

**POLITICS
AND POLICY
IMPLEMENTATION
IN THE THIRD
WORLD** Edited by
MERILEE S. GRINDLE



Politics and Policy Implementation in the Third World

Edited by

MERILEE S. GRINDLE

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Main entry under title:

Politics and policy implementation in the Third World.

Includes index.

1. Underdeveloped areas—Politics and government—Addresses, essays, lectures.
 2. Underdeveloped areas—Economic policy—Addresses, essays, lectures.
 3. Underdeveloped areas—Social conditions—Addresses, essays, lectures.
- I. Grindle, Merilee Serrill.

JF60.P66 351.007'09172'4 79-3213

ISBN 0-691-07617-0

ISBN 0-691-02195-3 pbk.

List of Abbreviations

APRA	American Popular Revolutionary Alliance (Peru)
BNH	National Housing Bank (Brazil)
CAP	Agrarian Production Cooperative (Peru)
CENCIRA	National Center for Training and Investigation for the Agrarian Reform (Peru)
CDC	Commonwealth Development Corporation
CHISAM	Coordinating Agency for Housing in the Rio Area (Brazil)
CNA	National Agrarian Confederation (Peru)
CNC	National Peasants' Confederation (Mexico)
COHAB	Popular Housing Company (Brazil)
CONASUPO	National Staple Products Company (Mexico)
DAPC	District Agricultural Production Committees (India)
FAFEG	Federation of Associations of Favelas in the State of Guanabara (Brazil)
HFCK	Housing Finance Company of Kenya, Ltd.
IAS	Indian Administrative Service
ICS	Indian Civil Service
ICSM	Instant Corn-Soya-Milk
ICT	Territorial Credit Institute (Colombia)
Invicali	Cali Housing Institute (Colombia)
KANU	Kenya African National Union
KPU	Kenya People's Union
MNR	Revolutionary Nationalist Movement (Bolivia)
NCC	Nairobi City Council (Kenya)
NCKK	National Christian Council of Kenya
NHC	National Housing Corporation (Kenya)
PRI	Institutional Revolutionary Party (Mexico)
RE	Rural Electrification (India)
RSEB	Rajasthan State Electricity Board (India)
SAIS	Agrarian Social Interest Society (Peru)
SEB	State Electricity Board (India)
SINAMOS	National System for the Support of Social Mobilization (Peru)

List of Abbreviations

UNIP	United National Independence Party (Zambia)
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VLW	Village Level Worker (India)

Acknowledgments

MANY individuals have helped this book along its way toward publication. Principal among these, of course, have been the contributors who have been enthusiastic about our shared concern with implementation and open to dialogue about their individual chapters. They deserve credit for the energy expended in field research and the insightfulness of their analyses. In addition, Norman Uphoff of Cornell and John Montgomery of Harvard made useful comments on a draft of the manuscript. Henry Dietz of the University of Texas read it with thoroughness and made numerous constructive suggestions. Cheryl Publicover of Wellesley College provided expert editorial assistance and Steven Grindle added his admirable good humor, his advice, and his understanding. At Princeton University Press, Sanford Thatcher and Marsha Shankman were consistently helpful. I would like to express my appreciation to these individuals for their support and encouragement. I am also grateful to Wellesley College for a faculty research grant that helped defray some of the costs involved in manuscript preparation.

Acknowledgment is given to the University of California Press for permission to reprint parts of the following books:

Bureaucrats, Politicians, and Peasants in Mexico: A Case Study in Public Policy, by Merilee S. Grindle

The Myth of Marginality: Urban Politics and Poverty in Rio de Janeiro, by Janice Perlman

Copyright © 1980 by Princeton University Press

Published by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey
In the United Kingdom: Princeton University Press, Guildford, Surrey

All Rights Reserved

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data will be
found on the last printed page of this book

This book has been composed in Linotype Times Roman

Clothbound editions of Princeton University Press books
are printed on acid-free paper, and binding materials are
chosen for strength and durability

Printed in the United States of America by Princeton
University Press, Princeton, New Jersey

Contents

List of Tables	ix
List of Figures	xi
List of Abbreviations	xiii
Acknowledgments	xv
Introduction	
ONE • <i>Policy Content and Context in Implementation</i> BY MERILEE S. GRINDLE	3
Part One FROM FORMULATION TO IMPLEMENTATION	
TWO • <i>The Paradox of Popularity: “Ideological” Program Implementation in Zambia</i> BY STEPHEN A. QUICK	40
THREE • <i>Reform Governments and Policy Implementation: Lessons from Peru</i> BY CYNTHIA MCCLINTOCK	64
Part Two CHOICE AND CONSEQUENCE OF IMPLEMENTING STRATEGIES	
FOUR • <i>The Pilot Project and the Choice of an Implementing Strategy: Community Development in India</i> BY GERALD E. SUSSMAN	103
FIVE • <i>From Pilot Project to Operational Program in India: The Problems of Transition</i> BY DAVID F. PYLE	123
	vii

