



Lorne, Colin; McDonald, Ruth; Walsh, Kieran; Coleman, Anna (2019) Regional assemblage and the spatial reorganisation of health and care: the case of devolution in Greater Manchester, England. *Sociology of Health & Illness*. ISSN 0141-9889 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9566.12867>

Downloaded from: <http://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk/4651419/>

DOI: [10.1111/1467-9566.12867](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9566.12867)

#### Usage Guidelines

Please refer to usage guidelines at <http://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk/policies.html> or alternatively contact [researchonline@lshtm.ac.uk](mailto:researchonline@lshtm.ac.uk).

Available under license: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/>

## **Regional assemblage and the spatial re-organisation of health and care: The case of devolution in Greater Manchester, England**

### **Abstract**

In this paper we consider how space is integral to the practices and politics of re-structuring health and care services and systems and specifically how ideas of assemblage can help understand the remaking of a region. We focus on health and social care devolution in Greater Manchester, England to illustrate our arguments. Emphasising the open-ended political construction of the region, we examine the work involved in assembling different actors, organisations, policies and resources into a new territorial formation that provisionally holds together without becoming a fixed totality. We illustrate how the governing of health and care is shaped through the interplay of local, regional and national actors, organisations and agencies co-existing, jostling and forming uneasy alliances. Our goal is to show that through devolution national agendas continued to be strongly embedded within the regional project including the politics of austerity. Yet through keeping the region together as if it was an integrated whole and drawing upon new global policy networks, regional actors strategically re-worked national agendas in attempts to leverage and compete for new resources and powers. In doing so, we set out a research agenda that emphasises the multiple spatial dimensions of re-structuring health and social care.

### **Introduction**

Re-structuring of health and care systems and services occurs in time and space. Health policy scholars commonly incorporate a longitudinal approach examining the former (e.g. Powell 2003). Historically-sensitive work considers how ‘sedimented’ layers of previous healthcare reforms continue to unevenly shape contemporary governing practices (Jones, 2017). However, the spatial dimensions of re-structuring processes are often ignored or downplayed, despite appeals otherwise (Moon, 1990; Moon and Brown, 2000). Where scholarship has engaged with how the political construction of space shapes healthcare reform, there is a tendency for analysis to privilege a single spatial dimension as *the* definitive concept for examining historical or contemporary changes (Jessop *et al.*, 2008). Understandably, this scholarship often responds to healthcare policy agendas which either explicitly or implicitly adopt geographic concepts such as place (Prince *et al.* 2006; Hammond *et al.*, 2017), localism (Allen, 2006) or community (Moon, 1990). Perhaps unsurprisingly, studies tend to find the latest spatialised policy rhetoric often does not meet with reality. We build on spatially-sensitive accounts of health and care reform to examine the remaking of a region through devolution. We consider how reforms are negotiated and contested across multiple spatial dimensions simultaneously.

To do so, we take inspiration from critical scholars adopting ideas of assemblage to understand the remaking of regions (Allen and Cochrane, 2007; 2010) and public services (Newman and Clarke, 2009). As we discuss below, we understand an assemblage as the gathering together of heterogeneous and often ill-fitting elements into a provisional socio-spatial formation. Assemblages never become a totality, but require work to sustain them and keep them together or they fragment and fall apart. Thus, an assemblage, in our case a region,

is made through ongoing practices of assembling new actors, resources or policies and disassembling others to arrange health and social care systems and services into a meaningful, new, if not necessarily coherent or conflict-free, project.

To illustrate how ideas of assemblage help understand the practices and politics of re-organising health and social care, we use the politically high-profile example of health and social care devolution in the metropolitan region of Greater Manchester, England.<sup>1</sup> The Greater Manchester project incorporates elements of reform subject to international scholarly attention which occur across different spatial dimensions. Devolution involves the re-scaling of power through transferring certain functions from national to sub-national levels. Changes also include place-based integration of health and social care, in spite of the political and technical challenges faced through bringing universal healthcare and means-tested social care together. Integrated care models draw upon learning from trans-national health policy networks as the latest ideas are mobilised by a seemingly ever-expanding circuit of health policy experts. This all takes place within a complex, fragmented institutional landscape of public, private and voluntary sector organisations interested in the organisation, provision, regulation and improvement of health and social care as well as infrastructure such as buildings, medicines and technologies. It affects 2.8 million people in the region, many of whom are unpaid or underpaid carers or work for the National Health Service (NHS) as one of the biggest employers in the region. Yet reform is taking place in an age of centrally-driven ‘super-austerity’ (Lowndes and Gardner, 2016). Local authority budgets have been cut and NHS healthcare budgets witnessed the lowest increase in its 70 year history. Given the uncertainties surrounding the devolution project, academics have termed the project the ‘Greater Manchester experiment’ (Walshe *et al.* 2016), although think-tanks have begun to position Greater Manchester as a model integrated health and care system. The remaking of health and care is fundamentally a political process.

The paper proceeds as follows. We outline our conceptual focus on space and assemblage thinking in relation to sociological scholarship concerned with health and care. We then situate our case study and our research methodology. Framing our study as a regional assemblage we examine how the re-structuring of health and care in Greater Manchester holds together through the interplay of local, regional and national actors, organisations and agencies co-existing, jostling and forming uneasy alliances. We highlight the ongoing work required to sustain fragile relations within the region. Foregrounding the heterogeneity of the assemblage, we outline how attempts by national actors to embed their agendas in the region were more-or-less successful and connectedly, how these were reworked by regional actors in attempts to leverage further resources and formal powers. A discussion of our contributions concludes the paper.

