contributing to this special issue of Global Health Governance on “Political Science in Global Health,” this exploratory article draws attention to the potential role of ideas in policy implementation, a topic that has been relatively neglected in the contemporary political science literature on ideas and public policy. First, the article presents a review of this literature, which stresses the limited attention to implementation among students of policy ideas. Next, the article illustrates its main claims about the role of ideas in policy implementation through a discussion of the resistance of policy implementers against the removal of health-care user fees currently taking place in sub-Saharan Africa. In addition to making a contribution to the study of ideas in public policy, the article helps fill a gap in the literature on global health and policymaking in Africa, in which studies about policy implementation remain rare.

INTRODUCTION

As part of this special issue of *Global Health Governance* on “Political Science in Global Health,” it is most relevant to explore how this discipline has contributed to our understanding of the role of ideas (i.e., the beliefs, assumptions, and perceptions of actors) in the policy process. In recent decades, a growing number of empirical studies and theoretical contributions have stressed the central role of ideas in policy development. More recently, scholars have moved beyond the general claim that “ideas matter” to study *how* they matter.¹⁻³ As argued in this article, however, the recent multiplication of ideational studies in political science and related disciplines cannot hide the relative neglect of policy implementation within that scholarship. In Africa, for instance, despite the existence of some anthropological literature exploring how colonial, neoliberal, or broader cultural ideas have shaped African bureaucracies and the implementation of certain policies,^{4, 5} the role of ideas in implementation is seldom explored in a detailed and systematic way.

The main objective of this article is to stress this shortcoming while beginning to address it. In order to do so, we review the ideational literature to reveal its relatively limited attention to implementation; to address this shortcoming, we draw on the existing implementation scholarship,⁶⁻⁹ which sometimes explores the role of ideas, typically in an unsystematic manner. To illustrate our broad analytical claims, we turn to the recent new wave of health care reforms taking place in sub-Saharan Africa, with a focus on the ongoing implementation of policies that wave user fees for vulnerable segments of the population. As suggested, the mismatch (or the harmony) between the ideas associated with a particular policy and the assumptions of the actors tasked to implement it can directly impact the implementation process, and policy development in general. In addition to making a contribution to the study of ideas in public policy, this article helps fill a gap in the literature on health care and public policy in Africa, where implementation studies remain too rare.^{10, 11} Because implementation is one of

the crucial stages of policy development,¹² this article contributes to both ideational research and policy studies, in Africa and beyond. Yet this is an exploratory article, and our goal is not to offer a systematic empirical analysis but simply to use the example of health care reform in Africa to exemplify some of our analytical claims while formulating a broad agenda for future research on the ideas-implementation nexus. We selected user fees in African health care as a topic because this is an area we know well, in part due to our existing scholarship in the field. Yet, user fees in Africa are only one possible example among many others of how ideas can shape policy implementation.

Because transnational actors frequently play a direct role in shaping national policies in Africa, the ideas these actors diffuse should not be neglected. That was particularly the case in the 1980s, when user fees became dominant in African health policy.^{13, 14} However, implementation is an area in which the ideas diffused by transnational actors play a limited role, especially when the issue of free health care is concerned.¹⁵ In this context, following the call for more research and explicit use of theory about street-level bureaucracy in Africa¹⁶, our analysis focuses on national actors, especially street-level workers⁸. We have studied the changing nature of the discourse of transnational actors on user fees in our previous scholarship but here we do not explore the impact of this discourse on policy implementation, something that future research could assess.¹⁷

IDEAS AND POLICY PROCESSES

Over the last two decades, a new wave of scholarship in political science and related disciplines has stressed the role of ideas, discourse, and culture in policy development. This ideational approach to policy development has made a direct contribution to political science and policy analysis by showing how the ideas and assumptions of actors, alongside institutions and interests, can shape policy outcomes.^{3, 18-21} One of the key insights of this scholarship is that interests matter, mainly through the way policy actors perceive them. The same remark extends to the goals and preferences of these actors, which are historical and political constructions rather than realities mechanically derived from the material position of these actors.²² Lastly, ideational scholars such as Mark Blyth²² have offered new insight on the long-standing debate about the origins of new policy institutions, which are typically introduced in a context of perceived “crisis” and acute uncertainty that weakens the legitimacy of existing institutions while also pressuring policymakers to consider alternative policy ideas, which can form the basis for these new institutions. These scholars have shown that such a “crisis” can generate acute uncertainty which, in turn, empowers new policy ideas that actors use to reshape or even replace existing institutions.²³ Increasingly, students of health care policy have turned to this growing literature on ideas and public policy to address specific empirical puzzles.^{24, 25}

Although this “ideational turn”²⁵ has made a direct contribution to the field of policy and health care research,²⁴ the ideational literature has not paid equal attention to the five main stages of the policy process¹²: agenda-setting (defining and drawing attention to a policy problem), policy formulation (designing policy instruments to address a specific problem), decision-making (selecting and enacting a particular policy instrument), policy implementation (operationalizing policy provisions and instruments), and policy evaluation (drawing lessons from existing policies to shape

future decisions). Importantly, these stages can overlap and/or occur in a different order than the one stated above. This is true because, as John Kingdon²⁶ has suggested for the United States, and as Merilee Grindle and John Thomas,²⁷ Valéry Ridde,²⁶ and Gill Walt²⁷ have suggested for low- and middle-income countries, the policy process is seldom linear. Keeping this in mind, we only use the policy stage typology to map the policy literature on ideas and to stress the relative lack of attention it has been given with regard to implementation.

