

1 Title: **The Middle-Out Perspective – an approach to formalise**  
2 **‘normal practice’ in public health advocacy**


3

4 Authors:

- 5 1. Jennifer S Mindell, Professor of Public Health, Institute of Epidemiology & Health  
6 Care, UCL, London, UK [j.mindell@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:j.mindell@ucl.ac.uk)  
7 2. Yael Parag, Vice Dean, School of Sustainability, Reichman University, Herzliya, Israel  
8 [yparag@idc.ac.il](mailto:yparag@idc.ac.il)  
9 3. Suzanne E. Bartington, Clinical Research Fellow, Institute of Applied Health  
10 Research, University of Birmingham [s.bartington@bham.ac.uk](mailto:s.bartington@bham.ac.uk)  
11 4. Laura Stoll, Public Health Specialty Registrar, Institute of Epidemiology & Health  
12 Care, UCL, London, UK [laura.stoll@nhs.net](mailto:laura.stoll@nhs.net)  
13 5. James Barlow, Professor of Technology & Innovation Management (Healthcare),  
14 Imperial College Business School, London, UK [j.barlow@imperial.ac.uk](mailto:j.barlow@imperial.ac.uk)  
15 6. Kathryn B. Janda, Principal Research Fellow, Energy Institute, UCL, London UK  
16 [k.janda@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:k.janda@ucl.ac.uk)

17

18 **Graphical abstract**



19

20 **Abstract**

21 **Background:** The Middle-Out Perspective (MOP) provides a lens to examine how  
22 actors positioned between government (top) and individuals (bottom) act to promote  
23 broader societal changes from the middle-out (rather than the top-down or bottom-  
24 up). The MOP has been used in recent years in the fields of energy, climate change,  
25 and development studies. Public health practitioners involved with advocacy activities

26 and creating alliances to amplify health promotion actions will be familiar with the  
27 general MOP concept if not the formal name.

28 **Methods:** This paper introduces the MOP conceptual framework and customises it for  
29 a public health audience by positioning it among existing concepts and theories for  
30 actions within public health. Using two UK case studies (increasing signalised crossing  
31 times for pedestrians and the campaign for smoke-free legislation), we illustrate who  
32 middle actors are and what they can do to result in better public health outcomes.

33 **Results:** These cases studies show that involving a wider range of middle actors,  
34 including those not traditionally involved in improving the public's health, can broaden  
35 the range and reach of organisations and individuals involving in advocating for public  
36 health measures. They also demonstrate that middle actors are not neutral. They can  
37 be recruited to improve public health outcomes, but they may also be exploited by  
38 commercial interests to block healthy policies or even promote a health-diminishing  
39 agenda.

40 **Conclusions:** Using the MOP as a formal approach can help public health organisations  
41 and practitioners consider potential 'allies' from outside traditional health-related  
42 bodies or professions. Formal mapping can expand the range of who are considered  
43 potential middle actors for a particular public health issue. By applying the MOP, public

44 health organisations and staff can enlist the additional leverage that is brought to bear  
45 by involving additional middle actors in improving the public's health.

46 **Key words**

47 Advocacy; Health improvement; Middle-Out Perspective; Public health; Middle actors

## 48 INTRODUCTION

49 Both the general public and professionals in a wide range of disciplines are familiar  
50 with 'top-down' and 'bottom-up' approaches for mobilising change. Top-down actions  
51 use governments' regulatory powers and fiscal influences to introduce or impose  
52 policy measures, such as controlling the Covid-19 pandemic. Bottom-up activities  
53 involve grassroots and individual actions (including purchasing power) to change  
54 groups' or institutions' behaviours at a local, regional or national level: the #MeToo  
55 and the Black Lives Matter movements are recent international examples.


56 Public health practitioners and organisations are generally positioned between  
57 national government and the general public. They work by assembling, reviewing and  
58 disseminating evidence and trying to influence upwards to government and  
59 downwards to local communities and individuals. However, this model underplays an  
60 essential component of effective public health working: liaising with, influencing or  
61 supporting others who are also in 'the middle'.

62 The 'Middle-Out Perspective' (MOP) is a socio-technical framework first described by  
63 Janda and Parag in 2013 <sup>1</sup>. They showed how various groups of actors positioned  
64 between actors at the top and the bottom, i.e., middle actors such as public health  
65 practitioners and other organisations working to improve the public's health, exert

66 their influence in three directions: middle-up, middle-down, and sideways (Figure 1).  
67 They also examined the modes by which influence was exerted: 'enabling', 'mediating'  
68 and 'aggregating'.<sup>1</sup> This approach was described initially in the field of energy and the  
69 transition to low carbon systems.<sup>2-4</sup> Kranzler *et al.* applied the MOP in the field of  
70 public health to identify and focus attention on stakeholders positioned between the  
71 policy-makers generally associated with 'top-down' approaches and those involved  
72 with 'bottom-up' actions, calling for MOP to be incorporated into the public health skill  
73 set.<sup>5</sup>

74

75 **Figure 1. The Middle-Out Perspective**



76

77 **Existing concepts and theories for public health actions**

78 Public health has a tradition of integrative leadership and advocacy, including  
79 coordination of individuals, organisations and communities with diverse perspectives  
80 to bring about concerted actions for equitable population health benefit.<sup>6</sup> At the core  
81 of public health practice is addressing the 'wider determinants' of health, a diverse  
82 range of social, environmental and economic conditions and commercial influences<sup>7-10</sup>