---

<sup>1</sup> For simplicity, we refer to the city-region of Greater Manchester as a region. The wider impacts of re-structuring health and care towards global city-regionalism are beyond the scope of this paper.

### **Conceptual approach: Space and assemblage**

Despite the prevalence of geographic ideas within health policy, spatially-inflected analysis has often experienced a rather marginalised position within sociological studies of healthcare policy and reform (Moon, 1990). Conversely, and not unconnectedly, it has been some time since Robin Kearns (1993) appealed to geographers to engage with a renewed geography of health that moved beyond medical geography and engaged more fully with social theory, a call that continues to resonate. Brown *et al.* (2017) helpfully capture the plurality of subsequent scholarship situated between health and geography. Of course, various sociological studies into health and care have utilised geographic concepts to examine how space is entangled within care practices, for instance, in relation to embodied care work and spaces of home (England and Dyck, 2011), how place and care are co-produced (Ivanova *et al.* 2016) and the architectural spaces of healthcare buildings (Martin *et al.* 2015). Nonetheless, whilst there have been a number of spatially-sensitive sociological studies of healthcare across a range of scales, the contributions of geography within healthcare policy and reform remain under-valued.

There is a historical, if now somewhat outmoded, tendency amongst sociologists to treat space as Cartesian and objective (Urry 2001) waiting to be filled with meaning to become a place. We insist, however, that space is not ‘abstract geometries’ (cf. Gieryn 2000:465), but instead integral to the ways in which places, or indeed, cities, regions or continents, are constructed and struggled over. Put most simply, space is socially produced. We can understand regions as constituted through the juxtaposition of multiple, interweaving social relations, some of which may be fleeting, others more enduring, some relationships may more local, others seemingly global (Massey 2005). This incorporates an awful lot, far more than a concern for health and social care systems and services. Yet it provides a helpful entry point into thinking about how the remaking of regional health and care is not merely what happens within the delineated territorial boundaries of a healthcare system. Space is politically contested and struggled over. As social-spatial entities, as Kivelä and Moisio (2017: 30) remind us, health and social care systems are ‘neither static nor politically neutral’, but instead are a key dimension of the ongoing spatial transformation of the state.

Ideas of assemblage are one approach that helps examine the multiple socio-spatial dimensions of such transformation. Frequently associated with the writings of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari (1988), scholarship interested in ideas of assemblage have witnessed growing interest among social scientists in recent years. Assemblage has been used in variety of ways, from a non-conceptual descriptive device through to an ontological orientation for thinking about the emerging composition of relations in the world (Anderson *et al.*, 2012). Given the rather dense theoretical language associated with these ideas, we broadly understand an assemblage a provisional gathering together of diverse and often ill-fitting elements into a socio-spatial formation, without becoming a fixed totality. Our interpretation enables us to examine the ‘double dynamics of solidity and fragility’ as heterogeneous elements of people, organisations, policies and resources are brought together into a meaningful order for some time (Newman and Clarke 2009: 15). To sustain assemblages, work is required to smooth over fractures and contradictions otherwise the assembled

formation is at risk of breaking apart and failing. With health and social care increasingly shaped by a multitude of public, private and voluntary sector organisations and agendas, assemblage thinking provides a useful framing for examining the practices of orientating and stabilising health and care systems and services between often conflicting or diverging elements. It pays attention to the practices of unmaking and remaking as the assemblage mutates, new policies or political actors are introduced or relationships cannot be sustained and things fall apart.

Assemblages thus require labour to hold them together as new elements become attached or alliances are not maintained (McFarlane 2011). This is the *assembling* and *disassembling* or *dismantling* work involved in the ongoing formation of assemblages. This approach encourages attention to be paid to the associations and alliances of the different elements forming assemblages rather than their individual properties, recognising that these relationships adapt and change over time. More specifically, it focuses on the ongoing relationships between the *whole* and its *parts* of socio-spatial formations. This entails a view of agency which recognises the intersubjectivity of meaning and action. Agency is understood as distributed, made possible through the associations of relations that make up the assemblage, rather than rooted in the capabilities of specific individuals. With an emphasis on process, assemblage thinking blurs the structure/agency dualism, paying attention to how even seemingly well-ordered formations are open to the unexpected and contingent. That agency is an emergent property of an assemblage does not convey that power is evenly or randomly dispersed, but instead that some of the points at which the trajectories of groups and individuals intersect are busier and more significant than others (Bennett 2005). Thus no central power or single individual can determine the functions of an assemblage. Rather, we focus here on the ongoing relations of assembling, stabilising and disassembling that constitute a particular matter of concern.

Ideas of assemblage have been used to understand the political remaking of regions. Allen and Cochrane (2007, 2010) adopt this approach to conceptualise regions as made of a multitude of variously ‘local’, ‘regional’, ‘national’ and ‘global’ actors, organisations and agencies that are co-present and embedded within regions, co-existing, jostling and forming uneasy alliances in different ways:

Some of this interplay takes place indirectly by authorities *reaching into* the politics of regions and localities in an attempt to steer and constrain agendas; some of it operates in a more direct fashion by *drawing within close reach* those that are able to broker and influence decisions; whilst other forms of mediated interaction *reach out* beyond the region or locality to shape events within.