First, students of policy ideas have conducted extensive research on *agenda-setting* and, in a related manner, problem definition and framing processes.^{3, 28-30} This scholarship explains how actors, located both inside and, especially, outside the state, help draw attention to concrete issues, which they define as collective problems worthy of public attention and state intervention. For instance, in the post-war era, “drinking and driving” was transformed into a social and policy problem worthy of policy interventions.³¹ Conversely, in Africa since the 1990s, exempting the very poor from health care user fees has never become a public problem that the state needed to address.^{32,33}

Second, the ideational scholarship is largely centered on the analysis of policy formulation and, more specifically, the development of policy solutions.^{3, 18, 23, 34, 35} This aspect of the literature focuses primarily on the role of experts and policy paradigms in the formulation of policy alternatives and instruments. The main claim here is that the ideas of policy experts,^{36, p.141} as embedded in particular policy paradigms, can shape the formulation of concrete policy solutions. For instance, to legitimize the generalization of health user fees in Africa in the 1980s, World Bank experts popularized the idea of a frivolous use of health services when care is not directly paid for by users.³⁷ Scholars have since shown that, in Africa, this type of discourse participated in the “building of consensus across different institutions and national settings defining the ‘problem’ of health care financing and potential solutions.”¹³ Importantly, however, policy solutions are not always developed as a direct and original response to new policy problems, as specific experts and policymakers can try to impose their preferred policy alternatives, regardless of the problem of the day.²⁹ For example, in the field of old-age pensions, the emergence of demographic aging as a policy problem has encouraged neoliberal experts to promote the creation of private savings accounts, a policy alternative that had emerged long before this problem first entered the policy agenda.²⁸

Third, there is a sizable ideational scholarship on the decision-making stage, especially the ways in which policymakers make a discursive case for the “need to reform”³⁸ while attempting to convince the population and key interest groups to support specific pieces of legislation.^{24, 25} For instance, to justify the enactment of the 2010 Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act in the context of the deepest economic crisis since the Great Depression, U.S. President Barack Obama claimed that this crisis made reform more urgent, as it could help improve the economic competitiveness of U.S. firms on the global stage by reducing their “high and rising health costs” (45).⁴⁰ Similarly, in Ghana, to finance the recent development of that country’s national health insurance, legislators and political parties managed to convince the public of the need to increase the Value Added Tax (VAT) by 2.5 percentage points on certain products.³⁹

Fourth, an extensive ideational literature on policy evaluation is available. This literature focuses on lesson drawing,⁴⁰ learning,^{34, 41} and implementation fidelity.⁴² On one hand, Richard Rose⁴⁰ and many other scholars—including health specialists⁴³—have

shown how actors can draw lessons from policies implemented in a specific historical or geographical context to develop or revise policy in a different context. On the other hand, the scholarship on learning processes focuses on how bureaucrats and experts evaluate policies located within their jurisdiction to revise, discard, or replace them.^{34, 41, 44} For example, there is evidence that policymakers can learn from different types of disasters and use this knowledge to revise existing policies.⁴⁵ Regarding financial access to health care in Africa, communities of practice have been created since 2010 to facilitate experience sharing among policymakers implementing health policies.⁴⁶ This suggests a practical awareness of the need for policy evaluation and learning on the ground.

POLICY IMPLEMENTATION: BRINGING IDEAS AND AFRICA IN

As the above discussion suggests, students of ideas and public policy have systematically contributed to our understanding of four of the five main stages of the policy cycle. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said of policy implementation, a policy stage that has been relatively neglected by ideational scholars. In addition to the limited number of detailed empirical studies about policy implementation in the contemporary ideational literature, this neglect of policy implementation is apparent in recent and influential introductions to ideational policy analysis in political science. For example, a recent policy-centered volume by Daniel Béland and Robert Henry Cox about *Ideas and Politics in Social Science Research* says virtually nothing about “implementation,” a term that is simply absent from another introductory volume edited by Andreas Gofas and Colin Hay.⁴⁷ The same remark applies to Vivien Schmidt’s overview of “discursive institutionalism” featured in the *Annual Review of Political Science*.⁴⁸ Finally, influential publications that have shaped the field, such as Mark Blyth’s *Great Transformations*,²³ John L. Campbell’s *Institutional Change and Globalization*,¹⁸ and Peter Hall’s seminal article on policy paradigms, “Policy Paradigms, Social Learning and the State Hall,”³⁵ are generally silent about implementation. This points to a significant gap in the policy literature on the role of ideas.

The existence of this gap would not be that problematic if implementation was a relatively marginal and inconsequential aspect of the policy process. Yet since the 1970s, empirical studies have stressed the crucial role of implementation in policy development. This literature emerged primarily in the United States in the aftermath of the apparent failure of some Great Society programs, which Martha Derthick,⁷ as well as Jeffrey Pressman and Aaron Wildavsky,⁹ related to implementation problems. This early scholarship encouraged authors such as Eugene Bardach⁶ to take a more systematic look at policy implementation at large. Over the years, new empirical and analytical publications on implementation contributed to the expansion of implementation research.⁴⁹ More recently, scholars have called for, and participated in, a revival of implementation studies.^{50, 51}

To illustrate the importance of implementation within the policy cycle, we can explore health care reform in Africa. Turning to Africa to study implementation is particularly important because research on policy implementation in Africa remains limited in scope. In fact, according to Harald Saetren,¹⁰ only 4% of the research about policy implementation worldwide has been conducted in Africa. On this continent,

public policy research remains relatively underdeveloped and the social sciences, including political science, could play a major role in improving this situation.⁵²

Since 2000, Africa has witnessed the enactment of a wave of new health financing policies which focus on the removal of user fees for vulnerable populations. In contrast to what happened in the 1980s, when many African countries followed the recommendations of international organizations such as the World Bank by adopting user fees for health services,¹³ many African countries have begun lifting at least some of these fees over the last decade. This is a key trend worth exploring because Africa remains the continent where the proportion of household health expenditure at the point of service is the highest.