83 which impact upon physical and mental health and contribute to health inequity.<sup>11</sup> The  
84 mechanisms by which such factors influence health are dynamic and inter-related,  
85 involving a diverse array of multi-sectoral stakeholders operating within a broad,  
86 complex system, which the public health community must effectively navigate and  
87 ultimately influence to achieve desired outcomes. Therefore, public health  
88 professionals are well accustomed to operating beyond organisational 'silos'. Yet the  
89 role of critical actors who are in the 'middle' of the system is often neglected in  
90 traditional public health practice.<sup>12</sup> Existing conceptual models include characterisation  
91 of preventative public health action reflecting targeted interventions for 'upstream'  
92 health determinants (structural, affecting the population) and 'downstream'  
93 (individual) minimisation of harmful consequences,<sup>13</sup> and application of systematic  
94 methodological frameworks, e.g., Health Impact Assessment processes.<sup>14</sup>

95 Nearly all health promotion programmes and public health policy initiatives involve  
96 changes in people's behaviour and practices and the introduction of new norms and  
97 procedures. Their success depends on multi-faceted efforts, requiring collective action  
98 to tackle and overcome different societal, technological and economic challenges.  
99 Thus, actors such as government and regulators collaborate with public, third sector,  
100 and sometimes private organisations and the public to achieve goals. In other words,



101 actors positioned at the top, bottom and middle change the way public health  
102 programmes are developed, implemented and regulated.<sup>5</sup>

103 Although public health research and evaluation have traditionally adopted linear cause  
104 and effect models, the complexity of public health systems<sup>15</sup> and interventions<sup>16</sup> are  
105 increasingly recognised.

106 Health in All Policies (HiAP) is an established conceptual public health approach, which  
107 seeks synergies in cross-sector actions to improve population health and equity.<sup>17</sup> A  
108 HiAP approach inherently encompasses a broad spectrum of activities, from single  
109 collaborations with individual policymakers to ongoing multi-agency collaborative  
110 processes, with diverse stakeholders, including those who do not consider themselves  
111 as operating within the public health sphere.<sup>11</sup> Such advocacy comprises three pillars:  
112 information, strategy, and action,<sup>18</sup> requiring multiple participant roles and levels of  
113 engagement and involvement across the information, strategy and action domains.

114 While recognising public health professionals' direct advocacy role, this framework  
115 does not explicitly recognise the key role of additional relevant actors, both individual  
116 and organisational, and the influence of potential 'middle actors' including those not  
117 traditionally considered public health actors, e.g. builders.<sup>3</sup> Similarly, existing research  
118 on public health advocacy has a narrow focus, typically considering health message

119 articulation and communication within the professional or practitioner  
120 community.<sup>7,19,20</sup>

121 The MOP conceptual framework focuses on middle actors and examines how they can  
122 promote (or diminish) action by enhancing top, bottom and other middle actors’  
123 interest in action and ability to act. In the public health field, middle actors include a  
124 wide variety of organisations that can contribute substantially to making a case for a  
125 new or amended policy or its successful implementation, to improve health and  
126 reduce inequalities. They include local government (policymakers and practitioners);  
127 higher education institutions; third sector organisations; community, interest, or  
128 industry groups; private businesses; religious organisations; and professional  
129 associations. We propose the MOP to address the existing over-simplification of ‘top-  
130 down’ and ‘bottom-up’ approaches by providing a lens through which to view public  
131 health advocacy work and identify other actors and activities that can be recruited to  
132 progress a public health agenda. Such processes thereby acknowledge the  
133 contribution of middle sector actors beyond the core professional public health  
134 community. In this paper we describe the MOP and analyse two case studies through  
135 the MOP lens.

136

## 137 **METHODS**

### 138 **Theoretical basis of the MOP**

#### 139 *Middle actors*

140 Parag and Janda identified specific attributes necessary to be considered as middle  
141 actors (Box 1).<sup>1,4</sup> Kranzler and colleagues described the domain of middle actors as  
142 *“elusive administrative spaces”* within which they *“shape policies, steer funding and*  
143 *facilitate continuity”*.<sup>5</sup> Through these domains and activities, middle actors can exert  
144 their influence, upwards to policy makers, downwards to the public, and sideways on  
145 other middle actors in the policy arena.

146 Middle actors can be the immediate target that public health is aiming to influence  
147 because of their potential to be powerful allies or communication channels for  
148 knowledge exchange and suggested actions. They may be entities that affect the  
149 public’s health, without being recognised as public health organisations, such as  
150 companies providing public transport information.

### Box 1. Attributes of middle actors

- Institutions that are visible, separate and specified, e.g. through:
  - organisational structures
  - membership
  - procedures or rules, whether official or not
- Have access to:
  - unique resources, for example
    - funding
    - equipment
  - other resources, for example
    - expertise
    - experience
- Have a distinct authority and legitimacy:
  - Professional, legal and rational
  - Spiritual and ethical
  - Traditional and charismatic
- Have pre-existing formal and/or informal channels of communication with:
  - their own members

- other middle actors
- top actors (e.g., decision-makers, policymakers)
- bottom actors (e.g., individuals and citizens)

*Expanded and adapted from Janda and Parag<sup>1</sup> and Parag and Janda<sup>4</sup>*

151

152 ***How middle actors influence others***

153 Tackling complex public health challenges requires the adoption of complex and multi-  
154 disciplinary interventions that take account of contexts, actors, and environments. In  
155 such a turbulent and 'messy' arena, middle actors are important. How do middle  
156 actors contribute to long lasting and sustainable programmes and policies? The main  
157 mechanisms identified by Janda and Parag<sup>1,4</sup> are *mediating*, *aggregating*, and *enabling*,  
158 although these sometimes overlap.