(Allen and Cochrane 2010: 1075; original emphasis)

The institutional hierarchical organisation of the state, which invariably gets labelled ‘regional’, say, or ‘national’ is not abandoned, but there is a recognition that spaces such as regions are constructed through the interplay of over-lapping, entangled and unstable negotiations of power that hold together rather than exist *a priori*. That is to not to eschew the

idea that decision-making may be re-scaled from national to regional or local institutions, or that we might talk about operating within a highly centralised state *per se*. Yet, it encourages attention to the ongoing arrangement of different ‘local’, ‘regional’ or ‘national’ actors and how they interact and intersect. Understanding regional assemblages in this way helps us how certain national actors are able to make their presence felt in governing health and care in a region whilst others may be less successful and displaced, or to consider the influential role of apparently ‘global’ policy experts and management consultants are drawn upon by regional bodies in attempt to rework and redirect national priorities.

Our reading of assemblage provides a mode of enquiry for questioning the changing relations between the parts *and* the whole of, in our case, regional health and care systems and services. This helps us appreciate how the region’s constituent parts retain a relative degree of autonomy without the region being reducible to its discrete parts. It allows us to understand how the integrating of different elements that make up health and care in a region fit together more or less effectively and successfully over time. It illustrates that the governing of a new political formation is a provisional accomplishment contingent on the co-functioning of new and emerging policies, organisations, budgets and legislation mixing with the residual fragments of previous re-disorganisations cutting across spatial scales. Together, this foregrounds how seemingly minor events or technical procedures are connected to the spatial politics of re-structuring health and social care which can sometimes lead to surprising and unexpected outcomes. We elaborate on this further in our presentation of empirical findings and discussion of these, after situating our case study and research methods in the following sections.

### **Devolving health and social care in Greater Manchester, England**

Located in the North West England, Greater Manchester is a metropolitan region with a population of approximately 2.8 million. It is comprised of 10 local authority areas with a history of working together since the abolition of the metropolitan county councils by the Thatcher government in the 1980s. Local authority leaders in Greater Manchester have long positioned the region as a ‘proto-devolution experiment’ strategically using its history of voluntary collaboration between predominantly Labour local authorities to emphasis their ability to work with successive central governments (Haughton et al. 2016: 10). By 2012, the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) was formed out of the 10 local authorities and by 2014 their first devolution deal was agreed with central government. This gave the region new, if highly constrained, controls over issues such as transport, housing and planning, conditional on an elected Metro Mayor and continuation of austerity measures (Lowndes and Gardner, 2016). This agreement set a precedent for largely secretive, patchwork of subsequent deal-based devolution settlements across England, heavily-steered by central government with an absence of a solid constitutional basis or public debate (Ayres et al., 2018).

The 2014 deal provided the catalyst for a second separate health and social care devolution deal for the region, the principle focus of this paper (hereafter, ‘devolution’ refers specifically to health and social care devolution unless otherwise stated). Devolution was an initiative to

remake Greater Manchester *in its entirety* out of the fragments and failures of previous health and social care reforms. This included the contentious Health and Social Care Act 2012 intended to promote market-competition and encourage conflict within the organisation of healthcare services (Jones, 2017). The region became the target for a particular set of policy and political outcomes established behind-the-scenes by an elite group of political and managerial actors from central government, local government and the English National Health Service (NHS). The content of this agreement was publically set out in a *Memorandum of Understanding* in February 2015 (AGMA/NHSE/GMAAG, 2015). By December 2015, a strategic plan for the region known as *Taking Charge* had been produced (GMCA/NHS in Greater Manchester, 2015) and locality plans within each of the 10 localities followed which broadly aligned with *Taking Charge*.

The aims of devolution were that the health and well-being of Greater Manchester's population had to improve amidst high levels of social and health inequalities, health and care services were to become integrated despite healthcare being principally universal whilst social care means-tested, clinical sustainability of services was required, and underpinning all this, the region had to achieve 'financial sustainability'. In the face of centrally-driven austerity measures, Greater Manchester was to work together to close a 'financial gap' of £2bn by 2020/1 despite massive local authority budget cuts and the slowest increase in NHS funding in its history. In return, the Greater Manchester deal offered certain 'internally delegated' NHS health commissioning functions alongside the budgetary responsibility for delivering health and care within the allocated resources. A £450m 'Transformation Fund' was agreed to support the change process. Therefore, on first sight, the extent of devolution on offer was highly constrained.

Devolution went live in April 2016. It was governed by the Greater Manchester Health and Social Care Partnership (Partnership, hereafter), formed out of the then-37 statutory organisations.<sup>2</sup> This was originally made up of 10 local authorities, 12 clinical commissioning groups (clinically-led organisations responsible for purchasing healthcare services) and 15 NHS hospitals, mental health and community service provider organisations (Foundation Trusts and Trusts) that provide services at least partially within the region. The Partnership also includes representatives from primary care, the voluntary sector and police and fire service. A substantial non-statutory formal Partnership Team was established to co-ordinate changes across Greater Manchester, including the Chief Officer of the Partnership. Significantly, the Chief Officer was employed by NHS England (an influential national arm's length body who have the responsibility to commission some healthcare services and largely steer national health policy on behalf of the Department for Health). Devolution introduced a new layer of within an already complex organisational landscape, albeit with the regional Partnership Team with limited formal powers (Checkland *et al.*, 2015).

---

<sup>2</sup> This has since reduced through several mergers.

