

ARDA

JR

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20523
BIBLIOGRAPHIC INPUT SHEET

FOR AID USE ONLY

Batch 73

1. SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION	A. PRIMARY Development and economics	DC00-0000-0000
	B. SECONDARY Development assistance	

2. TITLE AND SUBTITLE
Public sector implementation; an overview and bibliography

3. AUTHOR(S)
Ingle, M.D.; Klauss, Rudi; Lutter, Dorothy

4. DOCUMENT DATE 1977	5. NUMBER OF PAGES 51p.	6. ARC NUMBER ARC
--------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------

7. REFERENCE ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS
Syracuse

8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES (Sponsoring Organization, Publisher, Availability)
(In Development Management Research Ser.Rpt.no.2)

9. ABSTRACT

Presents an overview of and index to implementation literature, along with annotated implementation references of about 25 books and a selected bibliography of 62 entries. The realization that there is more to program and policy success than planning has caused a greater focus on the area of implementation, or policy execution, in the public administration and management literature. This study looks at the existing knowledge to ascertain how implementation has figured in the programming and design process; to look at the social, economic, organizational and other variables that impact on implementation; and to assess what can be applied to assure more effective implementation of development projects. It clarifies what is meant by implementation and highlights factors involved in the public sector implementation process. The studies reviewed cover both developed and developing country contexts. The overview section first presents several definitions and then discusses the issues of implementation analysis and participatory planning. Important variables in the implementation process are highlighted and organizational capabilities required for successful implementation are reviewed. This report is designed to acquaint the reader with some of the major issues associated with public sector implementation and to serve as a guide for further study. The study is useful for anyone engaged in the business of development, but it was prepared for managers who have taken A.I.D.'s two week course in Project Management.

10. CONTROL NUMBER PN-AAF-038	11. PRICE OF DOCUMENT
12. DESCRIPTORS Bibliographies AID Implementation Management	13. PROJECT NUMBER
	14. CONTRACT NUMBER AID/otr-C-1318
	15. TYPE OF DOCUMENT
Project design Project planning	

Development Management Research Series

REPORT NO. 2

PUBLIC SECTOR IMPLEMENTATION:

AN OVERVIEW AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

**MARCUS INGLE
RUDI KLAUSS
DOROTHY LUTTER**

MAXWELL TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

**The Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York**

1977

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWARD	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
PUBLIC SECTOR IMPLEMENTATION	1
Introduction	1
Definitions	2
Implementation Analysis at the Planning Stage	4
Implementation Variables	6
The environmental set	6
The target population	7
Resources and actors	8
Coalitions	9
Goal consensus and modification	9
Incentives for participation	10
Organizational Capabilities	12
Conclusion	15
PART I: INDEX TO THE IMPLEMENTATION LITERATURE	17
PART II: ANNOTATED IMPLEMENTATION REFERENCES	25
PART III: SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	39
EVALUATION FORM:	45

FOREWARD

The development landscape is littered with projects that have fallen short of their goals. Design triumphs have ended in implementation disasters. It is almost as if the project plans have contained within them the seeds of their own failure. Clearly a project which cannot be implemented is no project at all; and to maximize the chances of project success, its implementability must receive priority consideration at every step of the design process. While these statements may appear to be truisms, surprisingly little systematic knowledge has been accumulated on the implementation process, and what knowledge exists has not been assembled and analyzed for its implications for the management of the development process. This study attempts to do just that: to look at the existing knowledge; to ascertain how implementation has figured in the programming and design process; to look at the social, economic, organizational and other variables that impact on implementation; and to assess what can be applied to assure more effective implementation of development projects.

This is not a "how-to" manual; we wish it could be, but the state of the art does not quite permit it. We have instead surveyed what is known, asked some questions, and designed a

framework for obtaining answers to these questions. We are addressing the study to thoughtful persons engaged in the business of development, in the hopes that it will provide a base from which a "how-to" manual might eventually become feasible. Specifically, we have prepared this study for managers who have undergone the Agency for International Development's two week course in Project Management. It is part of our promise to provide them with follow-up materials that would assist them in digging more deeply into the subject that is their central professional concern. The study was prepared under the same contract that funded the training itself, and we would appreciate any comments you might have on its usefulness.

Robert W. Iversen
Maxwell Training and Development Programs
Syracuse University

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This bibliography would not have been possible without the support of the following groups and individuals.

At the U.S. Agency for International Development we are indebted to the Professional Services and Career Development Office for financial assistance, and encouragement. We would especially like to thank Daniel Creedon and William Fuller for their continuous support.

At Syracuse University, special thanks goes to Cynthia Schaffhausen who provided much of the initial research, and to Larry Beyna who provided editorial assistance. We would also like to thank Joanne Garfield, Marcia Comstock, and Gloria Katz for their administrative support.

"The great problem, as we understand it, is to make the difficulties of implementation a part of the initial formulation of policy. Implementation must not be conceived as a process that takes place after, and independent of, the design of policy. Means and ends can be brought into somewhat closer correspondence only by making each partially dependent on the other" (Pressman and Wildavsky, 1973, p. 143).

PUBLIC SECTOR IMPLEMENTATION

Introduction

In the past decade the discipline of public administration has witnessed a growing emphasis on the theory and practice of public planning and policy analysis. Implicit in this development appears to have been the assumption that sound plans and policies, that is, those that are well researched and that look workable, will, in fact, lead to the accomplishment of desired objectives. However, the evidence from public administration experience indicates that, in spite of well-laid plans successful implementation is more the exception than the rule.

Increasingly it is recognized that there is more to program and policy success than what has come to be known as "planning" or design. This awareness has generated an ever-greater focus on the area of implementation, or policy execution, in the public administration and management literature. For some, this new focus involves making a clear distinction between planning and implementation; for others, planning and implementation are integrally related, and constantly influence each other. Whatever the orientation, it is clear that scholars and practitioners are paying more attention to what happens in the public sector after the major share of planning has been completed.

What follows is a brief introduction to the process of "implementation" and some of the scholarly contributions in this area. An attempt is made to clarify what is meant by implementation and to highlight certain important factors involved in the public sector implementation process. The implementation studies

reviewed in this report cover both developed and developing country contexts.

The overview section is organized as follows. First, several definitions of implementation are presented. Then, the issues of implementation analysis and participatory planning are discussed. The next section highlights important variables in the implementation process. Finally, organizational capabilities required for successful implementation are reviewed.

We hope this report will give the reader a feel for some of the major issues associated with public sector implementation, and will serve as a guide for further study. To this end, Part I provides a general classification scheme for the implementation literature. In Part II, several Annotated References are provided to highlight the more useful studies. Part III contains a more general Selected Bibliography of implementation studies. Together these should help the reader further his/her knowledge of public sector implementation.

Definitions

An understanding of what implementation is and where it fits in the administrative process requires a clear definition of the term. Central to the several definitions presented below is the idea of an action process directed toward both the execution of policy and goal fulfillment.

Probably the most widely accepted definition of implementation is that of Pressman and Wildavsky, who view it as a process of carrying out, accomplishing, producing, or fulfilling a policy.