159 Middle actors act as *mediators* between the various actors in the field, often  
160 functioning as an effective communication channel, and as translators of needs and  
161 limitations. They *aggregate* various resources, e.g. knowledge and funding, to make  
162 them more robust and visible to the other actors in the field. They use their own  
163 unique resources and legitimacy to *enable* action by removing or overcoming different

164 types of contextual, technical, normative barriers and obstacles.<sup>1</sup> These modes of  
165 action occur both within public health<sup>5</sup> and elsewhere.<sup>2</sup>

166 *Mediating* is particularly suited to public health practitioners' strengths in using  
167 language appropriate for different audiences and, where necessary, 'interpreting'  
168 between different professional or disciplinary groups, policy-makers, and the public,  
169 including giving a voice to those frequently under-represented in research and policy  
170 debates.<sup>19</sup> Health practitioners are positioned well to *aggregate* fragmented evidence  
171 and local knowledge into a comprehensive, robust and trustworthy reflection of the  
172 field. The aggregation makes scattered phenomena visible to other actors in the field.  
173 They can also aggregate relatively small budgets from different sources into a more  
174 meaningful amount, supporting more substantial action. Their unique resources that  
175 other actors lack, including moral, professional and ethical legitimacies and access to  
176 tacit and local knowledge, help them overcome barriers for change and *enable* (or  
177 delay or block) action.

178

179 *Case studies*

180 We selected two case studies in which non-governmental and public health  
181 organisations (some traditionally involved in health promotion and some not) have  
182 worked collaboratively to achieve national policy changes.

183

184 **Case study 1. Smokefree legislation:** Successive governments in England have had a  
185 longstanding commitment to voluntary agreements with industry for tobacco control<sup>21</sup>  
186 and other public health areas. The legislation banned smoking in indoor public places,  
187 including workplaces, places of entertainment, shops, transport, etc., and reinforced  
188 existing local initiatives on public transport, for example.

189 **Case study 2. Signalised pedestrian crossings:** Pelican signalised pedestrian crossings  
190 (Figure 2a) have two pedestrian phases. The 'invitation to cross' (the 'green person'  
191 showing), lasts 6-10 seconds in the UK, dependent on road width. This is followed by  
192 the 'clearance time' (a flashing green icon or nothing visible to pedestrians), so those  
193 who are already crossing the road can reach the other side before the road traffic  
194 resumes. The clearance time duration assumes a walking speed of  $\geq 1.2\text{m/s}$  (4.3km/hr,  
195 2.7mph) in the UK; the limited time available deters mobility, rather than causing  
196 injuries.

197 **Figure 2. Types of signalised pedestrian crossings in the UK**



These photos by Unknown Authors are licensed under CC BY-SA

198

199 *Footnote: 2a: Pelican crossing (fixed timings); 2b: Countdown crossing (fixed timings);*

200 *2c: PUFFIN crossing (camera-controlled).*

201

202 The clearance time duration assumed an average walking speed for the general public

203 but did not take account of slower walking speeds for the elderly. Due to pressure

204 initiated by an NGO, the signal crossing time was changed.

205 For each case study, we analysed who the actors were and how the actions taken by

206 the key actors were used, applying the MOP framework described above.




207 **RESULTS**

208 **Case study 1: Smoke-free legislation in England**

209 An account of the advocacy work by a consortium of NGOs and practitioners'  
210 organisations that led to the national government in England passing smoke-free  
211 legislation in 2006, implemented in 2007, has been published elsewhere.<sup>23</sup> The top,  
212 middle and bottom actors are shown in Figure 3. Bottom actors were very wide-  
213 ranging in their backgrounds, knowledge of the issue, and concerns. The tobacco  
214 industry also used a middle-out approach, working through front organisations and  
215 hospitality trade associations, encouraging them to recruit their own bottom actors to  
216 lobby government to oppose smoke-free legislation (see below).

217

218 **Figure 3. The Middle-Out Perspective used in advocating for smoke-free legislation**



219

220 The process was led by the NGO Action on Smoking and Health (ASH, [www.ash.org.uk](http://www.ash.org.uk)).

221 The initial action was to build a coalition to advocate for smoke-free legislation to

222 protect children and non-smokers from secondhand smoke. ASH was closely familiar

223 with the action and interests of many other middle actors, and with decision-makers'

224 attitudes and pressure put on top actors preventing them from adopting new actions

225 on smoking. ASH understood that while many small organisations advocate action

226 against smoking, they can be invisible to decision-makers and their voice is not  
227 heeded. *Aggregating* these voices in a coalition made them more visible and their  
228 demand more influential. ASH's professional expertise and reputation made them a  
229 trustworthy actor and granted them a professional legitimacy in the tobacco policy  
230 domain. The middle actors' coalition's activities are summarised in Table 1.

231 However, the tobacco industry is also a powerful middle actor active in the smoking  
232 policy arena, driven by a strong economic incentive not to limit smoking. The tobacco  
233 industry used the hospitality industry as their own middle actors, working sideways to  
234 encourage vociferous opposition to the proposed legislation by clubs, restaurants, and  
235 bars, for example, in the media and middle-up to lobby politicians against the  
236 proposal. Nevertheless, when Liverpool and London proposed passing local smoke-free  
237 legislation, when national legislation was not forthcoming, this cleverly separated the  
238 interests of the hospitality industry and the tobacco industry: the hospitality trade  
239 viewed national legislation as preferable to local laws and the 'uneven playing field'  
240 that would result.