## Methods

Adopting assembling thinking as methodology encourages an openness to the unexpected, paying attention to the multiple, uncertain and non-linear dynamics of making and enacting policy (Baker and McQuirk, 2017). Through broadly adopting social-constructivist and relational understandings of the world, assemblage thinking pays attention to the circulating, translating and reassembling of policy as it becomes embedded and re-worked in particular places. Advocates encourage researchers embrace an ‘experimental’ approach which exposes researchers to uncertainty inherent in processes as complex as re-organising health and social care (Anderson and McFarlane, 2011). There is no methodological blueprint to follow as such when working with the ideas of assemblage (Allen, 2011) so there is a need to balance the tension between careful project research design and attending to the unforeseen events, divergent trajectories and new connections (McCann and Ward, 2012). This, we suggest, was particularly helpful for researching devolution in real-time, not least given its rather speculative, loosely-defined origins.

We adopted a qualitative and ethnographic approach for our research which took place between the autumns of 2015 and 2017. The focus of the study was to understand the development of the devolution project, the changing governance and organisational arrangements and early changes to services. The themes of subsidiarity, efficiency and integration were identified from the *Memorandum of Understanding* guiding the initial direction of research. Data were gathered from observing more than 343 hours of meetings (Greater Manchester-wide and in localities). 50 semi-structured interviews were conducted with senior NHS managers and clinicians, local authority and combined authority staffs, representatives from the voluntary sector as well as management consultancies brought into the region. We collated documentary sources and attended a range of public and private events on devolution.

Observational notes were broadly guided by events arising within meetings, structured around the agenda of the day. Circulated slides and meeting papers were read beforehand. The atmosphere in meetings was recorded, debates and discussions noted and major tensions drawn out in concluding notes. We found ourselves travelling between meetings with managers on occasions or having informal conversations after meetings had finished. Whilst these insights are not cited directly, they informed our understanding of the ‘behind-the-scenes’ work involved in remaking health and care in the region. It also shaped questions within our interviews. Given the breadth of issues arising, interviewees would often be prompted by recent events that the two lead qualitative researchers on the project had themselves witnessed in meetings. Interviews tended to last approximately one hour, although some were closer to half an hour and others more than two. They were mostly held in person in the offices of managers across Greater Manchester, with interviews with management consultants taking place in London. Observation notes were transcribed, enabling sharing of data with other members of the study team. Interviews were transcribed verbatim. Data were inductively and deductively coded using NVivo v11 and organised thematically. The team (comprising all authors) iteratively reviewed the coding framework and emerging themes at regular team meetings and stakeholder meetings were held with



senior managers leading the devolution project to discuss emerging findings throughout the study.

### **Reassembling the region**

We use the case of health and social care devolution in Greater Manchester to illustrate how the conceptual approach of assemblage thinking helps us understand the spatial re-organisation of health and care in the region. Here, we examine the work involved in keeping the new regional formation together amidst the co-existence of diverse logics and diverging agendas for the organisation of health and care within Greater Manchester. We then turn to focus on how the regional assemblage is shaped by seemingly distant actors and organisations more or less successfully making their presence felt in the region, distorting the coherence of the new ‘devolved’ territorial entity. We outline how efforts in Greater Manchester to present the assemblage as a unified whole and make new connections elsewhere were strategically used to renegotiate devolution by embedding regional agendas nationally in attempts to leverage and compete for new resources and powers.

### ***Greater Manchester taking charge together – and staying together?***

Assemblages never fully cohere into a totality; rather they hold together in more-or-less solid and more-or-less fragile ways *as if* they are whole. The remaking of Greater Manchester through devolution was shaped by this dynamic of solidity and fragility. The project relied on managing consensus among a highly fragmented set of relationships between different organisations each with their own separate budgets and agendas. Such fragility existed right from the early stages when news of the full content of the devolution deal leaked to the local press in advance of the official announcement. A senior manager involved recounts:

The production of the MoU [Memorandum of Understanding] itself back in February last year was done in a ridiculously short period of time, I think we agreed to do it on something like 5<sup>th</sup> February and we had it done about three weeks later, and it was then leaked to the press, and we had a lot of work to do in a 24 hour period to make sure that a lot of CCGs and others who were pretty spooked by the whole thing didn’t then jump ship. So a lot of work had to be done to some extent reactively because of the leaking to make sure that the whole thing didn’t fracture and fragment’.

(Core team member, ID18, August 2016; interview)

Keeping the regional assemblage together was contingent on all the local organisations agreeing to stay on-board with changes that were, at the time, loosely-defined. Potential tensions associated with re-structuring local commissioning, for instance, threatened to fragment the project from the offset. Concerns were alleviated and fragmenting relationships repaired sufficiently to ensure stability in the region. This was the first of many issues that risked de-stabilising the region as the devolution policy began to take hold.

Assembling of health and care devolution contained a multitude of contradictions, conflicts and tensions. Undoubtedly, some actors in the region were more willing to pursue the changes than others. Whilst health and social care in the region was to be remade *as a whole*,

there was no one singular Greater Manchester. Uneven legacies, variations and political differences continued to register one way or another. Where some parts of the region had been successful at winning national funding for recent NHS pilot projects, others parts were at risk of their local hospital failing. Left wing councillors co-existed awkwardly alongside powerful Chief Executives. Bringing together local elected politicians and local health commissioning was one such example of assembling potentially ill-fitting elements together into new arrangements:

I'm worried about the future politicisation of health; it worries me. Local Authorities see everything as political, with elected members on [local integrated commissioning] boards, what are the implications? What about the role of the elected Greater Manchester Mayor who has no statutory responsibility for health?