Implementation implies a beginning and an end; an action started and a goal which is or is not achieved. Thus, implementation becomes the "interaction between setting of goals and action geared to achieving them" (Pressman and Wildavsky, 1973, p. xv).

Van Meter and Van Horn are concerned with implementation as it relates to goal achievement. They define policy implementation as "those actions by public and private individuals (or groups) that are directed at the achievement of objectives set forth in prior policy decisions," and believe that the study of implementation "examines those factors that contribute to the realization or nonrealization of policy objectives" (Van Meter and Van Horn, 1975, p. 447).

Williams contends that "in its most general form, an inquiry about implementation . . . seeks to determine whether an organization can bring together men and material in a cohesive organizational unit and motivate them in such a way as to carry out the organizations's stated objectives" (Williams, 1975, p. 554).

Levine emphasizes that there is a vital link between implementation and planning. He defines planning as an "advance laying out of a program of actions" with implementation following as the "carrying out of a program of actions" (Levine, 1972, p. 4). Implementation is seen by Levine as an integral part of the planning process; knowledge of implementation is necessary before programs can be effectively planned.

A close relationship between planning and implementation is also noted by Bunker, to whom implementation is basically

action oriented. He points out that implementation has been referred to as: the "application" of policy by Charles Jones; the "execution" of policy by Dror; the "activation" of plans by Gross; and "sanction and control" by Gergen. To Bunker, central to any definition of implementation is the answer to the question: "How are ideas translated into effective collective action?" (Bunker, 1972, p. 72). He sees implementation as "a set of socio-political processes flowing from and anticipated by early phases of policy process. It is the process of moving toward realization of the policy content" (Bunker, 1972, p. 72).

In summary, implementation refers to those actions which are necessitated by policy execution and goal achievement. Moreover, analysis and knowledge of the implementation process is essential in the early planning stages if policies and goals are to be successfully achieved.

Implementation Analysis at the Planning Stage

"Implementation analysis" refers to a technique for considering implementation opportunities and obstacles during the various stages of program or project management. In "Implementation Analysis and Assessment," Williams stresses the importance of such assessment activities as a means of incorporating concern with implementation issues into the planning, implementing and evaluating processes. Allison's article represents part of a larger research strategy aimed at developing an "implementation analysis" methodology. Some key "implementation analysis" tenets are discussed below.

Prospective implementors should be involved in both policy

formulation and in the initial decision-making process. Ensuring their participation at this stage helps to overcome the lack of communication between planners and implementors that often results because each group represents different organizational interests and faces different professional limitations. Furthermore, as a result of their involvement: (a) the administrative staff should become more committed to the project; (b) the organization will be given additional lead time to develop its operating capacity; and (c) the channels of communication for subsequent feedback will be enhanced.

The general disposition of the implementors, in addition to their participation, should be considered both during the planning stage and throughout the process of policy execution. Not only should the prior policy experiences of the implementors be assessed, but their understanding of policy objectives should be ensured during the initial goal definition process (Van Meter and Van Horn, 1975). Policy execution may be unsuccessful if those responsible for operations do not understand their role in the process and the ultimate intent of the program. In this respect it is interesting to note that planners are often thought of as superior to implementors in terms of education and social background. This image is contested, however, by Smith (1973), who finds that implementors and planners are comparable.

Another important variable is the disposition of the implementors toward the particular policy to be implemented, since initial rejection by the implementors of the policy will probably result in the failure of the entire process. Van Meter and

Van Horn cite a number of possible bases for rejection by implementors, such as the threat to the implementor's personal value system, extraorganizational loyalties, sense of self-interest, and existing preferred relationships. All of these should be taken into account beginning at the planning stage.

A final factor which should be assessed during the design stage is the degree of communication between the research community and those involved in the implementation process. Frequently, little use is made of existing implementation knowledge. Thus, "policy analysts have not been able to tell policy makers what actual leverage they have over implementation or how to move in desired directions" (Levine, 1972, p. 36). At present, there are few incentives for such communication, although such increased communication between the research community, planners, and implementors is beneficial to all concerned.

Implementation Variables

Six major variables affecting the implementation process are frequently referred to in the literature. These variables take the form of constraints within which implementors must operate. They also represent factors which can be isolated and acted upon to increase the likelihoods of achieving desired results through the implementation process.

The Environmental Set

The internal and external environments of public sector organizations directly influence the implementation process.

These environmental factors can be viewed as a "constraining corridor through which the implementation of policy must be forced" (Smith, 1973, p. 205). Several questions which can be addressed in considering the economic, social, and political environmental factors include:

1. Are the available economic resources of the area sufficient to support the implementation effort;
2. How and to what degree will the economic and social climate of the area be influenced by implementation of the policy;
3. What partisan support is there for or against the policy; and
4. What is the extent of private interest group mobilization in support of, or in opposition to, the policy (Van Meter and Van Horn, 1975)?

In general, consideration should be given to the political "feasibility" of implementation, to both the official and unofficial leadership, and to the organizational structures.

The Target Population

Planners and implementors must also be knowledgeable about the target population. This is crucial in determining social, cultural, and other constraints which will be placed upon implementation in local areas. Even more important, such knowledge aids in the designing of programs which will be appropriate for the target population and which will help them solve the problems they face (Honadio and Ingle, 1976). Participation by individuals from the target population and information flow

8

among all parties, whether official or unofficial, are vital to this process.

Resources and Actors

Resources and actors are dispersed within the target population, and between the target population and the implementing and funding agencies. This necessitates the identification of leverage points, defined as those areas where interest groups and individuals, internal and external to the implementing organization, will attempt to exercise influence. The following variables can be looked upon as part of a scheme for locating these actors within the implementation process:

1. Issue salience: the centrality or importance of the issue to the actor in question;
2. Power resources: the resources available to the actor (political, financial, etc.); and
3. Agreement: the degree to which the actor is in agreement or disagreement with execution of the policy (Bunker, 1972).

The decision-making structure will also be dispersed and disjointed due to the dispersed nature of resources and actors. Identification of actual decision makers becomes necessary; and there is a greater need for an information system to serve as an interorganizational and intraorganizational linkage, and as a linkage between implementors and target populations. Due to the diverse interests and concerns of various actors, decisions will often evolve from conflict resolution. Psychological field manipulation, adaptive adjustments, bargaining, negotiation,

threats, authoritative control, are cited as means by which actors attempt to influence each other's behavior (Rondinelli, 1976). Decisions made during initial policy formulation by planners and politicians will often be altered by decisions made and carried out by the implementors and other actors within the target environment.

Coalitions

Coalition building is often required due to the large number of actors involved in the implementation process. This includes coalition building within target populations; between target populations and funding sources; and between those directly involved with implementation and all other parties. The necessity for coalitions results from the "fragmentation of authority, organizational complexity, and unequal distribution of power that characterizes decision making" (Rondinelli, 1976, p. 78). Not only may such coalitions differ in size, but they may also shift over time in response to changes in the environment and perceptions of costs and benefits.

Goal Consensus and Modification

Goal consensus and modification is another important factor that requires attention. Unless there is an agreed upon goal, the various parties involved will end up working at cross-purposes. During policy execution, consensus becomes almost impossible to obtain because of radically different perceptions of the goal. Thus, there is a need for goal definition prior to the execution of policy.