241 ASH had only around five to seven members of staff during this period but enabled a  
242 multiplicative effect for the volume of advocacy, successfully scaling up its reach and  
243 effectiveness. For example, over 50% of the public were aware of the existence of ASH,

244 and 92% of stakeholders rated ASH's campaigning and policy work as excellent or  
245 good.<sup>24</sup>

246

247 **Table 1. Smoke-free legislation in England**

<b>Direction of activity</b>	<b>Enabling<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Mediating<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Aggregating<sup>a</sup></b>
Middle-down	<p><i>Using professional legitimacy to build support: Using ASH’s reputation for impartial evidence to educate the public via the media.</i></p>	<p><i>Communication with the public to increase interest and motivation: Middle actors generated grassroots support, framing the issue around improving the public’s health, reducing disease, and protecting employees from occupational exposure to a lethal substance.</i></p> <p><i>Translating between professional and public languages: ASH filled the role of mediators between the scientific knowledge and evidence on the relations between smoking and health, publishing reports to maintain interest and expand knowledge. Middle actors built up public</i></p>	<p><i>Development of public knowledge of the risks of secondhand smoke and public support, to improve its interest to engage in the debate through communicating with the public via the media and with members/supporters</i></p> <p><i>Formalisation of a grassroots initiative: Middle actors encouraged their supporters to write to their MPs to garner</i></p>

Direction of activity	Enabling <sup>a</sup>	Mediating <sup>a</sup>	Aggregating <sup>a</sup>
		<p>knowledge of the risks of SHS support by tailoring their messages to their members' particular focus.</p>	<p>political support, and demonstrate to national government that there was widespread public support.</p>
Middle-up	<p><i>Building relationships:</i> ASH and other middle actors developed relationships with key individuals advising government</p> <p><i>Lobbying:</i> Middle actors lobbied government directly; and wrote to MPs and Peers.</p> <p><i>Influencing the drafting of legislation:</i> Legislation proposed by ASH and its</p>	<p><i>Translating between professional and sectoral languages:</i> ASH filled the role of mediators between the scientific knowledge and evidence on the relations between smoking and health.</p> <p>They proposed an evidence-based agenda as an alternative to the one proposed by the tobacco industry</p> <p><i>Building political pressure:</i> Middle actors were able to demonstrate to national government that</p>	<p><i>Aggregating the evidence from the field</i> to present top actors with a comprehensive and more complete view of the issue:</p> <p>Middle actors aggregated the evidence, which supported their position.</p>

Direction of activity	Enabling <sup>a</sup>	Mediating <sup>a</sup>	Aggregating <sup>a</sup>
	<p>coalition of middle actors was supported in a report by the cross-party House of Commons Health Select Committee. Many of the experts who gave evidence to the Select Committee were themselves middle actors.</p>	<p>there was widespread public support. Core middle actors responded immediately with a letter published in a leading national newspaper, signed by senior figures from FPH, CIEH, the national public health association, and others, decrying the Secretary of State [Minister] for Health's comments that poor women needed to smoke.</p>	
Sideways	<p><i>Identifying legal/financial levers:</i></p> <p>Middle actors worked with employers, employees, and lawyers to raise the threat of legal action by employees.</p>	<p><i>Building and maintaining coalitions with allies:</i></p> <p>ASH's initial sideways work was with an existing core group of middle actor organisations.</p> <p><i>Expanding the coalition:</i> Middle actors worked within their own localities to generate political</p>	<p><i>Aggregating the evidence:</i></p> <p>Middle actors used evidence to support their position with other hospitality trade middle actors.</p>

Direction of activity	Enabling <sup>a</sup>	Mediating <sup>a</sup>	Aggregating <sup>a</sup>
	<p><i>Identifying new policy levers:</i> Middle actors used the threat of local legislation in Liverpool and London to divide the hospitality trade from the tobacco industry.</p>	<p>support within local government authorities, which then became additional middle actors.</p> <p>ASH and CIEH recruited local authorities. Fifty stated they were interested in becoming smoke-free; some went further.</p> <p><i>Translating between professional and sectoral languages:</i> ASH filled the role of mediator between the scientific knowledge and evidence on the relations between smoking and health.</p>	<p>ASH supported the London Health Commission's consultation 'The Big Smoke Debate', aiding publicity and encouraging grassroots and middle actors to respond. Six other regions followed suit, broadening the extent of local dissemination of the evidence.</p>

248 <sup>a</sup> Enabling: enabling action by using own resources and legitimacy to overcome barriers; Mediating: providing a communications channel;

249 Aggregating: providing resources, e.g. knowledge, funding.

250 ASH: Action on Smoking and Health; CIEH: Chartered Institute for Environmental Health; FPH: UK Faculty of Public Health of the Royal Colleges

251 of Physicians



## 252 **Case study 2. Increasing signalised crossing times for pedestrians in the UK**

253 Using nationally-representative Health Survey for England data, Asher et al. demonstrated  
254 that 76% of men and 85% of women aged 65+ who could walk 8m unaided walked slower  
255 than the 1.2m/s threshold speed. Mean walking speed was 0.9m/s for men and 0.8m/s for  
256 women.<sup>22</sup> On publication, there was massive traditional and social media coverage  
257 (<https://academic.oup.com/ageing/article/41/5/573/47590#405680>,  
258 <https://oxfordjournals.altmetric.com/details/791287>), noticed by non-governmental (civil  
259 society) organisations (NGOs) and community groups.