(NHS provider manager, ID71, May 2017; meeting observations)

For NHS managers, devolution and the integration of health and care was de-stabilising as new political actors were becoming drawn into decision-making who previously had not been. This included the new Greater Manchester Mayor who formally, at least, had no influence on the NHS. Whilst we may dispute the notion that health decision-making was hitherto apolitical, the new assemblage of actors, many of whom had long been present in the region, were brought into very different sets of relationships. This generated much uncertainty.

Previously agreed decisions that once helped secure the devolution deal became less secure. *Healthier Together* was an initiative intended to 'join up' emergency abdominal surgery services across fewer specialist sites across Greater Manchester. Whilst all the local CCGs in the region voted unanimously for the changes prior to devolution, it was politically-contentious and was subsequently legally challenged by local doctors. Their challenge was unsuccessful. In light of devolution which now incorporated a whole host of similar acute service changes, with new financial implications across the region, questions over altering the yet-to-be-implemented *Healthier Together* decision re-surfaced. However, unpicking *Healthier Together* was firmly closed down by key figures in the region, despite sitting awkwardly, insisting that it cannot be seen to be challenged and instead must be fully fitted into the new regional arrangements.

I'll be brutally honest I don't think *Healthier Together* fits with anything. I think it's operating in a parallel universe... What we're lacking in GM is a Master Plan for the whole of GM which actually sets out the future shape of hospital provision. And what we're doing is... within each locality plan, carving it out across ten different places ten times, and I just think we need a really clear overview, where will the specialist hospitals be? You know, what would be the nature of them and we've just ducked it.

(Local authority manager, ID62, February 2017; interview)

Bringing together new and existing elements together was a non-linear, conflict-laden process. Given the relatively weak ties that held statutory organisations in the region together,

tensions were continuously mitigated behind closed doors. Politically-sensitive changes which risked rupturing consensus, not least the public scrutiny generated by major hospital changes, could be strategically deferred, for now. The assembling of the devolution project aligned different and at times, ill-suited elements *as if* they were becoming a unified, region moving forward together. Work to be seen to operate in unity was significant for solidifying the apparent togetherness of the region.

Whilst the imagined unity of the assemblage was provisional, this had new material consequences. No single actor or organisation could determine relations in the region. The Partnership Team itself had relatively limited capacity to force decisions across Greater Manchester:

Getting things done and holding people to account, [the Partnership Team] just don't have the lines of authority. You know, [the Chief Officer of the Partnership] has no direct authority over Foundation Trusts. The Health and Social Care Partnership has got no direct authority over councils.

(Foundation Trust manager, ID74, July 2017; interview)

Despite formally signing up to be part of devolution, individual NHS providers remained relatively autonomous with their own individual boards who agreed decisions on their individual finances. Work to 'close the financial gap' illustrates how remaking the regional *whole* was transforming relations between its individual *parts*. An animated debate surrounding moves to create a Greater Manchester-wide financial control total, a mechanism to limit annual expenditure in the region, brought tensions to the fore given the impacts on the financial planning of seemingly discrete hospital organisations:

"The spirit of togetherness on [a Greater Manchester wide] control total has some esoteric meaning but we all need to fight out own battles" [ID54] ... "it doesn't make sense to have a boundary around Greater Manchester" [ID71] ... "At the end of the day", [ID66], insisted "the issue comes down to cash, that's what throws us into distress".

(NHS providers, February 2017; meeting observations)

Whilst strengthening the boundary around Greater Manchester in an effort to limit and re-direct healthcare expenditure towards primary care may have appealed to the incentives of NHS commissioners, for NHS acute hospital providers, this was fundamentally transforming how they relate to one another. Their fears were that new elements such as system-wide financial controls were being brought into and altering the initial *Memorandum of Understanding* they initially, tentatively, agreed to.

Work by the Partnership Team and key political figures in the region to persuade different local organisations to stay on-board with the project *was* sufficient to sustain the project and keep it from falling apart despite its contradictions and conflicts. Reinforcing the coherence of the Greater Manchester project helped make divergence high. Efforts were made to ensure

that each locality received a portion of the NHS transformation fund money. This held a certain appeal for cash-strapped local authorities. For NHS organisations, the potential for devolution to enable access additional national NHS funding remained an attractive prospect. The combination of centrally-driven austerity and frustrations with existing fragmented services helped create the conditions whereby there was seemingly no alternative:

I think if we're being very, very honest finance was probably at the heart of it. And I think there was a recognition across the [local] economy that we couldn't carry on as we were... I think social care, to be fair, has been absolutely obliterated financially over the last few years and it was inevitable that health would pay for those social cuts because it just moves patients over. And I think we just reached the scenario where we had to do something.

(CCG manager, March 2017, ID135; interview)

The above is just a few examples of the work beginning to re-organise health and care across the region and its localities and how this was successfully holding together as a meaningful spatial project. However, as we shall now discuss, the apparent *territorial* coherence of the Greater Manchester project was distorted by seemingly distant actors and organisations becoming embedded within the regional assemblage attempting to shape and limit what was possible and connectedly, how local and regional actors sought to strategically re-work these priorities in their efforts to compete for new resources and formal powers

### **Renegotiating devolution and embedding regional agendas elsewhere**

Devolution was often explained by managers in Greater Manchester as offering to possibility of *distancing* the region from the most overbearing centralising tendencies of national bodies. This would often be described in terms of getting national managers out of the region. For example:

...we could see what was coming and it [devolution] afforded an opportunity for us, if I put it quite bluntly ... *to get NHS England off our pitch* ...