As long as all parties have agreed upon the goal, even if their reasons differ, they will have a basis for discussing modification during actual execution. Thus, initial goal definition sets the boundaries within which necessary changes and modifications can be made. It facilitates agreement on legitimate modification of a goal, should this prove necessary. With improved understanding and the potential for flexible action, implementation is more likely to succeed.

Goal definition is also necessary in order to permit evaluation of a program's success or failure. However, initial definition will be subject to modification and should have built-in flexibility. This is especially true as the constraints to implementation are exposed. Goals defined on the federal level (or on any level which is removed from the actual environment within which the program will operate) often exceed the capacity of those individuals and organizations involved in the execution of policy. There remains, therefore, the need for "grass-roots" knowledge on the part of those involved in goal formation at the higher levels, and perhaps, involvement of those affected by the program's implementation in goal formation.

Incentives for Participation

One final variable essential to policy implementation is the incentive(s) for participation both within and outside the implementing organization.

Initiators/funding sources often experience difficulty in determining "proper" incentives and in using those already

available. Furthermore, there is a lack of understanding of local conditions and constraints by the federal sector. It was such a lack of understanding which contributed to the failure of the efforts of the Johnson administration to build new communities on federally owned land in metropolitan areas. The federal sector failed to properly account for the use of its resources (land and aid money) as an incentive mechanism; and local businessmen, for example, did not necessarily welcome the use of the land for the purposes designated by the federal government (Derthick, 1972). Similarly, Pressman and Wildavsky (1973), in their study of the Oakland California Project, cite the difficulty of obtaining local private business support and local interest group cooperation.

Of related interest are the "system's" incentives against concern for implementation (as opposed to concern for policy making) vis-a-vis major actors, such as the President, Congressmen, and top executives (Hargrove, 1975). It is politically more advantageous for major actors to be involved in the "grand design," which can be more innovative, optimistic, and altruistic than in the actual implementation of that design. Furthermore, they work under time constraints and limited terms of office and often cannot be involved in following through on a policy or in assessing the policy's impact. Finally, Congressmen, state legislators, etc., are often concerned only with the implementation of those programs which directly affect their constituencies.

Levine (1972) suggests that the development of a system

of "bureaucratic competition," similar to the economic "market mechanism," would enable decentralized forces to work toward a common objective, and would act as an incentive for the improvement of the implementation process.

Another method of improving incentives is "reciprocal exchange." Through a process of manipulation and conflict resolution leading to "mutually beneficial objectives," cooperation is obtained from participants when they gain benefits which are greater than their costs--a net "incentive" or a "profit." A system of rewards evolves which "stimulates behavior patterns, induces desired activities, and increases the probability of future interaction and cooperation" (Rondinelli, 1975, p. 197).

Organizational Capabilities

In addition to analyzing such variables as environmental set, target population, and resources and actors, it is also necessary to determine whether the individual organization is capable of undertaking the implementation of a plan or policy. In general, the capacity of an organization to execute policy is dependent upon the degree to which the implementing organization:

1. Has reached a consensual understanding of the task;
2. Has been appropriately "differentiated into parts related to its pertinent sub-environments";
3. Possesses an integrated information system;
4. Can make effective use of conflict management techniques;

5. Can make corrective changes in its performance; and
6. Is able to obtain knowledge about that performance.

An assessment of organizational capabilities should also determine whether or not the technical expertise required for the task, and whether adequate financial resources are available. More specifically, five administrative necessities are defined below.

These include:

1. Delineation of operational sub-goals;
2. Definition of necessary skills and role performance;
3. Establishment of standards for recruitment or internal development of those skills;
4. Definition of control "structures and procedures"; and
5. Priority selection between population targets and problems (Bunker, 1972, pp. 73, 75).

Additional factors for consideration are: (a) a "stable" organizational structure and "qualified" personnel; (b) leadership style appropriate to the organization; and (c) the implementing "program" and "capacity," which refers to the intensity with which the organization prepares for implementation and the capacity of the organization to meet the goals of the program (Smith, 1973).

Consideration of the organizational control system is especially important for maintaining an organization's capacity for implementation. This involves the process of getting work done in compliance with organizational rules and procedures. It assures that resources are obtained and used effectively and efficiently in the accomplishment of objectives (Van Meter and

Van Horn, 1975). In effect, the control system works to assure that the other implementing capabilities of the organization are in order.

An effective organizational information system is required to facilitate the information flow from subordinates to superiors and vice-versa. Lower-level participants in the organization are often those directly concerned with the operational problems of implementation. This necessitates superiors' knowledge of what lower-level personnel are doing. In the past, responsibility was frequently passed down the organization leaving no one definitely accountable. With an effective information system, responsibility for implementation can be shifted to lower-level personnel with top management being kept abreast of important activities. The information system also facilitates information flow between public and private organizations involved in implementation, and between organizations and their respective environments. Such a system is not only a tool for more effective management, but also a device which helps to delineate responsibility, authority, and accountability.

Another factor imperative for successful implementation is a capability for flexibility and change. Van Meter and Van Horn (1975) classify policies according to the amount of organizational change required, with those requiring a greater degree of change being more difficult to implement. Several factors which contribute to resistance to change are: resource limitations, sunk costs, collective benefits of stability, psychic costs, and official and unofficial constraints (Kaufman, 1971). It is necessary for the

organization to be flexible in order to operate in a changing environment. As goals change during implementation, the organization must be prepared to respond to those goal modifications. Thus, the consciousness of top management of the need for modification during implementation is often critical to the success of implementation activities.

Conclusion

This paper has presented a brief overview of the implementation literature, and of some of the important considerations in the implementation process. The focus has been primarily on the linkage between policy planning and execution in order to highlight some of the major factors which come into play during implementation. Throughout, implementation has been presented as a dynamic, ongoing action process which begins at the initial design stage and continues throughout the life of a program. Initial implementation analysis is necessary but not adequate. It is also essential for the public manager to remain alert and sensitive to the problems that may be encountered during the execution stage, and be flexible enough to make the necessary changes.

As will be evident from the bibliography presented below, much of the literature in this area deals with case studies or with the need for incorporating implementation analysis into the policy process. Currently, implementation analysis is in its formative stage and most of that being done is on an intuitive level. Thus, much remains to be learned about the dynamics of the

implementation process and the factors which impact on it.
Hopefully, researchers and practitioners will devote more time to
the study of this important policy process.

PART I: INDEX TO THE IMPLEMENTATION LITERATURE

In order to assist the reader in his/her study of implementation, Part I provides a classification scheme which categorizes the literature according to pertinent data. This scheme is divided into four major categories as explained below.

The first category is geographical area which indicates whether the work deals with a particular country, a region, or a group of countries. The term "general" is used if the work has no geographical focus, or deals with a diversity of countries. The second is the context which identifies the level of government --national, regional, state, local--referred to in the entry or shows if the work refers primarily to the internal operations of organizations. The third category gives the primary focus of each work. A few key words are provided to give the reader a general idea of entry content. Many of the works contain additional implementation information which may be of interest to the reader. The final category, theoretical/empirical, differentiates between those works which are basically theoretical in nature and those which make extensive use of examples or case studies.