260 Stimulated by this media coverage, Living Streets, an NGO that promotes walking and  
261 campaigns for better conditions for pedestrians launched '*3 Seconds More*' in November  
262 2013 (<https://www.livingstreets.org.uk/policy-and-resources/our-policy/crossings>). This  
263 campaign aimed to increase the time available to cross an average road through reducing  
264 the assumed walking speed to 0.8m/s. Opposition came from motorists' organisations and  
265 traditional transport planning approaches that prioritise motor vehicles, valuing car  
266 occupants' time more than other road users'.

267

## 268 **Middle-out activities**

269 As the signalised crossings' timings are mandated by national government, top actors were  
270 the Secretary of State (Minister) for Transport and the Minister for Roads, plus senior civil  
271 servants in the Department (Ministry) for Transport (DfT). They were the only actors with  
272 sufficient power to enable change.

273 The bottom actors in this arena were members of the public (particularly the elderly and  
274 those concerned for people with mobility impairments), local community groups, and  
275 individual practitioners who were members of professional organisations.

276 Middle actors were organisations interested in population health, transport, ageing, and/or  
277 inequalities, including local government and other practitioners' professional associations;  
278 NGOs; and the media. One of the paper's authors (JM) worked with Living Streets to include  
279 a broader set of middle actors, including the Transport and Health Study Group (an  
280 association of practitioners, policy-makers and researchers interested in implementing  
281 evidence-based policies to improve health and reduce inequalities associated with  
282 transport) and the UK Faculty of Public Health (the professional association for public health  
283 specialists).

284 Living Streets' actions are summarised in Table 2, classified by the type and direction of  
285 action. More than 10,000 people wrote to their MP to support the campaign, asking the  
286 MPs to lobby the Secretary of State to give pedestrians 3 more seconds at signalised  
287 pedestrian crossings. The aggregation of actors' voices and mediation between the levels  
288 increased the visibility of the crossing times issue, raised decision-makers' awareness, and  
289 put it on their agenda.

290 One grassroots response to the media coverage was to create, perform and upload online a  
291 YouTube video '*Hey Mr Boris*' by a campaigning choir of older people in a deprived area of  
292 London (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lpwboQxVJtg>).

### 293 *Outcomes*

294 The *middle-up* impact was evident in May 2014, when the DfT announced consultation on  
295 *Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions* (TSRGD), which includes crossings. DfT

296 proposed that in future, Pelican crossings should not be installed – although existing  
297 crossings could remain. The strong support in the ensuing consultation of many middle  
298 actors, including several NGOs and two-thirds of local authorities, demonstrated the *middle-*  
299 *sideways* impact. In 2015, the DfT issued mandatory guidance that signalled pedestrian  
300 crossings installed in future must either provide a ‘countdown’ (Figure 2b) or be ‘Puffin  
301 crossings’(Figure 2c: these utilise a camera that keeps the lights green for pedestrians and  
302 red for other traffic while anyone is still walking across the junction).<sup>25</sup>

303 Further *middle-up* impact was evident in the National Institute for Health and Care  
304 Excellence *Guidance on Physical Activity and the Built Environment*, which recommended  
305 that local councils should ensure that pedestrian crossings allow adequate time for  
306 pedestrians to cross the road.<sup>26</sup> In 2019, the DfT published updated guidance, permitting the  
307 use of a lower walking speed (1.0m/s) for signalised crossings where local authorities  
308 believe that will benefit local residents.<sup>27</sup>

309

310 **Table 2. Increasing signalised crossing times for pedestrians in the UK**

<b>Direction of action</b>	<b>Enabling<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Mediating<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Aggregating<sup>a</sup></b>
Middle-Down	<i>Providing information:</i> Living Streets enhanced their supporters' capacity to act and engage by providing encouragement and guidance on how to raise this with their MP or DfT.	<i>Communication with the public:</i> Living Streets maintained communication with the public (via their own supporters). Other middle actors (professional associations, NGOs) also communicated with the public directly, using the media, or via their members/supporters.	<i>Formalisation of a grassroots initiative:</i> Living Streets contacted their supporters, who already had high motivation to engage with this issue but increased that by encouraging them to lobby the DfT directly or via their own MP.
Middle-Up	<i>Influencing the drafting of legislation:</i> As a result of their campaigning, based on the	<i>Translating between professional and sectoral languages:</i> Middle actors presented evidence (e.g. Asher et al., 2012, the TRL review) that fed in to the draft NICE <i>Guidance on</i>	<i>Aggregating the evidence:</i> Living Streets commissioned TRL to review the evidence on

	<p>Asher et al. paper <sup>22</sup> and the TRL report they commissioned, Living Streets staff were asked to review a chapter of DfT's updated <i>Traffic Signs Manual</i>.</p>	<p><i>Physical Activity and the Built Environment</i>, responded to drafts, and lobbied the DfT and the relevant Ministers directly.</p> <p><i>Awareness-raising:</i> Middle actors used national media intensively to keep the issue live on decision-makers' agenda, e.g. publicising research by Living Streets of examples of individuals' difficulties in crossing the roads due to disabilities or poor crossing design (e.g. <a href="https://www.pressreader.com/uk/daily-mail/20170822/281676845029906">https://www.pressreader.com/uk/daily-mail/20170822/281676845029906</a> )</p>	<p>crossing times and older people's walking speed, which confirmed Asher and colleagues' findings.</p>
<p>Sideways</p>	<p><i>Providing information:</i> Living Streets brought the issue to other middle actors' attention and provided the evidence</p>	<p><i>Building and maintaining coalitions with allies:</i> Living Streets involved the media and the other middle actors with good mediation capabilities, increasing their interest to</p>	<p><i>Scaling up:</i> Living Streets invited other middle actors to encourage their members to join the advocacy efforts.</p>