(Commissioning Manager, ID87, October 2016, interview; our emphasis)

Although a simplification, the imaginary of strengthening the boundaries of Greater Manchester to defend against national managers carried a certain appeal. Indeed, national managers indeed suggested that they would keep their distance, albeit, on the condition that Greater Manchester proves it can work together as they required:

We will get off the pitch when results get better... [Greater Manchester] looks cohesive from afar ... [but] there is one shot to make devolution work and you need to solve things altogether... can you prove that you're up for it?

(National manager, ID164, January 2016, meeting observations; our emphasis)

Resonating with Foucauldian-inspired readings of power through notions of governmentality and governing-at-a-distance, the implication was that managers in Greater Manchester would

internalise national priorities and bring the region in line with the ‘centre’. In more dissenting moments, managers considered whether devolution was *distancing responsibility* from central government:

I think there’s probably a growing inevitability, in part, I would say cynically it’s about protecting Secretaries of State and ministers by insulating themselves by saying being able to point to when a crisis happens, to say actually that’s yours, and what are you doing about it because you’ve now got the devolved authority and decision-making and the money, so it’s your problem.

(NHS provider manager, ID71, August 2016; interview)

In this way, Greater Manchester was required to make politically-contentious ‘tough decisions’ on behalf of central government at a time of austerity (Lowndes and Gardner, 2016; Hammond *et al.*, 2017).

At first sight, we might legitimately dismiss the devolution description as an exercise in political branding. It echoes previous reforms that adopted the language of the local to present the idea that governmental power has been devolved despite the continued influence of central government agendas (Moon and Brown, 2000: 73). Hopes that Greater Manchester would distance themselves from national bodies through devolution, and the unwillingness to let this happen unless on the terms of national bodies is helpful for highlighting the limited extent of ‘devolution’ on offer. Whether national bodies governing from a distance or central government distancing itself, these spatial imaginaries suggest national priorities were always successfully embedded within the region without much resistance. Whilst national politics of austerity were embedded within the regional assemblage, as we shall illustrate in the rest of this section, relationships were more open-ended than they might first appear.

As an evolving process, there was a malleability to the interactions between Greater Manchester and the multitude of national intermediary arm’s length bodies and agencies themselves grappling with the formation of emerging local integrated alliances beginning to take shape:

I mean, [NHS England] have been brilliant in supporting this work, but all the regulators, NHSI, CQC, they need to come on the journey... That’s not a criticism by the way. We need to come on the journey, develop and understand some of these place-based constructs, recognise that actually some of the models in which they operate are not fit for purpose. *They cannot inspect, all the time, discrete functions within discrete organisations because those things don’t exist anymore.*

(Local authority manager, ID52, May 2017; interview)

New integrated governance arrangements and alliances were fitting less well with existing national regulation. Undoubtedly, performance targets inherited from previous NHS reforms and new national ‘must dos’ were not displaced entirely once Greater Manchester became devolved. However, as assembled relationships evolved in the region, attempts by distant

health authorities to directly reach into the region to shape priorities were able to be strategically reworked to bolster their regional interests.

The ability of the region to be seen to work together as one remained critical for renegotiating national relationships. Prompt submission of annual National Planning documents for the entire region was one such case in point. Providing a Greater Manchester-wide response, including organisations not required to respond, was considered vital to the Partnership Team's attempts to secure new decision-making capacity and resources. A senior manager relayed to the Partnership how their successful completion, where others failed, was helping persuade national actors to further their support for the Greater Manchester project:

This is recognised nationally as an extraordinary achievement... we were, I think, maybe the only, or certainly one of the only areas in the country to do it, certainly at this scale, to achieve that position. And the great thing about it is the signal it sends ... There had to be a few compromises, but we got over the message. The power, the totality of the message was really strong ... a number of people picked up on it and fed back the impact it had. I know we're not here first and foremost to satisfy national bodies, but what it does is it unlocks goodwill about other things that we might need or want.

(Meeting observation notes, January 2017; our emphasis)

The Partnership Team produced their own Business Plan for the region in the months that followed. They even included elements of the Greater Manchester Mayor's manifesto commitments. Its purpose was to intensify the region's efforts to lobby for greater devolution nationally. Terms for brokering new arrangements were set out:

During this second year we will need even more devolved authority to make the changes required to achieve our objectives. For example, taking over further responsibilities from NHS England will support new commissioning arrangements, including for ambulance and NHS 111 services. We want to have more freedom in how we use money from the national *Better Care Fund* to join up health and social care services. And we aim to establish a single system control total for Greater Manchester finances.

(Business Plan 2017/18: 8)

Previous work by the Partnership Team to move towards contentious Greater Manchester-wide financial control totals were being enrolled into their current attempts to leverage new resources for the region. Their efforts were successful. Not only this, but there region managed to gain access to limited national capital as one of the 'most advanced' integrated health and care systems in the country, despite others rating 'higher'.