Although the available evidence suggests that removing user fees is effective in both reducing household health spending and increasing the use of formal health care services by low-income citizens, the implementation of fee removal policies in Africa poses great political and institutional challenges.^{15, 53} This is precisely why, at the beginning of the current wave of user fee removals, policy experts stressed the need to address implementation challenges and conditions on the ground.⁵⁴ In fact, as they spread across the continent, such reforms trigger passionate debates likely to shape their implementation over time. This is true partly because attempting to remove financial barriers to access to care stemming from user fees, a reform centered on the idea of gratuity, contradicts years of practices, beliefs, and international policy recommendations. In most countries, gratuity was adopted by high-ranking government officials, frequently the president of the country himself.⁵⁵ The decision to remove user fees was largely political and was often made just before elections.¹⁵ Health workers tasked with implementing that change rarely participated in the decision-making process.^{15, 56, 57} This means that this policy has largely been imposed upon them when, for 30 years, they had been trained to believe in, and had integrated, the idea that user fees were both effective and legitimate. This example points once again to the potential role of ideas in policy implementation.

IDEAS AND POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

Unfortunately, the recent scholarship on implementation, which comes after the “ideational turn”⁵⁸ in policy research, pays relatively limited systematic attention to the role of ideas. The same remark also applies to the earlier implementation scholarship, which has paid scant attention to the role of ideas overall.⁵⁹ However, there are good reasons to believe that actors’ ideas and perceptions can shape policy implementation. First, some implementation studies have stressed the role of ideas.⁶⁰ This is notably the case in the field of education research, where scholars have recognized and explored the ideational component of implementation processes.^{61, 62} Second, although they seldom provide methodical insight on the topic, several introductions to policy analysis written by political scientists allude to the role of ideas in policy implementation.^{12, 63, 64} Finally, going against the relative neglect of implementation identified above, several students of ideational processes explicitly emphasize the relationship between ideas and policy implementation. This is the case of political scientist Frank Fischer,⁶⁵ who, as part of his attempt to reframe policy analysis, points to the interpretative aspect of implementation. Even more relevant for the study below, in *Elites, Ideas, and the Evolution of Public Policy*, William Genieys and Marc Smyrl formulate a few general

remarks about the role of ideas in policy implementation. The most noteworthy point they make is that policy failure may occur “if a program developed in one systematic framework is implemented in a place whose ideational ‘culture’ is incompatible, that is, is grounded in an incompatible systematic framework” (41).⁶⁶

Although it does draw our attention to the role of ideas in policy implementation and, more broadly, to the relevance of ideational analysis for implementation research, this remark cannot hide two significant limitations of Genieys and Smyrl’s ideational perspective on implementation. First, their volume does not systematically explore this issue. Second, and especially crucial for our analysis, as opposed to what these authors suggest, the mismatch between ideas at the formulation and the implementation stages is not only about the transfer of a policy program from one country to another, which is a form of “policy transfer.”⁶⁷ In reality, this type of mismatch can occur within the same country, when key actors, such as professionals and street level bureaucrats⁸ tasked with implementing a policy instrument, share different ideas than the ones imbedded in that instrument, which are by and large the ideas that dominated the formulation stage (for a similar perspective, see Carroll, Patterson, Wood, Booth, et al.,⁵⁹).

The example of health-care reform in West African countries illustrates the possibility of a mismatch between prevailing cultural assumptions at the formulation and at the implementation stages within the same country. In these countries, donors have long pushed countries to support the development of mutual health insurance schemes. But, after 15 years, the coverage rate remains below 5%. There are multiple reasons for this policy failure,⁶⁸ including the inability of many citizens to pay the premiums, the poor quality of care available with this coverage, and the cultural belief that paying for care before you become sick is likely to attract diseases. Although we reject purely culturalist arguments,⁶⁹ it is clear that this cultural idea helps explain the low coverage of mutual health insurance in Africa. More generally, this points once again to the potential impact of ideas on policy implementation.

Regarding the role of health workers and user fee removal in Africa, survey data suggest the existence of plural and ambivalent perceptions among health workers. In the context of this article, we focus primarily on the ideas of street-level workers at the heart of the implementation process,¹⁶ assuming that actors located higher up in the chain of policy command share the same basic ideas as them about user fees. A detailed analysis of the ideas of all the actors involved in the implementation process should be conducted as part of future research in the field. Although we would have liked to cover more ground and focus on the ideas and perceptions of all actors involved in policy implementation, we decided to use examples readily available in the existing literature, which are necessarily limited in scope. Beyond these remarks about the limitations of our study, the perceptions of health care workers regarding user fees in Africa can be classified into three distinct categories, which are discussed separately below. This discussion points to the presence of contradictory ideas about user fees and free health care, not only between countries but even sometimes within the same country. This paradoxical situation further justifies the need for more research on the topic, as more data is needed to explain some of these contradictions.

Support for Free Health Care: For health workers in South Africa, free health care is a positive development leading towards universal access to health systems^{56, 70}; it is an opinion shared by their colleagues in the Sudan⁷¹ and in Ghana.⁷² In Ghana, for instance, 99% of health workers interviewed in the Volta and Central regions believe

that free access facilitates medically assisted child delivery while benefiting the poorest segments of the population.⁷² Similarly, in two of Niger's health districts, health-care workers have a positive perception of free health care for pregnant women and for children under 5. In fact, no fewer than 94% of the health workers interviewed agree with the statement that the abolition of user fees has increased the use of health services.⁷³ A similar percentage (91%) is found in Mali, where health care workers supported the idea of free health care.⁷⁴ In South Africa, some health workers see free access to ARV (*antiretroviral*) treatment as a contributing factor to their satisfaction and increased motivation to work in the sector.⁷⁵

