The Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF)  
(Paul Sabatier)

[The intellectual inspiration]
- To overcome the limitations of the stages heuristic
- To provide theoretical insight (scientific, technical) in political debates
- To understanding politics and policy change over time (beyond tradition)

[The debates in the philosophy of science]
- Thomas Kuhn, Imre Lakatos (hard core & progressive problem-shift...)

- Vincent & Elinor Ostrom (Institutional Analysis & Development Framework)
- Benny Hjern & Ken Harff (bottom-up, implementation)
- Martin Shubik (the need for alternate theories to rational choice)
- Hugh Heclo (learning and integration of social economic conditions with individual agency for explaining policy change)

Sabatier (1987, 1988) - Synthesized top-down and bottom-up approaches to implementation in the formation of the ACF  
(Sabatier, 1987, 1988) - Introduced the ACF, as the lead article in a special issues of the framework in Policy Sciences

Revision (Q.)  
(pp. 186-188)
- Modifying & adding hypotheses: precise or strengthen the theoretical rigor
  * The role of brokers in learning, hierarchically superior jurisdiction ...
  ** Paths for policy change (negotiated agreements, internal events)
- Modifying & clarifying concepts: Individual, Belief system, Policy subsystem
- Adding concept
  *: Purpose/Material group, **: Strong/Weak coordination, Mature/Naas subsystem, ***: Coalition opportunity structures/resources
- Clarifying the framework & theoretical emphases: Weible et al (2011) ...

Causal Process (Q.)  
(pp. 193-194)
- Relatively Stable Parameters
  1. Basic attributes of the problem area and distribution of natural resources
  2. Fundamental sociocultural values and social structure
  3. Basic constitutional structure
- Long-Term Coalition Opportunity Structures
  1. Degree of consensus needed for major policy change
  2. Openness of political system
  3. Overlapping Societal Coalitions
- External Subsystem Events
  1. Changes in socioeconomic conditions
  2. Changes in public opinion
  3. Changes in systematic governing coalitions
  4. Changes in other policy subsystems
- Short-Term Constraints and Resources of Subsystem Actors
- Policy Subsystem
  1. Beliefs
  2. Resources
  3. Strategies
  4. Institutional Rules
- Policy Outputs
- Policy Impacts

Scope ~ System level (Q.)
- [Traditional] useful for understanding high conflict situations involving coalition, learning, and policy change at the policy subsystem level of analysis ~ organizational level in collaborative setting, a form of application

Advocacy Coalition - actors sharing policy core belief
- H1. The stability of coalition over time
- H2. The substantial consensus on issues pertaining to the policy core
- H3. Giving up secondary aspects of her(s) belief system (before acknowledging weakness in the policy core)
- H4. The moderate position of administrative agencies (than their interest group allies)
- H5. The constraint of purposive group actors (than from material groups)

*2&3: resulted in few confirmations. 4&5: rarely tested
*Implication
  (1) the presence of other factors, outside belief, that affect coalition formation and stability
  (2) coalitions are shaped more by shared opponents than by shared beliefs
  * Dominant and minority coalition
  * Overcoming threats to collective action (3 rationales)
  * Principal and auxiliary coalition actors
  * Resources, strategies, and activities

Policy-Oriented Learning
- H1. Intermediate level of informed conflict
- H2. Forum
- H3. Quantitative data > qualitative
- H4. Natural systems > social or political systems
- H5. Accumulation of technical information
  (affect policy broker)
  - Attributing of forums ~ among allies and opponents
  - Level of conflict between coalitions (intermediate ~ cross-coalition learning)
  - Attributing of the stimuli (intractable ↑, cross-coalition learning ↓)
  - Attributing of actors ~ belief system, resources, strategies, and network contacts (moderate > extreme, broker ~ facilitating learning)
  * concern: inconsistency in the conceptualization and measurement of the concept
  ⇒ Best practice needs to be developed

Policy Change ~ four conceptual paths
- H1. Four pathways are necessary, but not sufficient for source of change ...
- H2. Not significantly revised until the change is imposed by hierarchically superior jurisdiction
  - stable over long periods / dramatic & nonincremental change ⇒ provoke this focus (Sabatier, 1988)
  - change in core aspects: Major policy change / change in secondary aspects ~ Minor policy change
  - Pathway 1. some external source: external shocks, or perturbations ⇒ major
  - mobilization by minority coalitions to exploit the event
  - Pathway 2. internal event: crises, policy fiascoes, scandals ⇒ major
  - Pathway 3. policy-oriented learning ⇒ minor
  - Pathway 4. negotiated agreement between previous learning coalitions
  - nine prescription for fostering negotiation: hurting stalemate, broad representation ...

Future Research Agenda (Q.)  
(pp. 204-207)
1. Reconsidering the ACF’s belief system  
2. Advancing the theory & measures of learning (understudied area)  
3. Refining the theory of coalition formation and maintenance (for understanding coalition structure and the reason of defection)  
4. Developing a hierarchy for coalition resources  
5. Using the ACF for comparative public policy research (bring additional costs)  
6. Focusing on types of actors (auxiliary, principal, brokers, entrepreneurs) ...

Purpose → Utilization [enlightenment] → Contribution for democracy → Better society, life → Human dignity

Table 6.2, p 210  
(Q.) Empirical application
- Number of application (1987-2013): 224
- Topic: Environment (128, 57%), Health (17, 11%), Finance/eco. (17, 8%) ...
- Continent: North America (95, 42%), Europe (94, 42%), Asia (16, 7%) ...
- Outlet: Other journal(22), 54%, Policy Studies Journal(23, 10%) ...

(Q.) Framework
- ACF is best thought of as a framework supporting multiple, overlapping theoretical foci (Note. 7, p. 214)
- frameworks are not directly testable but provide guidance toward ...
- frameworks supports multiple theories which are ...
- Framework ~ assumption, scope (type of questions), basic categories of concepts and general relations for answering research questions.

(Q.) Assumption
- The policy subsystem is the primary unit of analysis for understanding policy processes. (defined by a policy topic, territorial scope, and the actors)
- * Key words: uncountable, demarcate, semi-independent, (provide) authority
- * The set of relevant subsystem actors includes any person regularly attempting to influence subsystem affairs. (from government, private sector, media, school ...)
- * Individuals are boundedly rational with limited ability to process stimuli, motivated by belief systems, and prone to experience the “devil shift”
- * People remember losses more readily than gains
- * the structure of the belief system: deep core / policy core / secondary
- * Subsystem are simplified by aggregation actors into one or more coalition.
- * organized actors into one or more advocacy coalitions based on shared beliefs and coordination strategies.
- * Policies and programs incorporate implicit theories reflecting the translated beliefs of one or more coalitions.
- * Scientific and technical information is important for understanding subsystem affairs (used in political debates & negotiation)
- Researchers should adopt a long-term perspective (e.g., ten years or more) to understand policy process ad change.