Embedding regional priorities within central government went beyond the Department of Health alone. Making connections with the economic growth agenda of the wider devolution project, long standing efforts to bring together a renewed *Work and Health* sought to draw in a combination of new national and European Union funding:

We're negotiating hard with the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) and the Treasury. However, DWP's national funding has reduced because of devolution and so we're in convocation with them, the European Social Fund can match DWP moneys invested. Anything that GM puts in above that makes DWP the junior partner and therefore devo becomes quite symbolic and changes the design, management and evaluation in GM. Removing of ring-fences can greatly benefit the system with the individual at heart rather than being constrained by the national level. Therefore, we can start to develop a GM Work and Health Programme to fit the needs of GM rather than a national template and is an opportunity to test and learn in GM to help determine future decisions.

(Combined Authority manager, ID14, May 2016; observations)

The connection between health and work opens up a new set of wide-ranging political economic questions, given the principally neoliberal mode of accumulation in Greater Manchester beyond the scope of this paper. Here, our concern is with the way in which regional actors were subsequently successful at forging new associations and resources independent of national health priorities.

The work of remaking health and care in Greater Manchester was not achieved by state and clinical actors alone. An extended circuit of think-tanks and apparently 'global' management consultants were drawn into Greater Manchester to legitimise and bolster, although not necessarily direct, regional priorities (Allen and Cochrane, 2010). In fact, devolution brought about a whole new set of geographical connections. Delegates from as close as Yorkshire and as far as China came to learn about health and care in Greater Manchester. The Partnership Team forged new ties with health managers in New York State, going on policy study tours to share 'best practice' and boost their profile internationally. Global pharmaceutical companies were courted to bring new private capital into the region rather than the South East. Health think-tanks held in high regard by central government were invited to observe meetings showcasing region developments. A positive assessment was circulated online and leaders invited to headline their annual event. These connections all helped bolster Greater Manchester's agenda on an international stage, presenting the region as a 'pioneering' integrated health and care system working as one.

As our research drew to a close, the new Greater Manchester Mayor was collaborating with the Partnership Team to negotiate with central government for Greater Manchester to pilot new social care reforms. An attempt for new funds failed. Yet, Greater Manchester's lobbying was intensifying. As the Partnership would have it, this was all part of their 'devolution journey'.

## **Discussion and conclusion**

In this paper we have sought to illustrate how and why space is integral to the practices and politics of re-structuring health and care services and systems and specifically how ideas of assemblage can help understand the remaking of a region. We described the work involved in remaking health and social care through assembling different, often ill-fitting elements that emerge, become ordered, mutate and fall apart, using the example of Greater Manchester

devolution in England. Our use of assemblage enabled us to highlight how health and social care in Greater Manchester has been stabilised into a new devolved territorial formation *without becoming whole*, despite the search for, or claims to, its totality (cf. Painter 2008). The ongoing political construction of the region is the outcome of the interplay of local, regional and national actors, organisations and agencies bringing together different policies and priorities, sometimes in conflict, at other times fitting together more easily. Our approach allowed us to demonstrate the multiple and diverse activities contributing to bringing about relative coherence despite the contradictory and conflicting dynamics involved in major re-structuring of health and care systems and services.

The spatial re-organisation of health and care involves negotiation and contestation. An important contribution relates to the ways in which agency is conceived in assemblage thinking. Whilst reference is often made to the significance of (system) leadership for major health and care reforms (Turner et al. 2016), our analysis demonstrates how agency is more usefully understood as embedded within the regional assemblage, rather than resulting from the actions of local, regional or national managers. Thinking about the governing of the regional assemblage moves us away from viewing national bodies as imposing ‘top down’ control or fixing the context for reform, by instead emphasising how they national actors are embedded within the new territorial formation, more-or-less successfully shaping and limiting what is possible. Our data highlight how different national actors were embedded within the Greater Manchester ‘experiment’, becoming part of the practices and politics of reassembling health and care. Central government-led austerity measures were firmly embedded in the process. Yet, through drawing upon resources independently, such as think-tanks and management consultants, actors in Greater Manchester were mobilising to leverage their own agendas, to compete with other places in England for additional public resources during a period of austerity and to attract new private capital into health and care in the region.

Assemblage thinking helps us to pay attention to the evolving and sometimes unexpected dynamics of health and care reform. There is a tendency amongst evaluators of reform programmes to focus on comparing implementation in practice with the programme theory or logic model which underpins their design. This fails to address the more uncertain, political and emergent dimensions of the practices of working out and working through conflicts and crises. It also ignores the ways in which different groups conceive of changes from variegated positions which may or may not be mutually compatible. Rather than checking compliance against a shared mental model or explicit blueprint, researchers should investigate the conflict-laden and political processes involved in assembling entities comprised of a multiple elements and how they hold together or not.

Where assemblage thinking has been used to understand practices and places of care, we view it as having significant application for examining major health and care re-structuring. This requires attention to how the spatial formation of health and social care is contested and shaped by the topological reach of different powers ‘beyond’ the boundaries of the region. It reminds us that re-organising health and care requires continuous political effort and that



there are always alternatives. Rather than approaching change in terms of before and after evaluations, we should examine the on-going work through space and time as part of a continuous process of reassembling and dismantling as new policies and political actors are introduced and old ones fall away.