Opposition to User Fees: In Niger, Senegal and Ghana, many health workers believe that patients do not value free treatment.^{72, 73, 76} This reluctance towards free care is sometimes justified in cultural terms, as when it is claimed that getting something for free is not the "African way." This ideological discourse persists in Mali, where receiving direct payment is considered a right of the caregiver.⁷⁴ In addition, many health workers strongly believe the lack of user fees leads to a frivolous use of health centers and services, a claim mirroring the discourse World Bank economists popularized in the 1980s.³⁷ For many health workers, this discourse about frivolous use constitutes the main argument to justify their enduring commitment to user fees. This points to the strength of the support for user fees among health workers, as confirmed by the results of a survey sent to health workers in South Africa, Burkina Faso, Niger, and the Democratic Republic of Congo.^{56, 77, 78}

Skepticism Towards Free Health Care: This category includes health workers who recognize the legitimacy of health care gratuity but show some concerns over its potential short-term effects on the health system and its long-term sustainability as a policy instrument. In South Africa, a vast majority of officers (85%) say that free health care has increased their workload.⁵⁶ As revealed by health workers in Senegal, the increase in workload is real, as few countries have increased staff or created new financial incentives for these workers that would compensate for the growing demand for health services.⁷⁹

The most important concern of health workers belonging to this category deals with the long-term policy sustainability of gratuity. They support it but consider it to be only temporary.⁸⁰ This type of perception is widely shared when it comes to specific user fee removal projects in Niger⁷³ and in the Democratic Republic of Congo.⁷⁴ Overall, this perception that gratuity cannot last as a health policy instrument reflects a more general lack of confidence in the capacity of the state to develop fiscally sustainable policies over time.

These remarks suggest the existence of divergent ideas about free health care and user fee removal among health care workers, depending on the national or regional context in which they operate. Considering this, the influence of the particular context of policy implementation on the ideas of health care workers is an important issue that requires further study.^{16, 81} Beyond this specific point, it is clear that ideas are likely to impact policy implementation, and that a detailed analysis of such ideas could help explain why implementation is successful or not, depending on which ideas are dominant within a jurisdiction at a specific point in time. These remarks lead us to further explore the role of ideas in policy implementation.

LOOKING INSIDE POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

For Michael Lipsky, “ideology provides a framework in terms of which disparate bits of information are stored, comprehended, and retrieved. In street level bureaucracies ideology also can serve as a way of disciplining goal orientations” (147).⁸ This is why, without explicitly referring to the role of ideas, one of the first modern students of policy implementation identified the existence of shared goals or attitudes among key policy actors as a potential source of success in implementation.^{82, 83}

Based on this remark and the above discussion about health care reform in Africa, we can formulate the following ideational hypothesis about policy implementation: *under specific institutional and historical circumstances, a mismatch between the dominant assumptions of the actors in charge of implementing a policy and the assumptions at the core of that policy can negatively impact its implementation. Conversely, a convergence between the core assumptions of these actors and the policy at hand is likely to facilitate implementation.* This is a very broad hypothesis, and it needs to be adapted to the empirical case under investigation to take into account its particular institutional and historical context. For instance, considering the above discussion about health care reform, we can formulate more specific hypotheses about the implementation of user fee removal in Africa: 1) when implementation is well organized, with enough input and regard for the perceived interests of health workers, the ideas of health workers should not adversely affect the implementation process; however, 2) when the implementation process is poorly organized, without effective means and proper preparation, not directly taking the perceived interests of these workers into account, their potentially negative ideas about the policy instrument at hand should have a detrimental impact on the implementation process. This should create problems that, as a feedback effect, are likely to strengthen the negative perception of this instrument.

These hypotheses need to be empirically tested in future research but, from the analytical perspective outlined above, taking ideas directly into account in the analysis of policy implementation may help explain why some policies are smoothly implemented while others face much resistance on the ground, which can affect their performance or even jeopardize their sustainability. As future empirical studies test the above hypotheses, it is essential to examine alternative, non-ideational explanations. For instance, one could argue that resistance to the implementation of user fee waivers in African health care policy is the pure product of the objective, material, or institutional interests of health professionals and other constituencies. Considering this type of alternative argument, the only way to validate our main ideational hypotheses is to explore, and stress the limitations of, alternative explanations grounded in other logics of explanation, namely the material or the institutional logic (on this issue, see Parsons⁸⁴).

Grounded in the policy literature on ideas reviewed above, our main hypotheses give a concrete content to our ideational perspective on policy implementation. Importantly, our goal here is not to displace existing approaches focusing on institutional and/or material obstacles and opportunities to implementation. Rather, it is to supplement these approaches, which compels us to 1) define what we mean by ideas (in contrast with other factors like institutions); and to 2) stress the analytical

boundaries, and the potential synergies, between the ideational approach and institutional as well as material explanations in political science and policy analysis.⁸⁴

The term ideas refers broadly to the beliefs, perceptions, and policy assumptions of actors, as they are distinct from institutions and interests.¹ On one hand, ideas are distinct from institutions in part because many of them are never institutionalized. This means that ideas are not, in themselves, the formal and informal rules we call institutions. Ideas and institutions are closely related in the empirical world but it is both possible and necessary to draw an analytical line between them.⁸⁴ On the other hand, to show that ideas play a distinct role in policy implementation, scholars must show that ideas do more than simply reflect the material position and interests of actors, which are not purely objective.^{18, 23, 24, 48}

As suggested above, to demonstrate that ideas have a direct impact on implementation, we must show that they cannot be reduced to the material interests and the position of actors who share these ideas (i.e., that their objective financial stakes would fully explain their behavior and attitudes). In the same way, we should be able to show that ideas do not simply reflect the institutional position of actors. Yet once the autonomous impact of ideas is demonstrated, it always remains possible to stress the fact that they can interact with institutional and/or material factors to produce certain outcomes. As Craig Parsons suggests, once a clear line has been drawn between specific factors, we can study how they interact to produce specific policy effects.⁸⁴ From this perspective, showing “how ideas matter”^{2, 3} is compatible with the claim that ideational forces can interact with other factors to produce concrete policy outcomes.^{85,87}