Asterics (*) are used to designate references for which annotated entries are included in Part II. Annotations have been completed for the more useful implementation references. These entries vary greatly in length and depth of summarization for several reasons. First, the books and articles vary in the extent to which they deal with implementation and related issues. Secondly, the works of some authors are simply easier to summarize than others. Books and other rather lengthy works tend to

receive the most shallow treatment, but even here, the focus is usually only on relevant chapters and sections, rather than on entire works. Part III contains a more complete, but by no means exhaustive, list of recent implementation references.

This classification scheme and the bibliographies which follow were designed primarily to be informative, and it is hoped that they will orient the reader to relevant implementation sources.

Index to the Implementation Literature

Reference ¹	Geographical Area ²	Context ³	Primary Focus	Theoretical/ Empirical ⁴
1. Agarwal *	India	N	Financial Planning	T,E
2. Allensworth	USA	N	Policy Planning	T,E
3. Allison *	USA	S	Health Policy Planning	T,E
4. Anderson *	USA	N	Social, Regulatory, and Foreign Policy Compliance	E
5. Anthony	USA	N,O	Budgetary Planning and Control	T
6. Archibald	General	O	Policy Planning	T
7. Bailey et al.	USA	N,S,L	Educational Planning and Control	T,E
8. Barkdoll	USA	N,O	Budgetary and Operational Planning	E
9. Baum	General	O	Judicial Policy Compliance and Control	T

¹An asterisk (*) = entries in the bibliography for which there are abstracts included.

²LDC = Less Developed Countries. This descriptor is used when the entry deals with less developed countries, but not with any specific one, or with too many to list in this index; General = those entries for which there is no specific geographical focus, or too many countries to list in this index.

³N = National (Central) Government; S = State (Provincial) Government; L = Local Government; R = Regional Focus; O = Organizational Focus; General = those entries for which no specific context is given.

⁴T = Theoretical; E = Empirical

Index Continued

Reference ¹	Geographical Area ²	Context ³	Primary Focus	Theoretical/ Empirical ⁴
10. Bunker	General	N,R,L,O	Policy Planning and Integration	T
11. Caiden et al.	LDC	N	Financial and Budgetary Planning	T,E
12. Chambers*	East Africa	N,L-Rural	Development Project Management and Planning	T
13. Churchman et al.	General	O	Operations Research Planning, Personnel	T
14. Cleaves*	Chile	N	Financial Planning and Control	E
15. De*	India	N	Financial Planning and Personnel	T
16. Derthick	USA	N,S,L	Financial Integration	E
17. Derthick	USA	N,S,L	Policy Planning and Integration	E
18. Dubhashi	India	N	Financial Planning	T
19. Dye	USA	N	Social Policy Planning	T,E
20. Fried*	USA	N,S,L	Policy Planning	T
21. Gant	LDC	N,L	General Management, Personnel	T
22. Gortner	USA	N,S,L,O	General Administration	T
23. Gross et al.*	USA	L,O	Educational and Organizational Change	T,E
24. Hargrove*	General	General	Policy Planning	T
25. Hargrove*	USA	O	Social Policy Planning	T
26. Harper et al.	USA	N,O	Budgetary Planning	E

Index Continued

Reference ¹	Geographical Area ²	Context ³	Primary Focus	Theoretical/ Empirical ⁴
27. Hodgetts* et al.	USA	N,S,L,O	Policy and Operational Planning and Control	T,E
28. Honadle et al.*	LDC	O-Rural	Development Project Management	T,E
29. Hood	General	O	General Administration	T
30. Hood*	Great Britain	N,O	Policy Planning and Control, General Administration	T,E
31. Huysmans	General	O	Operations Research Planning and Control	T,E,
32. Jain*	India	N	Financial Planning	T,E
33. Jones	USA	N,S,L	Policy Planning	T,E,
34. Kaufman	USA	N,S,L,O	Operational Control, Personnel	T, E
35. Kaul	India	N	Financial Planning	T,E
36. Levine*	USA	N,O	Policy Planning	T,E,
37. Levy	USA	N,S,O	Social Policy Planning	E
38. Malhotra	Nepal	N	Operational Planning	T,E,
39. Meltzner*	USA	N,S,L	Policy Planning	T,E,
40. Meltzner	General	General	Policy Planning	T
41. Moyhian	USA	N,S,L	Social Policy Planning, Participation	T,E,
42. Murphy	USA	N,S,L	Educational Planning and Integration	E

Index Continued

Reference ¹	Geographical Area ²	Context ³	Primary Focus	Theoretical/ Empirical ⁴
43. Panandiker	India	N	Financial Planning and General Administration	T,E
44. Pressman et al.	USA	N,L	Policy Planning and Integration	T,E
45. Quade [*]	USA	O	Policy Planning	T
46. Rabinovitz et al.	USA	N,S,L,O	Services, Social, and Financial Policy Compliance and Control	T,E
47. Ripley et al.	USA	N,S,L	Social Policy Planning	E
48. Rivlin	USA	N,S,L	Services and Social Policy Planning	T,E
49. Rondinelli	General	General	Policy Planning	T
50. Rondinelli	USA	R, L-Urban, O	Development Planning	T,E
51. Sharkansky et al.	USA	N	Policy Planning	T,E
52. Smith [*]	General	General	General Process	T
53. Smith [*]	New Zealand	N,O	Policy Planning	T,E
54. Stillman	USA	N,S,L,O	Policy Planning, General Administration	T,E
55. Sverdlov [*]	LDC	N	Financial Planning	T
56. Van Gigh	General	O	Organizational Change, General Systems	T
57. Van Gunsteren	Netherlands, USA	N,O	Policy Planning and Control	T,E
58. Van Meter, et al.	General	N,S,L	Services Planning and Integration	T

Index Continued

Reference ¹	Geographical Area ²	Context ³	Primary Focus	Theoretical/ Empirical ⁴
59. Van Meter et al.*	USA	N,S,L,O	Policy Planning, General Process	T
60. Wildavsky*	Nepal	N	Financial Planning	E
61. Williams*	General	O	Policy Planning, General Process	T
62. Young	General	L-Urban, O	Services Planning and Control	T

PART II: ANNOTATED IMPLEMENTATION REFERENCES

Agarwal, P. P. "Some Aspects of Plan Implementation." Indian Journal of Public Administration 19 (January-March 1973): 16-25.

Agarwal notes that effective implementation really begins at the formulation stage when various decision-making groups in the public and private sectors come together for the planning process. He stresses the use of systems analysis and the need for flexibility throughout the implementation process.

He sees a close on-going relationship between a nation's development plan and how that plan is implemented. "A social and economic development plan, by definition is the blue-print of a dynamic process. Unless the implementation takes cognizance of the dynamic character of the plans and programmes and unless these are managed according to the twin principles of efficiency and justice, there is every likelihood of a 'gap' arising between the plans and their implementation. The need of the day is to eliminate this gap."