## References

- Allen, P. (2006) New localism in the English National Health Service: What is it for? *Health policy*, 79, 244-252.
- Allen, J. (2011) Powerful assemblages? *Area*, 43, 154-157.
- Allen, J. and Cochrane, A. (2007) Beyond the territorial fix: regional assemblages, politics and power. *Regional studies*, 41, 1161-1175.
- Allen, J. and Cochrane, A. (2010) Assemblages of state power: topological shifts in the organization of government and politics. *Antipode*, 42, 1071-1089.
- Anderson, B. and McFarlane, C. (2011) Assemblage and geography. *Area*, 43, 124-127.
- Anderson, B., Kearnes, M. McFarlane, C. and Swanton, D. (2012) On assemblages and geography, *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 2, 171-189.
- Association of Greater Manchester Authorities (AGMA)/NHS England/Greater Manchester Association of Clinical Commissioning Groups (GMACCGs) (2015) *Greater Manchester Health and Social Care Devolution: Memorandum of Understanding*, [http://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/135/greater\\_manchester\\_health\\_and\\_social\\_care\\_devolution\\_memorandum\\_of\\_understanding.pdf](http://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/135/greater_manchester_health_and_social_care_devolution_memorandum_of_understanding.pdf) (last accessed 20 December 2017)
- Ayres, S., Flinders, M., and Sandford, M. (2018). Territory, power and statecraft: understanding English devolution. *Regional Studies*, 52, 853-864.
- Baker, T. and McGuirk, P. (2017). Assemblage thinking as methodology: commitments and practices for critical policy research. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 5, 425-442.
- Bennett, J. (2005) The agency of assemblages and the North American blackout, *Public Culture*, 17, 445-65.
- Brown, T, Andrews, GJ, Cummins, S, Greenhough, B, Lewis, D, Power, A (2017) *Health Geographies: A Critical Introduction*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell
- Checkland, K. Segar, J., Voorhees, J., and Coleman, A. (2015) 'Like a Circle in a Spiral, Like a Wheel within a Wheel': The Layers of Complexity and Challenge for Devolution of Health and Social Care in Greater Manchester, *Representation*, 51, 453-469.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1988) *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London: The Athlone Press.
- England, K., and Dyck, I. (2011). Managing the body work of home care. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 33, 206-219.
- Gieryn, T. F. (2000) A space for place in sociology, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 463-496.
- Greater Manchester Combined Authority and NHS in Greater Manchester (2015) *Taking Charge of Health and Social Care in Greater Manchester*. <http://www.gmhsc.org.uk/assets/GM-Strategic-Plan-Final.pdf> (last accessed 20/12/2017).
- Hammond, J., Lorne, C., Coleman, A., Allen, P., Mays, N., Dam, R. and Checkland, K. (2017). The spatial politics of place and health policy: Exploring Sustainability and Transformation Plans in the English NHS, *Social Science & Medicine*, 190, 217-226.
- Haughton, G., Deas, I., Hincks, S. and Ward, K. (2016) Mythic Manchester: Devo Manc, the Northern Powerhouse and rebalancing the English economy, *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 9, 355-370.

- Ivanova, D., Wallenburg, I. and Bal, R. (2016) Care in place: A case study of assembling a carescape. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 38, 1336-1349.
- Jessop, B., Brenner, N., and Jones, M. (2008). Theorizing sociospatial relations. *Environment and Planning D: society and space*, 26, 389-401.
- Jones, L. (2017). Sedimented governance in the English National Health Service. In *Decentring Health Policy*, Bevir, M. and Waring, J. (eds) Routledge: Abingdon, 29-45.
- Kearns, R. A. (1993). Place and health: towards a reformed medical geography. *The Professional Geographer*, 45, 139-147.
- Kivelä, S. and Moisio, S. (2017). The state as a space of health: on the geopolitics and biopolitics of health-care systems. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 5, 28-46.
- Lowndes, V., and Gardner, A. (2016) Local governance under the Conservatives: super-austerity, devolution and the 'smarter state', *Local Government Studies*, 42, 357-375.
- Martin, D., Nettleton, S., Buse, C., Prior, L., and Twigg, J. (2015) Architecture and health care: a place for sociology. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 37, 1007-1022.
- Massey, D. (2005) *For space*. London: Sage.
- McCann, E., and Ward, K. (2012) Assembling urbanism: following policies and 'studying through' the sites and situations of policy making. *Environment and Planning A*, 44, 42-51.
- McFarlane C (2011) The city as assemblage: Dwelling and urban space. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 29: 649–671.
- Moon, G., and Brown, T. (2000). Governmentality and the spatialized discourse of policy: the consolidation of the post-1989 NHS reforms. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 25, 65-76.
- Moon, G. (1990). Conceptions of space and community in British health policy. *Social Science & Medicine*, 30, 165-171.
- Newman, J. and Clarke, J. (2009) *Publics, politics and power: Remaking the public in public services*. London: Sage.
- Painter, J. (2008) Cartographic anxiety and the search for regionality, *Environment and Planning A*, 40, 342-361.
- Powell, M. (2003) Quasi-markets in British Health Policy: A Longue Durée Perspective. *Social Policy & Administration*, 37, 725-741
- Prince, R., Kearns, R., and Craig, D. (2006). Governmentality, discourse and space in the New Zealand health care system, 1991–2003. *Health & Place*, 12, 253-266.
- Turner, S., Ramsay, A., Perry, C., Boaden, R., McKevitt, C., Morris, S. and Fulop, N. (2016) Lessons for major system change: centralization of stroke services in two metropolitan areas of England. *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy*, 21, 156-165.
- Urry, J. (2001). The Sociology of Space and Place. In Blau, J. (ed) *Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Walshe, K., Coleman, A., McDonald, R., Lorne, C., and Munford, L. (2016) Health and social care devolution: the Greater Manchester experiment, *BMJ: British Medical Journal*, 352.