This discussion leads us to systematically discuss the alternative materialist claim that, on their own, purely objective material factors explain the resistance of many health workers towards gratuity in Africa. Two examples illustrate this counterclaim, which future scholarship on the implementation of user fee removal must address head on. First, if available health personnel in many countries are adequate to meet the increased demand generated by the removal of user fees, the fact remains that the daily workload of health workers has typically increased as a consequence of gratuity. In other words, there is a shift from under-utilization to more intense workloads, and many workers see this as an overload that they have a material interest in stopping.⁵⁵ Second, in some countries, user fees generated direct revenues for health workers, which created material incentives to preserve this system and oppose gratuity. Often, the removal of user fees created both more work for health workers and the loss of direct revenues for them.¹⁵

The problem with this materialist perspective is that the perception of interests is mediated through certain ideas about what is good for the actor and society at large.¹ From this angle, in a context of rapid policy change and uncertainty, the interests of actors are not always clear.²³ In this context, the ideas of actors about the nature of both their interests and the public good can be politically influential.²² In some of the scenarios mentioned above, there is no direct evidence that health workers have been negatively impacted by the removal of user fees, which has not prevented many of them from opposing this change. Considering this, ideas as to what constitutes good medicine and the proper relationship between doctors, patients, and the state might trigger much resistance against policy change, independently from seemingly objective material realities. This means that looking exclusively at such “interests” (as separated from the

ideas and perceptions of actors) may not explain resistance against free health care services in Africa.

Regarding the potential role of institutions, the existing literature on user fee removal in Africa points to the possible existence of two distinct institutional logics. First, in countries like Mali, Niger, and Burkina Faso, the implementation of gratuity policies through pilot projects launched in selected health districts by health ministries and supported by international NGOs is typically smooth.⁸⁶ The quality of health services is maintained, medical drugs are available, both citizens and health care workers are satisfied with the new arrangements, and health facilities are reimbursed on time for the services they offer at no cost to patients.^{78, 87} Second, with a few exceptions, when the state organizes user fee removal policies at the national level, often without taking into account the lessons drawn from pilot projects, implementation is chaotic, even catastrophic. In this context, the allocated budgets are not sufficient to meet the increased demand for health services, citizens are not well informed about the new policies, the resources available are in short supply, and health care workers are not satisfied with the way policy change affects their working conditions.^{15, 55, 79}

The contrast between these two scenarios could suggest that, on its own, the role of institutional factors such as pilot projects and NGO activities explains the difference between success and failure in policy implementation. However, there are good reasons to believe that, alongside institutions, ideational factors play a direct role in explaining this contrast in implementation outcomes. This is the case partly because the attitudes of health workers regarding free health care vary greatly across the two scenarios above. One possible hypothesis is that NGOs and the lessons drawn from pilot projects help shape the attitudes of health workers in the sense of a greater support for gratuity, which, in turn, may facilitate implementation. This means that, in addition to the respective roles of the state and NGOs and other institutional issues of administrative capacity, funding, and governance, the ideas of the street-level health workers⁸ concerning user fees and their removal may directly shape the implementation of gratuity policies in Africa. New surveys, in-depth interviews with these workers and the analysis of the debates over the implementation of such policies could help assess the role of ideas in policy implementation.

RESEARCH PROPOSITIONS

As a contribution to this special issue on “Political Science in Global Health,” this article has explored the relationship between ideas and policy implementation. Based on the above discussion, it becomes clear that this relationship is a two-way street. On one hand, the problems facing the implementing of a policy such as user fee removal in Africa are likely to influence the way health workers perceive this policy. For instance, when health workers in Niger or Senegal question the value of health care gratuity for children or the elderly, this is largely because, when surveys are carried out, this type of policy suffers from significant fiscal shortcomings and challenges. In this context, it is not the idea of gratuity that is being questioned but the way it is implemented. Moreover, policy actors who are ideologically predisposed to be against this idea are likely to refer to problems stemming from its implementation to legitimize their opposition to this particular policy instrument.

On the other hand, the policy ideas of actors can genuinely impact the implementation process. In the case of the ideas of health workers, this claim is consistent with the traditional call for “a focus on intervention staff (...), as they are the major actors who continuously shape the implementation of the program” at stake (145).^{88, p.145} This is true because health workers are at the heart of the implementation of user fee removal policies. As Lipsky⁸ puts it, such street-level actors are actual *policymakers* in the sense that their actions, which are shaped by their ideas and perceptions, are typically instrumental to successful (or failed) implementation. This direct attention to health care workers as policymakers and the impact of their ideas on policy implementation are consistent with the general claim that “programs do not work in and of themselves; they work through the reasoning of program subjects” (186).^{89, p.186} This is the case for policy development in general, including policy implementation.

Starting from our general claims about the potential role of ideas in implementation, this article suggests that the ideas of health workers can shape the implementation of user fee removal policies in Africa. As hypothesized, if health workers do not believe that this removal is a sound policy solution, they are likely, at best, to do as little as possible to facilitate its implementation or, at worst, to do everything they can to undermine it. Once again, these remarks point to the general role of ideas in policy implementation.

Based on this discussion, we suggest that future empirical research about the removal of user fees in Africa should recognize the centrality of health workers and their ideas in policy implementation in health care and tackle the following propositions:

1. The ideas actors involved in the implementation process have about specific policy problems and solutions can help account for the success or the failure of this process;
2. The more these actors witness implementation problems, the more they are likely to oppose the policies being implemented; and
3. The greater the gap between the policy solution at hand and the assumptions of these frontline workers, the more likely implementation will face opposition on their part.

Although these propositions are developed in relationship to the empirical topic discussed throughout this article (health care user fee removal in Africa), they could help global health researchers working on many other policy issues in different parts of the world better grasp the potential role of ideas in policy implementation. At the most general level, the relationship between ideas and policy implementation must become a more prominent aspect of contemporary policy studies all around the world.