	<p>underpinning the problem for a substantial proportion of the population in trying to cross roads safely.</p>	<p>participate by bringing the issue to their attention and providing the evidence underpinning the problem.</p>	
--	---	--	--

311 <sup>a</sup> Enabling: enabling action by using own resources and legitimacy to overcome barriers; Mediating: providing a communications channel;

312 Aggregating: providing resources, e.g. knowledge, funding.

313 MP: Member of Parliament; DfT: Department for Transport; NICE: National Institute for Health and Care Excellence.

## 314 **DISCUSSION**

### 315 **Main findings of this study**

316 ASH promoted smoke-free legislation, and Living Streets promoted change to crossing  
317 times, by acting as: mediators between the public interest and decision makers, and  
318 between various middle actors; aggregators, providing opportunities that amplified the  
319 voices of bottom and middle actors and made their demand more robust and visible; and  
320 enablers, proposing the evidence-based agenda as an alternative to the tobacco industry's  
321 and car user lobbies' agendas. Both NGOs increased the knowledge, interest and motivation  
322 of bottom and middle actors to actively engage in this domain and put pressure on decision-  
323 makers to act. They also increased the capacity of various, relatively small, diverse and  
324 widespread actors to act and present arguments to decision-makers at the top. The  
325 elevated motivation and capacity of top, bottom and middle actors facilitated the action.

326 Both case studies had as the ultimate aim changing national policy. In both, the main actions  
327 were sideways to multiply the effects of both middle-down and thus bottom-up, and of  
328 middle-up. Applying the MOP lens recognises the advocacy work that middle actors were  
329 uniquely positioned to lead in both these examples.

### 330 **What is already known**

331 Learning from past public health campaigns can help in planning effective strategies for  
332 future campaigns. Involving key organisations and creating networks and alliances are  
333 important strategies for effective public health action <sup>28</sup>. While such networks have  
334 commonly involved a wide range of health-relevant organisations and individuals,<sup>29</sup> the  
335 adoption of a Sustainable Development Goal hygiene indicator on handwashing resulted

336 from NGOs, academics, and commercial organisations working together with traditional  
337 public health bodies to influence policy-makers (middle-up), while implementation involves  
338 the same actors working middle-down.<sup>30</sup> Many would argue that this, and the MOP, is how  
339 public health works, and has always worked.

#### 340 **What this study adds**

341 We suggest that using the MOP framework as a diagnostic lens and *formal* structure can  
342 assist public health professionals and others to identify the ‘missing middle actors’ and the  
343 interactions between them and other key actors. A more systematic approach would help in  
344 the design of advocacy or implementation strategies to achieve desired policy or behaviour  
345 changes and amplify the effectiveness of sideways, middle-up, middle-down, top-down and  
346 bottom-up activities.

347 The MOP can lead to public health practitioners stepping back and working in the  
348 background, leaving more overt action to others. While this low profile may be problematic  
349 for some individuals, or for justification of resources such as staff time, the goal should be  
350 the outcome in terms of the benefits for population health rather than the visibility of public  
351 health departments. Public health advocacy is a core skill of public health, yet the requisite  
352 skills and qualities are challenging, including familiarity with the evidence base and ability to  
353 effectively articulate key messages and relevant narratives to influence opinion leaders and  
354 the general public.<sup>31</sup> The process can also involve potential conflicts in the blending of  
355 science, politics and activism in the context of wider public interest, such as the different  
356 timeframes of politicians and outcomes of effective public health measures,<sup>32</sup> yet also has  
357 the power to deliver major systemic change. Legislation has a role reducing non-  
358 communicable diseases<sup>32,33</sup>; many recent public health laws that have been implemented



359 were achieved through use of a middle-out approach, including banning tobacco marketing,  
360 plain packaging of tobacco, and nutrition labelling. In case study 1, the lead middle actor  
361 recruited a broad set of middle actors, including many who are not traditionally involved in  
362 public health work. In case study 2, most of the middle actors were more traditionally  
363 involved in promoting the health of the public. In both case studies, the lead actor was an  
364 NGO but that role may be taken by local government, public health bodies or departments,  
365 community groups, or others.

366 It should be recognised that those with opposing goals may also use a middle-out approach.  
367 For example, the tobacco industry involved the National Federation of Retail Newsagents  
368 and the Tobacco Retailers Alliance (membership organisations for newsagents and  
369 tobacconists) in opposing legislation to ban tobacco advertising<sup>9</sup> and the hospitality industry  
370 to oppose proposed smoke-free legislation.<sup>23</sup> Such efforts include apparent bottom-up  
371 activities using manufactured 'grass-roots' campaigns, referred to as 'astroturfing'.<sup>9</sup> Many  
372 health-diminishing industries have used techniques trialled by the tobacco industry<sup>34</sup>;  
373 proponents of good health can also learn lessons.<sup>9,35</sup> The tobacco industry formerly, and the  
374 food and beverage industry more recently, have used a 'sideways' approach, involving  
375 national and international sporting bodies and individual clubs to promote unhealthy  
376 products to those attending or watching such sporting events ('middle-down').<sup>36</sup> It is not  
377 known whether these bodies also support their sponsors' interests in a 'middle-up' fashion.  
378 Thus, despite valid concerns about engaging with directly health-diminishing industries,<sup>34</sup>  
379 public health organisations need to engage with the potential industry middle actors  
380 nationally and locally to promote health.