Contents

SIX • <i>Administrative Decentralization and the Implementation of Housing Policy in Colombia</i>	
BY IRENE FRASER ROTHENBERG	145
SEVEN • <i>Controlled Decentralization and Policy Implementation: The Case of Rural Electrification in Rajasthan</i>	
BY SUSAN G. HADDEN	170
 Part Three	
DECIDING WHO GETS WHAT	
EIGHT • <i>The Implementor: Political Constraints on Rural Development in Mexico</i>	
BY MERILEE S. GRINDLE	197
NINE • <i>The Politics of Public Housing in Nairobi</i>	
BY FREDERICK T. TEMPLE AND NELLE W. TEMPLE	224
TEN • <i>The Failure of Influence: Squatter Eradication in Brazil</i>	
BY JANICE PERLMAN	250
 Conclusion	
ELEVEN • <i>Implementation amidst Scarcity and Apathy: Political Power and Policy Design</i>	
BY PETER S. CLEAVES	281
Contributors	304
Index	307

List of Tables

3-1. Positively Perceived Actions of Government	82
3-2. Perceived Quality of Life, 1969-1974	92
3-3. Positively Evaluated Features of Cooperatives	93
4-1. Indian Agricultural Productivity Among 26 Developing Nations, 1951	107
6-1. Tenure of Cali Councilmen and Alternates, 1958-1972	159
6-2. Tenure of Invicali Employees as of June 22, 1970	163
6-3. Tenure of Local Employees in 1970, by Institution	164
7-1. Population and Distance Criteria: Percent of Villages Electrified by Year	178
7-2. The Groundwater Criterion: Percent of Villages Electrified by Year	179
7-3. Scheduled Caste and Panchayat Headquarters Criteria: Percent of Villages Electrified by Year	180
7-4. Comparison of Electrified and All Villages by Party of Present State Legislator and Year of Electrification	180
7-5. Comparison of Number of Variously Competitive Villages Receiving Electricity in Different Years	181
7-6. The State Legislator Status Criterion, 1967-1970	181
7-7. Distribution of Villages Electrified During Power Ministers' Tenures	181
7-8. Controlled Decentralization and Problems of Implementation	190
9-1. Nairobi's Growth, 1901-1969	226
9-2. Percentage of Nairobi City Council Capital Expenditure on Different Types of Housing Projects, 1964-1970	231
9-3. Nairobi City Council Stock of Conventional Housing by Type, Cost, and Period Built	232
9-4. Housing Demand by Nairobi African Households, 1971, Compared to Public Sector Residential	

List of Tables

Construction, 1968-1971	234
10-1. Attitudes Toward Favela Removal	255
10-2. Relationship Between Housing Quality and Attitude to Relocation	256
10-3. Relationship Between Community Integration and Attitude to Relocation	256
10-4. Past and Present Responses to Removal Threat	262
11-1. Characteristics of Policy Affecting Its Implementation	287
11-2 Coordinates Affecting Policy Implementation	290

List of Figures

1-1. Implementation as a Political and Administrative Process	11
1-2. Critical Choices in the Implementation Process	21
8-1. The Context of Policy Implementation	205

Introduction

ONE · *Policy Content and Context in Implementation*

MERILEE S. GRINDLE

THE politics of policy implementation has recently emerged as a topic of interest for students of politics in both industrial and Third World countries. Implementation has captured their attention because it is evident that a wide variety of factors—from the availability of sufficient resources to the structure of intergovernmental relations, from the commitment of lower level officials to reporting mechanisms within the bureaucracy, from the political leverage of opponents of the policy to accidents of timing, luck, and seemingly unrelated events—can and do frequently intervene between the statement of policy goals and their actual achievement in the society. Such factors can account for the “often imperfect correspondence between policies adopted and services actually delivered.”¹ Attempts to explain this divergence have led to the realization that implementation, even when successful, involves far more than a mechanical translation of goals into routine procedures; it involves fundamental questions about conflict, decision making, and “who gets what” in a society.²

It was during the late 1960s and early 1970s that a series of useful and provocative books and articles appeared in the United States dealing explicitly with the problems of implementation. Many of these were stimulated by the desire to explain why the programs of the Great Society of the Johnson Administration had

Note: I am indebted to Norman Uphoff of the Center for International Studies, Cornell University, for invaluable comments, suggestions, and insights into the problems of implementation in the Third World.

¹ D. Van Meter and C. Van Horn, “The Policy Implementation Process: A Conceptual Framework,” *Administration and Society*, 6, No. 4 (February 1975), 446.