Daniel Béland, Ph.D. holds the Canada Research Chair in Public Policy at the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy, University of Saskatchewan campus. He has published more than a dozen books and 100 peer-reviewed articles on fiscal, health, and social policy.

Valéry Ridde, PhD. holds a Canadian Institute for Health Research funded Research Chair in Applied Public Health (Implementation Science and Global Health). He is Associate Professor at the School of Public Health and Researcher at IRSPUM, University of Montreal, Canada.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Pierre-Marc Daigneault, Lucy Gilson, Rachel Hatcher, Bernard Taverne, Omar Samb, and the reviewers for their comments and suggestions. Daniel Béland holds a Canada Research Chair in Public Policy and he acknowledges support from the Canada Research Chairs Program. Valéry Ridde holds a Canadian Institute for Health Research (CIHR) funded Research Chair in Applied Public Health (CPP 137901).

-
- ¹ Béland D, Cox RH, editors. *Ideas and Politics in Social Science Research*. New York Oxford University Press; 2011.
- ² Jacobs AM. How Do Ideas Matter? Mental Models and Attention in German Pension Politics. *Comparative Political Studies* 2009; 42(2): 252–79.
- ³ Mehta J. The varied roles of ideas in politics. From "whether" to "how". In: Béland D, Cox RH, eds. *Ideas and Politics in Social Science Research*. New York Oxford University Press; 2011: 23-46.
- ⁴ Musgrove P. Financial and Other Rewards for Good Performance or Results: A Guided Tour of Concepts and Terms and a Short Glossary: World Bank. Retrieved from <http://www.rbhealth.org/system/files/RBFglossarylongrevised.pdf>, 2011.
- ⁵ Ridde V, Queuille L, Ndour M. Nine misconceptions about free healthcare in sub-Saharan Africa. *Development Studies Research* 2014; 1(1): 54-63.
- ⁶ Bardach E. *The Implementation Game. What Happens After a Bill Becomes a Law*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: The MIT Press; 1977.
- ⁷ Derthick M. *New Towns In-Town: Why a Federal Program Failed*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. ; 1972.
- ⁸ Lipsky M. *Street-level bureaucracy. Dilemmas of the individual in public services*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation; 2010 (1980).
- ⁹ Pressman JL, Wildavsky A. *Implementation. How great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oakland*. 3rd ed. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press; 1984.
- ¹⁰ Saetren H. Facts and myths about research on public policy implementation: out-of-fashion, allegedly dead, but still very much alive and relevant. *Policy Studies Journal* 2005; 33(4): 559-82.
- ¹¹ Gilson L, Raphaely N. The terrain of health policy analysis in low and middle income countries: a review of published literature 1994–2007. *Health Policy & Planning* 2008; 23: 294-307.
- ¹² Howlett M, Ramesh M, Perl A. *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems (Third Edition)*. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press. ; 2009.
- ¹³ Lee K, Goodman H. Global policy networks : the propagation of health care financing reform since the 1980s. In: Lee K, Buse K, Fustukian S, eds. *Health policy in a globalising world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2002: 97-199.
- ¹⁴ Edwards N, Barker PM. The importance of context in implementation research. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2014; 67 Suppl 2: S157-62.
- ¹⁵ Meessen B, Hercot D, Noirhomme M, et al. Removing user fees in the health sector: a review of policy processes in six sub-Saharan African countries. *Health Policy and Planning (Suppl 2)* 2011; 26: ii16-ii29.
- ¹⁶ Erasmus E. The use of street-level bureaucracy theory in health policy analysis in low- and middle-income countries: a meta-ethnographic synthesis. *Health Policy Plan* 2014; 29 Suppl 3: iii70-8.
- ¹⁷ Robert E, Ridde V. Global health actors no longer in favor of user fees: a documentary study. *Globalization and Health* 2013; 9(29).
- ¹⁸ Campbell JL. *Institutional Change and Globalization*. Princeton: Princeton University Press; 2004.