With implementation in mind, he suggests the following guidelines for future plan adoption:

- a. Careful planning: initial time spent on analysis and feasibility studies will save time later; details must not be overlooked, and the importance of time and scheduling must be stressed
- b. Careful scheduling of the amounts and times of arrival of personnel and equipment
- c. Appropriate delegation of responsibility to those with the requisite skills and abilities
- d. Realistic use of funds for projects and programmes (flexible)
- e. Cost consciousness at all levels
- f. Participation and acceptance of new modes by the people.

Allison, Graham T. "Implementation Analysis: 'The Missing Chapter' in Conventional Analysis. A Teaching Exercise," in R. E. Zeckhauser, et al, (eds.). Benefit-Cost and Policy Analysis 1974. Chicago: Aldine, 1975, 369-391.

In this article Allison reports on a teaching exercise used at Harvard University. It represents part of a larger research strategy aimed at developing a methodology for "implementation

analysis." The following four propositions make up the argument the work is developing:

1. Implementation is a very large part of most public policy problems--in some cases 90% of the problem, and in some cases 10%, about half on average
2. Current policy analysis, both in its more formal and its more informal modes, pays minimal attention to implementation
3. Therefore, implementation should be a major focus of research aimed at developing methods for analysis that incorporate careful examination of obstacles and opportunities in implementation
4. While the tools currently available for implementation analysis are rudimentary, there do exist guidelines that offer prospects of substantial improvements in estimates of costs and benefits of policy alternatives and increased likelihoods of achieving desired results in the implementation process.

The article illustrates the argument concretely by the example of an actual historical example. This is aimed at two basic efforts:

"First, to develop a replicable methodology, beginning with a checklist or recipe, by which analysts can address implementation problems before a policy decision is made and build consideration of implementation obstacles into the comparison of alternatives presented to decision makers;

Second, to develop guidelines by which analysts can design plans for decision and action that increase the prospects of successful implementation."

He uses as an historical case study an issue in January 1969 when Governor Francis Sargent of Massachusetts had to decide whether to approve plans for construction of a state medical school in Massachusetts. The exercise casts the student as the new staffer to the Lt. Governor who has just received a formal analysis of the problem. He/she must read and analyze the document and recommend a course of action.

Allison describes the exercise and the initial check lists used for doing implementation estimates and plans. He describes three different sets of notes. Under "The Logic of Conventional Analysis" there is a brief check list for traditional cost-benefit analysis. "Implementation Estimates" focus on guidelines for forecasting the capabilities, interests, and incentives of organizations to implement each alternative analyzed by cost-benefit analysis, and for adjusting estimated costs and benefits in this light. He identifies a further set of considerations under

"Implementation Plans." This includes (a) assessment of the decision-maker's prospects to obtain alternatives and (b) design of tactics to pursue preferred alternatives through successive stages of decision and implementation.

At the end of the article Allison summarizes the common pitfalls in these different areas:

1. Logic of Analysis

- a. Misstate the problem or neglect some important objective
- b. Omit alternatives
- c. Neglect or misstate important categories of costs or benefits
- d. Invoke dubious facts or assumptions
- e. Muffle uncertainties
- f. Fail to highlight key findings
- g. Make unsupported recommendations

2. Implementation Estimate

- a. Miss organizational and political factors in implementation
- b. Fail to adjust estimated costs and benefits in the light of these operational factors

3. Implementation Strategy

- a. Neglect important groups and individuals who have taken stands on the issue and will have an impact on the resolution
- b. Miss decision-maker's problem, opportunity costs, and deadlines
- c. Fail to state real alternatives that identify who must do what and how
- d. Forget consequences of failure.

Anderson, James E., ed. Cases in Public Policy-Making. New York: Praeger, 1976.

The book gives a comprehensive look at policy-making as it is organized according to the steps in the public-policy process: agenda-building, policy formulation, policy adoption, implementation and evaluation. In Part Four, Anderson addresses the problems of implementing policy and he notes that the vagueness of legislation imparts substantial discretionary powers to implementing bodies.

Three case studies are presented which deal with different sets of concerns during the implementation phase. Harlan Blake's article deals with the ITT case of the early 1970's and

illustrates how political factors may affect the course of anti-trust enforcement. Morton Halperin discusses some of the problems connected with the implementation of presidential decisions and some of the means by which subordinates and officials may resist them (internal considerations). And finally, Rodgers and Bullock discuss the factors affecting compliance of citizens and officials with public policy, using the case of civil rights (external considerations).

Chambers, Robert. Managing Rural Development: Ideas and Experiences from East Africa. New York: Africana Publishing Co., 1974.

It is argued in this volume that the current (since mid-1960) rural development policies tend to be altered in implementation so that they disproportionately benefit those who are already better off. The main objective of the book is to develop management procedures to correct these imbalances by securing better performance from government staff in rural development. Ideas and experiences are drawn mainly from East Africa.

He describes various categories of rural development initiatives that have been in vogue and then states his own preference: improved management procedures for improved development--from urban bias to rural; from plan formulation and budgeting to programming, implementation and monitoring; and from authoritarianism to democratic management of field staff. Areas of activity are identified for which management procedures are proposed in subsequent chapters. He deals with such problems as program implementation, performance of lower-echelon field staff, and participation of people and government staff at the local level. Chambers suggests some kind of procedural-reform strategy for improved results in rural development.

Chapter Five is likely to be most useful for the development planner. It underscores the need for "practical" planning models, simple functional evaluation systems, and more realistic agricultural research. Much agricultural research is identified as "inbred, inward looking," and parochial, resulting in a gap between research findings and the farmer. Government policies tend to encourage "perfectionist" research and overcollection of data, most of it unusable and leading only to unrealistic action proposals. Given the importance of their activities, planners' time has high opportunity cost and should be treated as a scarce resource.

To combat these tendencies, Chambers suggests a series of shifts in focus and priority in research and planning, namely from complex to "quick-dirty surveys"; from maximization to optimization of returns; and from abstract rational planning to "progressive plan management." These shifts should be accompanied by a "well-designed management system" with clearly defined procedures directed toward supervision, work planning, implementation, staff

evaluation and progress review. (From a review by Avtar Singh in "Books in Review," International Development Review 2 [1976]:19-20, ed. Charles W. Hultman.)

Cleaves, Peter S. Bureaucratic Politics and Administration in Chile. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.

Using the following two questions as central themes--What elements internal to an organization explain administrative behavior, and what is the relationship between changes in an agency's setting and its internal operations? --Cleaves examines how organizations can be controlled, reinforced, or enervated for the implementation or thwarting of public policy. He begins with a consideration of generic features of organizations and goes on to a series of case studies from Chile that generate propositions of comparative applicability.

In the case studies, he shows how Chilean public agencies compete over scarce resources and often take advantage of supportive outside groups to maintain or increase their operating capacity. The political tactics and strategies used by clients and public agencies to gain an upper hand in the bureaucracy have important effects on planning, budgeting, and implementation of those policies.

De, Nitish R. "Public Administration and Plan Implementation." Indian Journal of Public Administration 20 (October-December 1974):701-722.