381 The United Nations (UN) Inter-Agency Task Force on the Prevention and Control of Non-  
382 communicable Diseases has called for increasing effective health-promoting partnerships  
383 with civil society and the commercial sector, giving due regard to managing conflicts of  
384 interests. These include stronger regulation and legislation to provide an environment that  
385 enables behaviours that promote health.<sup>37</sup> Much of this can be facilitated by taking a  
386 middle-out approach, which assists formal consideration of the broader range of  
387 organisations and groups that could be involved as allies. The MOP can also help with the  
388 systems thinking that is now recognised as crucial in improving population health.<sup>10</sup>

### 389 **Limitations of this study**

390 The main limitation is that the two case studies may not be representative. They were  
391 selected because we believe they illustrate the impact of middle actors. The MOP may be  
392 more or less applicable to other public health issues.

393

394

395 **CRedit statement**

396 Conceptualisation: JS Mindell, Y Parag

397 *Methodology*: KB Janda, Y Parag

398 *Writing*: Original Draft: JS Mindell, Y Parag, S Bartington

399 *Writing*: Review & Editing: J Barlow, S Bartington, JS Mindell, Y Parag, L Stoll, KB Janda

400 *Visualisation*: Y Parag, JS Mindell

401 *Supervision*: JS Mindell, Y Parag

402 *Project administration*: I Hamilton, KB Janda, Y Parag, JS Mindell

403 *Funding acquisition*: KB Janda, Y Parag, I Hamilton

404

405 **Funding**

406 A Middle-Out Perspectives workshop in Herzliya, Israel, 11-12 March 202 was funded by the

407 UK Foundation The Academic Study Group on Israel and The Middle East, and a grant from

408 University College London's Global Engagement Fund for Africa and the Middle East. This

409 paper grew out of discussions held at the workshop and subsequently, but the authors

410 received no financial support for the research, authorship, nor publication of this article. The

411 workshop funders played no part in the drafting of or approving the manuscript, nor in the

412 decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

413

## 414 **Acknowledgements**

415 We thank all participants in the Middle-Out Perspectives workshop held in Herzliya, Israel,  
416 11-12 March 2020, for their insights. We also thank the workshop funders. We thank Action  
417 on Smoking and Health and Living Streets for their leadership in many public health  
418 campaigns, such as the two described as case studies in this paper.

419

## 420 References

- 421 1. Janda KB, Parag Y. A middle-out approach for improving energy performance in  
422 buildings. *Build Res Inf* 2013; 41: 39–50.
- 423 2. Zohar T, Parag Y, Ayalon O. Strategizing demand management from the middle out:  
424 Harnessing middle actors to reduce peak electricity consumption. *Energy Res Soc Sci*  
425 2020; 61: 101360.
- 426 3. Janda K, Killip G, Fawcett T. Reducing Carbon from the “Middle-Out”: The Role of  
427 Builders in Domestic Refurbishment. *Buildings* 2014; 4: 911–936.
- 428 4. Parag Y, Janda KB. More than filler: Middle actors and socio-technical change in the  
429 energy system from the “middle-out”. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 2014; 3: 102–112.
- 430 5. Kranzler Y, Parag Y, Davidovitch N. Public Health from the Middle-Out: A New  
431 Analytical Perspective. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2019; 16: 4993.
- 432 6. Barton H, Grant M. A health map for the local human habitat. *J R Soc Promot Health*  
433 2006; 126: 252–253.
- 434 7. Dorfman L, Wallack L, Woodruff K. More Than a Message: Framing Public Health  
435 Advocacy to Change Corporate Practices. *Health Educ Behav* 2005; 32: 320–336.
- 436 8. Kickbusch I, Allen L, Franz C. The commercial determinants of health. *Lancet Glob*  
437 *Health* 2016; 4: e895–e896.
- 438 9. Mindell JS, Reynolds L, Cohen DL, et al. All in this together: the corporate capture of  
439 public health. *BMJ* 2012; 345: e8082.
- 440 10. Knai C, Petticrew M, Mays N, et al. Systems Thinking as a Framework for Analyzing  
441 Commercial Determinants of Health: Framework for Analyzing Commercial  
442 Determinants of Health. *Milbank Q* 2018; 96: 472–498.
- 443 11. Marmot M (Chair). *WHO Commission on Social Determinants of Health: Closing the gap*  
444 *in a generation*. Geneva: World Health Organization,  
445 [http://www.instituteofhealthequity.org/resources-reports/commission-on-social-](http://www.instituteofhealthequity.org/resources-reports/commission-on-social-determinants-of-health-closing-the-gap-in-a-generation)  
446 [determinants-of-health-closing-the-gap-in-a-generation](http://www.instituteofhealthequity.org/resources-reports/commission-on-social-determinants-of-health-closing-the-gap-in-a-generation) (2008, accessed 26 March  
447 2019).
- 448 12. Bryan A. Public Health Theories. In: *In Wilson F, Mabhala M (Eds.), Key concepts in*  
449 *public health (pp. 21-25)*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd, pp. 21–25.
- 450 13. Capewell S, Capewell A. An effectiveness hierarchy of preventive interventions:  
451 neglected paradigm or self-evident truth? *J Public Health* 2018; 40: 350–358.
- 452 14. Mindell J, Bowen C, Herriot N, et al. Institutionalizing health impact assessment in  
453 London as a public health tool for increasing synergy between policies in other areas.  
454 *Public Health* 2010; 124: 107–114.