- ¹⁹ Palier B, Surel Y. Les « trois I » et l'analyse de l'État en action. *Revue française de science politique* 2005; 55(1): 7-32.
- ²⁰ Orenstein MA. *Privatizing Pensions: The Transnational Campaign for Social Security Reform*. Princeton University Press; 2008.
- ²¹ Daigneault P-M. Reassessing the concept of policy paradigm: aligning ontology and methodology in policy studies. *Journal of European Public Policy* 2014; 21(3): 453-69.
- ²² Hay C. Ideas and the Construction of Interests. In: Béland D, Cox RH, eds. *Ideas and Politics in Social Science Research*. New York: Oxford University; 2011.
- ²³ Blyth M. *Great Transformations: Economic Ideas and Institutional Change in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.; 2002.
- ²⁴ Béland D. Policy Change and Health Care Research. *J Health Polit Policy Law* 2010; 35(4): 607-33.
- ²⁵ Bhatia V, Coleman WD. Ideas and Discourse: Reform and Resistance in the Canadian and German Health Systems. . *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 2003; 36(4): 715-39.
- ²⁶ Ridde V. Policy implementation in an African State : an extension of the Kingdon's multiple-streams approach. *Public Administration* 2009; 87(4): 938-54
- ²⁷ Walt G. *Health policy : an introduction to process and power*. London and Johannesburg: Zed Press and University of Witwaterstand; 1994.
- ²⁸ Béland D. *Social Security: History and Politics from the New Deal to the Privatization Debate*. . Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.; 2005.
- ²⁹ Kingdon JW. *Agendas, Alternatives and Publics Policies*. 2nd ed. New York: Harper Collins; 1995.
- ³⁰ Stone D. *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making*. New York: W.W. Norton; 1997.
- ³¹ Gusfield JR. *The Culture of Public Problems: Drinking-Driving and the Symbolic Order*. . Chicago University of Chicago Press; 1981.
- ³² Gilson L, Kalyalya D, Kuchler F, Lake S, Organa H, Ouendo M. The equity impacts of community financing activities in three African countries. *Int J Health Plann Manage* 2000; 15: 291-317.
- ³³ Ridde V, Jacob JP. *Les indigents et les politiques de santé en Afrique. Expériences et enjeux conceptuels*. Louvain-La-Neuve: Academia-L'Harmattan; 2013.
- ³⁴ Hall P. Policy paradigms, social learning and the state: the case of economic Policymaking in Britain. *Comparative Politics* 1993; 25(3): 275-96.
- ³⁵ Leeuw FL. Policy theories, knowledge utilization, and evaluation. *Knowledge & Policy* 1991; 4(3): 73-91.
- ³⁶ Howlett MP. *Designing public policies : principles and instruments*. London ; New York: Routledge; 2011.
- ³⁷ Akin JS, Birdsall N, De Ferranti D. *Financing Health Services in Developing Countries: An Agenda for Reform*: World Bank, 1987.
- ³⁸ Cox RH. The Social Construction of an Imperative: Why Welfare Reform Happened in Denmark and the Netherlands but Not in Germany. . *World Politics* 2011; 53: 463-98.
- ³⁹ Seddoh A, Akor SA. Policy initiation and political levers in health policy: lessons from Ghana's health insurance. . *BMC Public Health* 2012; 12(Suppl 1): S10.
- ⁴⁰ Rose R. *Learning from comparative public policy. A practical guide*. London and Nuew Yord: Routledge; 2005.
- ⁴¹ Hecló H. *Modern Social Politics in Britain and Sweden: From Relief to Income Maintenance*. . New Haven: Yale University Press. ; 1974.
- ⁴² Perez D, Lefevre P, Castro M, et al. Process-oriented fidelity research assists in evaluation, adjustment and scaling-up of community-based interventions. *Health Policy Plan* 2011; 26: 413-22.
- ⁴³ Marmor TR, Freeman R, H. KG, editors. *Comparative Studies and the Politics of Modern Medical Care*. . New Haven: Yale University Press; 2009.
- ⁴⁴ Sabatier PA, editor. *Theories of the policy process*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press; 1999.
- ⁴⁵ Birkland TA. *Lessons of Disaster: Policy Change after Catastrophic Events*. . Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. ; 2006.
- ⁴⁶ Meessen B, Kouanda S, Musango L, Richard F, Ridde V, Soucat A. Communities of practice: the missing link for knowledge management on implementation issues in low-income countries? *Trop Med Int Health* 2011; 16(8): 1007-14.
- ⁴⁷ Gofas A, Hay C, editors. *The Role of Ideas in Political Analysis. A Portrait of Contemporary Debates*. London and New York: Routledge; 2010.
- ⁴⁸ Schmidt VA. Discursive Institutionalism: The Explanatory Power of Ideas and Discourse. *Annual Review of Political Science* 2008; 11: 303-26.

- ⁴⁹ Lazin FA. Policy implementation of social welfare in the 1980s. New Brunswick, N.J., U.S.A.: Transaction Books 1987.
- ⁵⁰ Barrett S. Implementation Studies. Time fore a Revival? Personal Reflections on 20 Years of Implementation Studies. . *Public Administration* 2004; 82: 249-62.
- ⁵¹ Robichau RW, Lynn LE. The Implementation of Public Policy: Still the Missing Link. *Policy Studies Journal* 2009; 37(1): 21-36.
- ⁵² Gilson L, Hanson K, Sheikh K, Agyepong IA, Ssengooba F, Bennett S. Building the field of health policy and systems research: social science matters. *PLoS Med* 2011; 8(8): e1001079.
- ⁵³ Ridde V, Robert E, Meessen B. A literature review of the disruptive effects of user fee exemption policies on health systems. *BMC Public Health* 2012; 12:289
- ⁵⁴ Gilson L, McIntyre D. Removing user fees for primary care in Africa: the need for careful action. . *Br Med J* 2005; 331: 762-5.
- ⁵⁵ Olivier de Sardan J-P, Ridde V. Les contradictions des politiques publiques. Un bilan des mesures d'exemption de paiement des soins au Burkina Faso, au Mali et au Niger. *Afrique contemporaine* 2012; 243(3): 13-32.
- ⁵⁶ Walker L, Gilson L. 'We are bitter but we are satisfied': nurses as street-level bureaucrats in South Africa. *Social Science & Medicine* 2004; 59(6): 1251-61.
- ⁵⁷ Ridde V, Olivier de Sardan J-P. Abolishing user fees for patients in West Africa: lessons for public policy. Paris: AFD, Paris. <http://recherche.afd.fr>; 2013.
- ⁵⁸ Blyth M. Any More Bright Ideas? The Ideational Turn of Comparative Political Economy. *Comparative Politics* 1997; 29(2): 229-50.
- ⁵⁹ Carroll C, Patterson M, Wood S, Booth A, Rick J, Balain S. A conceptual framework for implementation fidelity. *Implement Science* 2007; 2: 40.
- ⁶⁰ Howlett M. Beyond Legalism? Policy Ideas, Implementation Styles and Emulation-Based Convergence in Canadian and U.S. Environmental Policy. *Journal of Public Policy* 2000; 20(3): 305-29.
- ⁶¹ McDonnell LM. Ideas and values in implementation analysis: The case of teacher policy. In: Odden AR, ed. *Education Policy Implementation* Albany, NY:: State University of New York Press; 1991: 241-58.
- ⁶² Goldrick-Rab S, Shaw KM. Tracking How Ideas Become Higher Education Policy and Practice: The Challenges of Gathering Comparative State Policy Implementation Dat. In: Shaw KM, E. HD, eds. *State Postsecondary Education Research: New Methods to Inform Policy Practice*. Sterling, VA: Stylus; 2007: 77-95.
- ⁶³ Birkland TA. *An Introduction to the Policy Process: Theories, Concepts, and Models of Public Policy Making (Third Edition)*. . Armonk: M.E.: Sharpe. ; 2011.
- ⁶⁴ Wu X, Howlett M, Fritzen S. *The Public Policy Primer : Managing the Policy Process*. London ; New York: Routledge; 2010.
- ⁶⁵ Fischer F. *Reframing Public Policy: Discursive Politics and Deliberative Practices*. . Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2003.
- ⁶⁶ Genieys W, Smyrl M, editors. *Elites, Ideas, and the Evolution of Public Policy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave; 2008.
- ⁶⁷ Dolowitz DP, Marsh D. Learning from Abroad: The Role of Policy Transfer in Contemporary Policy-Making. *Governance* 2000; 13(1): 5-23.
- ⁶⁸ De Allegri M, Sauerborn R, Kouyate B, Flessa S. Community health insurance in sub-Saharan Africa : what operational difficulties hamper its successful development ? *Tropical Medicine & International Health* 2009; 14(5): 1-11.
- ⁶⁹ Olivier de Sardan J-P. Le culturalisme traditionaliste africaniste. *Analyse d'une idéologie scientifique. Cahiers d'études africaines* 2010; L (2-3-4)(198-199-200): 419-53.
- ⁷⁰ Wilkinson D, Gouws E, Sach M, Karim S. Effect of removing user fees on attendance for curative and preventive primary health care services in rural South Africa. *WHO Bulletin*, 2001; 79: 665-71.
- ⁷¹ Zeidan A, Zakariah M, Bashier I, Eriksson B. The impact of user fee exemption on service utilization and treatment seeking behaviour : The case of Malaria in Sudan *International Journal of Health Planning & Management* 2004; 19: 95-106.
- ⁷² Witter S, Kusi A, Aikins M. Working practices and incomes of health workers: evidence from an evaluation of a delivery fee exemption scheme in Ghana. *Human Resources for Health* 2007; 5: 2-.
- ⁷³ Ridde V, Diarra A. A process evaluation of user fees abolition for pregnant women and children under five years in two districts in Niger (West Africa). *BMC Health Services Research* 2009; 9(89).