The article is divided into two parts: the first part deals with an assessment of the current status of Indian public administration in relation to the problems of implementation of the Fifth Plan; the second part deals with certain parameters of action to bring about changes in the system which are concomitant with some of the issues discussed in the first part.

De perceives planning and policy implementation as an on-going process and not as discrete elements. He maintains a premise that the integration of various complex socio-economic and political variables is not only a matter of technology of administration but also a matter of management of attitude, values, and authentic behavior. In the second part of the article he stresses that the following needs must be attended to: elitist bias towards non-productive culture and a propensity towards "welfare bureaucracy"; elitist attitudes and prejudices against the poor which makes the administrating machinery distinctly insensitive to public needs and even hostile to public criticism; and an elitist bias for the profit motive.

Any action plan must be devoted to the following considerations. The various ministries and their counterparts in the states should be required to examine rules and procedures and systems of work. There is a need to resolve the controversy

between specialists and generalists. Performance orientation calls for a major revision of the roles of those agencies responsible for audits, evaluations, etc. A debureaucratization of the administrative culture will call for planned recycling of public administrators between field assignments and office work.

He stresses that a dialogical relationship must be developed between the administrators and the people. This must not be on the basis of manipulation, but a genuine desire to involve and get involved. Participation is seen as smoothing out and speeding up the implementation process, whereas a manipulative process involves developing a time-consuming manipulative implementation process. With the mobilization of popular support as a resource to plan implementation, a newer variety of organizational design will have to be conceived. There will evolve certain primary activities on which the program of plan implementation will depend heavily. Finally, he notes that elites will have to cultivate values of self-awareness, etc., in order to meet these growing needs for successful implementation.

Fried, Robert C. Performance in American Bureaucracy. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1976.

Essentially an introductory text to the study of American public administration, the basic assumption in the book is "that 'policy implementation' counts; that the 'output linkages' between citizens and government, 'after' policies have been determined, are as important in determining the quality of American government as the 'input linkages'" Fried focuses explicitly on system performance, and includes in the concept of performance not only effectiveness, but also responsiveness and due process. In Part Three he deals with environmental and contextual variables which affect implementation, and in Part Four, he focuses on internal variables important to the process.

Gross, Neal, Joseph B. Giacchino, and Marilyn Bernstein. Implementing Organizational Innovations: A Sociological Analysis of Planned Educational Change. New York: Basic Books, 1971.

The authors set out to examine the circumstances and conditions facilitating and blocking implementation of innovations in educational and other organizations. They disagree with the explanation that the success or failure of planned organizational change will rely basically on the ability of management or a change agent to overcome members' "initial" resistance to change.

They note three important general interrelated conditions: "(1) Organizational members who are not resistant to change or whom initial resistance to it has been overcome may encounter obstacles in their efforts to implement an innovation which, if not removed, may make it impossible for them to carry it out. (2) Individuals in organizations are in large part dependent upon

their formal leaders to overcome these obstacles and they may not remove, or even be aware of these constraints. (3) Members who are initially favorable toward organizational change may later develop a negative orientation to an innovation, and therefore be unwilling to implement it as a consequence of the barriers and frustrations they have encountered in attempting to carry it out.

After testing their hypothesis in a case study they point out the importance of the following: clarity of an innovation to organizational members; capability of members of an organization to implement an innovation; availability of necessary materials and equipment; and compatibility of organizational structures.

Although this book deals more specifically with implementing organizational change, it contains some important considerations for the more general problems of implementation.

Hargrove, Ervin C. "Implementation." Policy Studies Journal 5 (Autumn 1976):9-14.

Hargrove gives a brief overview of implementation considerations and describes in turn its use by three different research communities: political scientists who find the complex political process of public programs of interest; public policy faculties who are interested in developing methodologies by means of which policy analysts can make "implementation estimates" of the institutional and political consequences of structuring programs in given ways; and researchers (mostly political scientists) interested in the operation of specific public programs who hope that by studying specific cases they can prescribe program improvement and invent new approaches to the problems at hand. He views these approaches as complementary and discusses some ways in which they might be integrated. He sees coordination as a problem that would go beyond any single approach.

. The Missing Link: The Study of the Implementation of Social Policy. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, July 1975.

Hargrove's essay focuses upon the need to increase utilization of research knowledge of implementation in policy and program development. A gap exists, Hargrove contends, between policy makers and program managers and the research community. The analyst, if he were to pursue an active role, has the potential to close that gap. Hargrove cautions, however, against the analyst as an active change agent involved in the actual implementation process. This role is best left to the politicians and civil servants. Instead, the analyst is to question, to propose different courses of action, and to present different perspectives.

In preparation for such a role, those involved in policy

analysis, policy research, and social science research must give greater attention to the problems of implementation. Hargrove states that social science researchers might consider the politics of program implementation, the functioning of the organization, the performance of professionals, and the relationship between citizens and government. Policy analysts and researchers might investigate the possibility of expanding cost-benefit analysis within the discipline of political economy to include proposals of alternative structures for programs and assessment of the feasibility of different means to the goal; examine problems of program administration citing weaknesses and possible solutions; focus upon and analyze specific problems occurring during implementation.

If such theoretical knowledge can be generated, models built, and variables defined, etc., Hargrove cautions that the current system of government may still not be willing to utilize such knowledge. Actors (the President, Congressmen, Department Executives, etc.) in the system, due to the nature of their roles, have little interest in implementation. The question, therefore, becomes one not only of increasing communication between disciplines, but of providing incentives to those actually involved in and responsible for implementation processes to turn their attention to problems of those processes.

Hodgetts, Richard M. and Max S. Wortman, Jr. Administrative Policy: Test and Cases in the Policy Sciences. New York: Wiley, 1975.

The book contains a collection of case studies from business, government, and nonprofit organizations. The authors integrate management science with the policy sciences in order to develop a new conceptual framework for administration. The chapters on "Analysis and Formulation of Organizational Strategy," "Implementation of Organizational Strategy," and "Interpretation and Evaluation of Organization Strategy" are particularly useful for a systematic view of the integration between policy planning and implementation.

Honadle, George and Mar-us Ingle. Project Management for Rural Equality. Syracuse, New York: A

This is a study of the potential role of organization design in Rural Development Administration. The study is intended to assist development managers identify project-related distributive impact and design project organizations which facilitate more favorable benefit distribution. Information, organization, systems, and cybernetic theories are used to isolate significant organizational variables which are then related to project benefit distribution in an empirical study of fifty subprojects in Africa and Latin America. The findings are:

(a) an information-sharing perspective can be applied to rural development projects; (b) information-sharing among subprojects is significantly associated with project-related benefit distribution patterns; (c) the organizational dimension of rural development projects should receive priority attention from those who design and manage projects intended to promote rural equality. Guidelines are then developed to improve project organization design and those guidelines are applied to the design of a rural development project in West Africa. The guidelines are judged useful for choosing appropriate organizational relationships and for identifying data needs to specify organizational factors affecting benefit distribution in particular situations. The study also examines the definition and measurement of benefit distribution, the development and use of heuristic design techniques, and the design of project management information systems to monitor distributive impact.