- 455 15. Rutter H, Savona N, Glonti K, et al. The need for a complex systems model of evidence  
456 for public health. *The Lancet* 2017; 390: 2602–2604.
- 457 16. Rutter H, Cavill N, Bauman A, et al. Systems approaches to global and national physical  
458 activity plans. *Bull World Health Organ* 2019; 97: 162–165.
- 459 17. World Health Organization, Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Finland. *The Helsinki*  
460 *Statement of Health in All Policies*,  
461 [https://www.who.int/healthpromotion/conferences/8gchp/8gchp\\_helsinki\\_statement](https://www.who.int/healthpromotion/conferences/8gchp/8gchp_helsinki_statement.pdf)  
462 [.pdf](https://www.who.int/healthpromotion/conferences/8gchp/8gchp_helsinki_statement.pdf) (10 June 2013, accessed 9 July 2020).
- 463 18. Christoffel K. Public health advocacy: process and product. *Am J Public Health* 2000; 90:  
464 722–726.
- 465 19. Smith KE, Stewart EA. Academic advocacy in public health: Disciplinary ‘duty’ or  
466 political ‘propaganda’? *Soc Sci Med* 2017; 189: 35–43.
- 467 20. Cullerton K, Adams J, Forouhi N, et al. What principles should guide interactions  
468 between population health researchers and the food industry? Systematic scoping  
469 review of peer-reviewed and grey literature. *Obes Rev* 2019; obr.12851.
- 470 21. Daube M. Voluntary agreements: designed to fail. *Tob Control* 1993; 2: 183–184.
- 471 22. Asher L, Aresu M, Falaschetti E, et al. Most older pedestrians are unable to cross the  
472 road in time: a cross-sectional study. *Age Ageing* 2012; 41: 690–694.
- 473 23. Arnott D, Dockrell M, Sandford A, et al. Comprehensive smoke-free legislation in  
474 England: how advocacy won the day. *Tob Control* 2007; 16: 423–428.
- 475 24. Action on Smoking and Health. 2014 ASH Annual Report. *Action on Smoking and*  
476 *Health*, <https://ash.org.uk/about/annual-reports/> (2014, accessed 19 February 2021).
- 477 25. Department for Transport. *DfT Circular: The Traffic Signs Regulations and General*  
478 *Directions 2015*. London: DfT, 2015.
- 479 26. NICE. *Physical activity and the environment NICE guideline ng90*. Public Health England,  
480 [www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng90](http://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng90) (2018, accessed 14 September 2020).
- 481 27. Department for Transport. *Traffic Signs Manual: Chapter 6*. London: TSO,  
482 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attach](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/851465/dft-traffic-signs-manual-chapter-6.pdf)  
483 [ment\\_data/file/851465/dft-traffic-signs-manual-chapter-6.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/851465/dft-traffic-signs-manual-chapter-6.pdf) (2019).
- 484 28. Berridge V. Public health activism: lessons from history? *BMJ* 2007; 335: 1310–1312.
- 485 29. Hasman A, Noble DJ. Childhood immunisation in South Asia – overcoming the hurdles  
486 to progress. *Perspect Public Health* 2016; 136: 273–277.
- 487 30. Griffiths S. Sustainable development goals: implementing the hygiene indicator in  
488 schools. *Perspect Public Health* 2017; 137: 214–215.

- 489 31. Murray J, Leigh-Hunt N. Training to be unpopular: five short steps to becoming a public  
490 health advocate. *BMJ blogs*, [https://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2019/04/29/training-to-be-](https://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2019/04/29/training-to-be-unpopular-five-short-steps-to-becoming-a-public-health-advocate/)  
491 [unpopular-five-short-steps-to-becoming-a-public-health-advocate/](https://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2019/04/29/training-to-be-unpopular-five-short-steps-to-becoming-a-public-health-advocate/) (2019, accessed 14  
492 February 2021).
- 493 32. Jacobson R. Refocusing upstream – three decades of public health: a personal  
494 reflection. *Perspect Public Health* 2017; 137: 21–22.
- 495 33. Magnusson RS, McGrady B, Gostin L, et al. Legal capacities required for prevention and  
496 control of noncommunicable diseases. *Bull World Health Organ* 2018; 97: 108–117.
- 497 34. Petticrew M, McKee M, Marteau TM. Partnerships with the alcohol industry at the  
498 expense of public health. *The Lancet* 2018; 392: 992–993.
- 499 35. Mindell J. Lessons from tobacco control for advocates of healthy transport. *J Public*  
500 *Health Med* 2001; 23: 91–97.
- 501 36. Ireland R, Bunn C, Reith G, et al. Commercial determinants of health: advertising of  
502 alcohol and unhealthy foods during sporting events. *Bull World Health Organ* 2019; 97:  
503 290–295.
- 504 37. Banatvala N, Akselrod S, Webb D, et al. Actions needed to prevent noncommunicable  
505 diseases and improve mental health. *Bull World Health Organ* 2019; 97: 75-75A.

506

507