² The phrase is Harold Lasswell's. See his *Politics: Who Gets What, When, How* (New York: Meridian, 1958).

not achieved the results they predicted.³ Each of these studies considered how the policy or program itself—its goals, implementing design, and availability of resources—helped shape the observed outcomes. In addition, however, the studies revealed other explanatory variables in the division of political power in the society and in the conflict and influences brought to bear on implementing decisions, factors that focused attention on the broader environment in which the programs were pursued. More recently, there have appeared several studies that have attempted to define the parameters of a general process of implementation by cataloguing the range of variables that intervene in it and by specifying some of the relationships among such variables.⁴

Explicit considerations of the frequent disparity between goals and outcomes in the implementation of public policy in the Third World, however, have tended to focus more narrowly on the administrative apparatus and procedures of implementing bureaucracies or on the characteristics of bureaucratic officials.⁵ Until now,

³ See, for examples of case studies of policy delivery, M. Derthick, *New Towns In-Town: Why a Federal Program Failed* (Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1972); M. Derthick, *Uncontrollable Spending for Social Services Grants* (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1975); A. Heidenheimer and M. Parkinson, "Equalizing Educational Opportunity in Britain and the United States: The Politics of Implementation," in W. Gwyn and G. Edwards, III, eds., *Perspectives on Public Policymaking*, 15 (New Orleans, La.: Tulane Studies in Political Science, 1975); P. Lermack, "Hookers, Judges, and Bail Forfeitures: The Importance of Internally Generated Demands on Policy Implementing Institutions," *Administration and Society*, 8, No. 4 (February 1977); J. Murphy, "The Education Bureaucracies Implement Novel Policy: The Politics of Title I of ESEA, 1965-1972," in A. P. Sindler, ed., *Policy and Politics in America: Six Case Studies* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1973); G. Orfield, *The Reconstruction of Southern Education* (New York: John Wiley, 1969); J. Pressman and A. Wildavsky, *Implementation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973).

⁴ See E. Bardach, *The Implementation Game* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1977); E. Hargrove, *The Missing Link: The Study of the Implementation of Social Policy* (Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1975); T. B. Smith, "The Policy Implementation Process," *Policy Sciences*, 4, No. 2 (June 1973); Van Meter and Van Horn, "Policy Implementation Process"; D. Van Meter and C. Van Horn, "The Implementation of Intergovernmental Policy," in C. Jones and R. Thomas, eds., *Public Policy Making in a Federal System* (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1976); W. Williams, "Implementation Analysis and Assessment," *Policy Analysis* (Summer 1975).

⁵ See R. Gurevich, "Teachers, Rural Development, and the Civil Service

there has been little attention given to linking characteristics of policies and programs to their subsequent implementation, to relating implementation problems to characteristics of the political regimes in which they are pursued, or to exploring the general nature of implementation in the Third World.⁶ These are the interests that have stimulated the editing of this volume.

More specifically, this book is the result of a conviction held by its contributors that the implementation process is especially central to politics in the countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America and is thus worthy of investigation and analysis. The chapters in this collection are addressed to two broad questions about implementation in general that are related by the authors to the specific conditions surrounding the execution of public programs in the Third World. First, the authors are concerned with the impact of *content*: What effect does the content of public policy have on its implementation? A second question, about *context*, is of equal concern to them: How does the political context of administrative action affect policy implementation? Such questions are of interest to these scholars because they share a common perspective about implementation itself. For them, it is an ongoing process of decision making by a variety of actors, the ultimate outcome of which is determined by the content of the program being pursued and by the interaction of the decision makers within a

in Thailand," *Asian Survey*, 15, No. 10 (October 1975); H. Hart, "The Village and Development Administration," in J. Heaphey, ed., *Spatial Dimensions of Development Administration* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1971); S. Heginbotham, *Cultures in Conflict: The Four Faces of Indian Bureaucracy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1975); J. Honey, *Toward Strategies for Public Administration Development in Latin America* (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1968); M. Kriesberg, *Public Administration in Developing Countries* (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1965); A. Raper, *Rural Development in Action: The Comprehensive Experiment at Comilla, East Pakistan* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1970); S. Wallman, *Take Out Hunger: Two Case Studies of Rural Development in Basutoland* (London: Athlone, 1970).

⁶ Exceptions to this statement can be found in P. Cleaves, *Bureaucratic Politics and Administration in Chile* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974); R. Daland, *Brazilian Planning: Development Politics and Administration* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1967); L. Graham, *Civil Service Reform in Brazil* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1968); M. Grindle, *Bureaucrats, Politicians, and Peasants in Mexico: A Case Study in Public Policy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977); F. Riggs, *Administration in Developing Countries: The Theory of Prismatic Society* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964).