The report is presented in two volumes. Volume I contains a research summary and the action guidelines. Volume II contains eight annexes which detail the theoretical, empirical and case studies.

Hood, Christopher C. The Limits of Administration. New York: Wiley, 1976.

Hood set out to do basically two things in this book: he shows how administrative analysis can contribute to policy studies; and he discusses the deficiencies in public administration theory itself. He identifies some of the difficulties involved in identifying administrative limits in the policy process and shows some of the types of administrative limits which are revealed by relaxing the conditions of the "perfect model" which he develops. He examines separately, problems of categorization, adaptation, and control, and with the use of case studies he demonstrates these internal administrative limits to policy implementation.

Jain, R.B. Contemporary Issues in Indian Administration. New Delhi: Vishal Publications, 1976.

Jain gives an overview of present-day Indian administration and some of the problems which must be addressed. Chapter Eight, "The Administration of Planning: Unrealistic Targets and Unfulfilled Hopes," contains a discussion of the necessary integration of economic policy planning and implementation. He stresses the need to reorganize planning and initiative at each point in the implementation process.

Levine, Robert A. Public Planning: Failure and Redirection. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Levine advocates the redirection of planning toward consideration of the organizational and political constraints

which hinder achievement of proposed changes. Planning, as a normative and nonconservative discipline, must examine the causes behind the failure of public programs to achieve their expected objectives: such failure is often the result of the conservative organizational system rejecting programs which require innovation.

Levine turns to the establishment of an adequate incentive system within public bureaucracies as a means of inducing change: organizational incentives are necessary to translate policies into action. Market techniques are cited as possible sources of incentives (e.g., increased bureaucratic competition), and are favorable. The market system, Levine notes, differs from the currently favored "highly administered system" by which policy is translated into operation. That administered system provides for the detailed application of policy, in a case-by-case approach, to the target population. Using examples of U.S. domestic and military policy, Levine contends that such application of policy is bound to fail: the "clientele" will not accept the policies imposed upon them by the officials. The market system, however, has the advantages of being:

1. Decentralized
2. Self-administering: major actors make their own decisions
3. Unplanned: not previously determined by an external authority
4. Capable of providing for gross application of policy rather than a case-by-case application
5. Self-motivating by the economic self-interests of the major actors.

Whether or not one believes in the market system as a possible source of incentives depends, of course, on the acceptance of Levine's market characteristics as advantageous and operational.

Meltaner, Arnold J. Policy Analysts in the Bureaucracy. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.

Meltaner describes and analyzes the work of policy analysts in the public sector. Although this is basically a book about how policy is made, he stresses the vital link between planning and implementation considerations. Chapter Three, "Problem Selection," and Chapter Eight, "Predicaments" are most useful.

Pressman, Jeffrey L. and Aaron B. Wildavsky. Implementation. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.

Pressman and Wildavsky view implementation as a "process of interaction between the setting of goals and actions geared to

achieving them." In their study of the Oakland Project they point out the important linkage between planning and implementation. They note that the study of implementation requires the understanding that an apparently simple sequence of events depends on complex chains of reciprocal interactions. Thus, each part of the chain must be built with the others in view. "The separation of policy design from implementation is fatal."

To close the gap between expectations and performance they suggest: reducing the complexity of the process by reducing the number of actors and steps in the process, paying as much attention to the creation of organizational machinery for executing a program as for launching one, and better calculation and understanding of the incentives of the major actors and the decision points where differences will have to be resolved.

Quade, E.S. Analysis for Public Decisions. New York: American Elsevier, 1975.

The book is a survey of the nature, aims, limitations, and benefits of policy analysis and related aids to decision making. Quade attempts to suggest alternatives to traditional methods of decision making with an emphasis on the public policy area.

In Chapter Seventeen, "Acceptance and Implementation," he divides policy analysis into three stages: discovery--attempting to find an alternative that is satisfactory and best among those that are feasible; acceptance--getting the finding accepted and incorporated into a policy or decision; and implementation--seeing that the policy or decision that is adopted is carried out without being changed so much that it is no longer satisfactory. He gives an overview of implementation by discussing the works of Pressman and Wildavsky, Smith, and Archibald. He stresses the importance of implementation analysis as the sort of thing that can only be analyzed through judgement and intuition.

Smith, Thomas B. "The Policy Implementation Process." Policy Sciences 4 (1975):197-209.

Smith contests the implicit assumption in many models that "once a policy has been made by a government, the policy will be implemented and the desired results of the policy will be near those expected by the policy makers." That assumption cannot hold true if a society does not possess the necessary political and organizational conditions for successful implementation. Smith finds such conditions especially lacking in Third World nations, while the West supposedly possesses the bureaucratic capabilities to implement policy. Smith's faith in the efficiency and effectiveness of Western bureaucracy has been criticized as premature: without clear definitions of the variables involved in the implementation process, it is difficult to assess which are the most important conditions under which a policy may be effectively implemented.

Smith constructs a model in an attempt to clarify the implementation process for policy makers. Within that model, policies are seen to generate tensions when actualization is attempted: tension is experienced both by those implementing the policy and by those experiencing the impact of that implementation. Four components are identified within the process: the idealized policy; the implementing organization; the target group; and the environmental factors in the process. Tensions occur within and between these four components at the individual, group and/or structural levels.

Smith, Thomas B. "Policy Roles: An Analysis of Policy Formulators and Policy Implementors." Policy Sciences 4 (1973): 297-307.

Smith questions the assumption that formulators of policy differ from implementors in terms of social background education, career expectations, job satisfaction, etc. He utilizes a sample of 119 New Zealand mid-level civil servants as a basis of comparison. Unfortunately, the ability to draw general conclusions from the study is reduced due to the sample size.

Smith concludes that there is no substantial difference between those serving in the different roles. He hopes that this will negate the contention that policy formulators must be members of a distinct elite with a higher degree of education than implementors. The study may be valuable as a point of departure for future consideration of the personalities of those involved in implementation (e.g., for consideration of Van Meter's variable of the "disposition of implementors").

Sverdlov, Irving. The Public Administration of Economic Development. New York: Praeger, 1975.

Sverdlov focuses on public administration within the context of planning for economic development and looks at how the activities of government can expedite or slow down the process of economic development. He notes the importance of implementation analysis during the decision-making stage and the importance of assessing the appropriateness and capability of the implementing organization. Evaluation and control are stressed so that policies can be reshaped during the implementation process. See especially the chapters on "Planning Operations," "The Process of Public Administration," and "Implementing Economic Policies."

Van Meter, Donald S. and Carl E. Van Horn. "The Implementation of Intergovernmental Policy." In C.O. Jones and R.D. Thomas, eds., Public Policy Making in a Federal System (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1976).

After a brief discussion of the study of intergovernmental relations and of policy implementation, the authors outline a descriptive, heuristic model of intergovernmental policy

implementation. Six sets of variables that influence implementation efforts to achieve local program performance are inter-related in Van Meter and Van Horn's model: policy resources, policy standards, communications, enforcement, dispositions of implementors, and economic and social conditions. The attempt is made here to integrate three, hitherto separately analyzed, explanations for unsuccessful implementation into a comprehensive view of the implementation process. Implementation fails because implementors do not know what to do (communications problem), do not have the capacity to do what is required (capability problem), and/or refuse to do what they are expected (dispositional problem).

