Box 1: Elaboration of Matland's model of conflict, ambiguity and implementation (adapted from Matland in Checkland et al 2019)

LOW CONFLICT HIGH CONFLICT

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLEMENTATION

Goals clear, and no conflict between goals or between means of meeting those goals

- Implementation approach required: rational, top-down
- **Key organising concept**: resources required to implement
- Example: smallpox eradication

POLITICAL IMPLEMENTATION

- Goals clear, but conflict either between goals or between means of meeting those goals. Often highly political
- Implementation outcomes determined by the location of authority top down
- **Key organising concept:** power who has authority to make changes
- Example: bussing children across town to maintain racial diversity in schools

EXPERIMENTAL IMPLEMENTATION

• **Goals** unclear, but little conflict surrounding the topic

- Implementation will be locally driven and bottom up, with outcomes determined by who is active and what local resources are available. outcomes may be variable and environmental influences likely to be important
- Key organising concept: context
- Example: UK Health action zones- multiple goals, considerable local variation

SYMBOLIC IMPLEMENTATION

- Goals unclear, and also conflict between goals or the means to achieving those goals
- Implementation will depend upon the local assembling of coalitions, with professional values and allegiances having a significant impact on outcomes. Often occurs when there are 'wicked' problems, with multiple stakeholders with differing agendas and desired outcomes. Bottom up implementation, but degree of conflict means that top down political influence will also occur
- Key organising concept: collaborative strength and local coalitions
- Example: creation of Health and Wellbeing Boards under the Health and Social Care Act

HIGH AMBIGUITY

LOW AMBIGUITY