- ⁷⁴ Touré L. Perceptions sur les politiques d'exemption de paiement des soins au Mali : une baisse de qualité comme prix à payer pour un meilleur accès aux soins ? *Afrique contemporaine* 2012; 243(3): Sous presse.
- ⁷⁵ George G, Atujuna M, Gentile J. The impact of ART scale upon health workers : evidence from two South African districts. . *AIDS Care* 2010; 22(1): 77-84.
- ⁷⁶ Mbaye E, Dumont A, Ridde V, Briand V. «En faire plus, pour gagner plus»: la pratique de la césarienne dans trois contextes d'exemption des paiements au Sénégal. . *Sante Publique (Bucur)* 2011; 23(3): 207-19.
- ⁷⁷ Tanon AA. Programme de gratuité partielle dans la province Maniema République démocratique du Congo. Rapport d'évaluation à mi-parcours. Kinsasha: Merlin, 2011.
- ⁷⁸ Ridde V, Queuille L, Atchessi N, Samb O, Heinmüller R, Haddad S. A user fees abolition experimentation evaluation for vulnerable groups in Burkina Faso. *Field Actions Science Reports [Online]*, 2012; Special Issue 8 | 2012, Online since 06 November 2012, Connection on 09 November 2012. URL : <http://factsreports.revues.org/1758>.
- ⁷⁹ Witter S, Dieng T, Mbengue D, Moreira I, de Brouwere V. The national free delivery and caesarean policy in Senegal: evaluating process and outcomes. *Health Policy & Planning* doi:101093/heapol/czqo13 2010; 25(5): 384-92.
- ⁸⁰ Witter S, Adjei S. Start-stop funding, its causes and consequences: a case study of the delivery exemptions policy in Ghana. *Int J Health Plann Manage* 2007; 22(2): 133-43.
- ⁸¹ Belaid L, Ridde V. Contextual factors as a key to understanding the heterogeneity of effects of a maternal health policy in Burkina Faso *Health Policy & Planning* 2015; 30(3): 309-21.
- ⁸² Hogwood B, Gunn LA. Policy Analysis for the Real World. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1984.
- ⁸³ Sabatier PA, Mazmanian DA. Effective policy implementation. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books; 1981.
- ⁸⁴ Parsons C. How to Map Arguments in Political Science. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2007.
- ⁸⁵ Padamsee T. Culture in Connection: Re-Contextualizing Ideational Processes in the Analysis of Policy Development. . *Social Politics* 2009; 16(4): 413-45.
- ⁸⁶ Ridde V. From institutionalization of user fees to their abolition in West Africa: a story of pilot projects and public policies. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2015 (In press).
- ⁸⁷ Ponsar F, Van Herp M, Zachariah R, Gerard S, Philips M, Jouquet G. Abolishing user fees for children and pregnant women trebled uptake of malaria related interventions in Kangaba, Mali. *Health Policy & Planning* 2011; 26(Suppl 2): ii72-ii83.
- ⁸⁸ Vaessen J, Leeuw FL. Interventions as Theories : Closing The Gap between Evaluation and the Disciplines? In: Vaessen J, Leeuw FL, eds. Mind the gap Perspectives on Policy Evaluation and the Social Sciences; 2010: 141-70.
- ⁸⁹ Pawson R. Middle range Theory and Program Theory Evaluation : From Provenance to Practice. In: Vaessen J, Leeuw FL, eds. Mind the gap Perspectives on Policy Evaluation and the Social Sciences; 2010: 171-202.