Although the model offered here is presented in the context of U.S. federal intergovernmental relations, it might be a useful one for examining the problems of central policy-making/local policy-implementing relationships in a deconcentrated system, or, for that matter, those of policy implementation under any decentralized arrangement.

Van Meter, Donald S. and Carl E. Van Horn. "The Policy Implementation Process: A Conceptual Framework." Administration and Society 6 (February 1975):445-488.

Policy implementation is defined as encompassing those actions by public and private individuals (or groups) that are directed at the achievement of objectives set forth in prior policy decisions. The authors note that little is known of policy implementation and that there has been no theoretical framework within which it could be examined. They propose a framework guided by three areas of literature: organization theory, the impact of public policy, and studies of intergovernmental relations. According to Van Meter and Van Horn, policy implementation will be most successful where only marginal change is required and goal consensus is high. It will be least successful where major change is required and goal consensus is low. Six variables are posited as affecting the linkage between policy and performance: standards and objectives; resources; interorganizational communication and enforcement activities; characteristics of the implementing agencies; economic, social and political conditions; and the disposition of implementors. Several relationships among these variables are hypothesized. The model is relevant to the three general explanations for unsuccessful implementation: communications problems, a capability problem, or dispositional conflicts.

Wildavsky, Aaron. "Why Planning Fails in Nepal." Administrative Science Quarterly 17 (December 1972):508-528.

Wildavsky explores some of the reasons for the failure to get comprehensive plans accepted and implemented in Nepal. He discusses each of the following and shows how they contribute to plan failure: insufficient information, few and poor project proposals, inability to program foreign aid, opposition of the

finance ministry, and a severely limited technical capacity to administer development. He views comprehensive planning unfavorably and would put more emphasis on project analysis, selection, implementation and evaluation. This approach is seen as more flexible and realistic and allows the actors to deal with concerns as they are encountered.

Williams, Walter. "Implementation Analysis and Assessment."
Policy Analysis, Summer 1975, pp. 531-566.

Williams defines implementation as the "stage between a decision and operation." It begins with "the development of program guidelines or design specification; moves to . . . lengthy stage of trying to work through a myriad of technological, administrative, staff and institutional problems that confront a new activity . . . [and] ends when the experiment is deemed ready to test or when the nonexperimental activity is judged fully operational."

Four assessment activities are stressed: implementation analysis; specification assessment; intermediate implementation assessment; and final implementation assessment. Implementation analysis must be performed before a decision is made: staff, organizational, and managerial capabilities must be assessed in relation to the proposed policy alternatives in the actual bureaucratic political setting; a determination must be made of the "clarity, precision, and reasonableness" of the preliminary policy specifications. Specification is seen as the link between theory and action. It entails examination of: what is to be done, how it will be done, what changes are required from the organizations involved, and what specific, measurable objectives are to be considered.

Williams stresses the critical role of top management in the improvement of policy execution. Management must move toward institutionalization of implementation as a "critical part of programmatic activity." His technique of "implementation analysis" serves as a means of incorporating concern with implementation problems into the planning/implementing/evaluating process.

PART III: SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Agarwal, P.P. "Some Aspects of Plan Implementation." Indian Journal of Public Administration 19 (January-March 1973): 16-25.
2. Allensworth, Donald T. Public Administration: The Execution of Public Policy. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1973.
3. Allison, Graham T. "Implementation Analysis: 'The Missing Chapter' in Conventional Analysis. A Teaching Exercise." In R.E. Zeckhauser et al., eds., Benefit-Cost and Policy Analysis 1974 (Chicago: Aldine, 1975), pp. 369-391.
4. Anderson, James E., ed. Cases in Public Policy-Making. New York: Praeger, 1976.
5. Anthony, Robert N. "Closing the Loop Between Planning and Performance." Public Administration Review, May-June 1971, pp. 388-398.
6. Archibald, K.A. "Three Views of the Expert's Role in Policy-Making: Systems Analysis, Incrementalism and the Clinical Approach." Policy Sciences 1 (Spring 1970):73-86.
7. Bailey, Stephen K. and Edith Mosher. ESEA: The Office of Education - Administers a Law. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1968.
8. Barkdoll, Gerald. "Making Planning Relevant to Public Agency Management." Long Range Planning, February 1976, pp. 59-65.
9. Baum, Lawrence. "Implementation of Judicial Decisions: An Organizational Analysis." American Politics Quarterly 4 (1976):86-114.
10. Bunker, Douglas R. "Policy Sciences Perspectives on Implementation Processes." Policy Sciences 3 (March 1972):71-80.
11. Caiden, Naomi and Aaron Wildavsky. Planning and Budgeting in Poor Countries. New York: Wiley, 1974.
12. Chambers, Robert. Managing Rural Development: Ideas and Experiences from East Africa. New York: Africana Publishing Co., 1974.
13. Churchman, C.W. and A.H. Schainblatt. "The Researcher and the Manager: A Dialectic of Implementation." Management Science 11 (February 1965):B-69-87.
14. Cleaves, Peter S. Bureaucratic Politics and Administration in Chile. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.

15. De, Nitish R. "Public Administration and Plan Implementation." Indian Journal of Public Administration 20 (October-December 1974):701-722.
16. Derthick, Martha. The Influence of Federal Grants. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.
17. _____. New Towns in Town: Why a Federal Program Failed. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1972.
18. Dubhashi, P.R. "Of Plans and Their Implementation." Indian Journal of Public Administration 13 (January-March 1967): 125-127.
19. Dye, Thomas. Understanding Public Policy. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
20. Fried, Robert C. Performance in American Bureaucracy. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1976.
21. Gant, George F. "A Note on Applications of Development Administration." Public Policy 15 (1966):199-211.
22. Gortner, Harold F. Administration in the Public Sector. New York: Wiley, 1977.
23. Gross, Neal, Joseph B. Giacquinta, and Marilyn Bernstein. Implementing Organizational Innovations: A Sociological Analysis of Planned Educational Change. New York: Basic Books, 1971.
24. Hargrove, Erwin C. "Implementation." Policy Studies Journal 5 (Autumn 1976):9-14.
25. _____. The Missing Link: The Study of the Implementation of Social Policy. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1975.
26. Harper, Edwin L., Fred A. Kramer, and Andrew M. Rouse. "Implementation and Use of PPB in Sixteen Federal Agencies." Public Administration Review 29 (November-December 1969):623-632.
27. Hodgetts, Richard M. and Max S. Wortman, Jr. Administrative Policy: Text and Cases in the Policy Sciences. New York: Wiley, 1975.
28. Honadle, George and Marcus Ingle. Project Management for Rural Equality. Syracuse: A report prepared for the Agency for International Development, 1976.
29. Hood, Christopher C. "Administrative Diseases: Some Types of Dysfunctionality in Administration." Public Administration 52 (Winter 1974):439-453.

30. Hood, Christopher C. The Limits of Administration. New York: Wiley, 1976.
31. Huysmans, Jan H.B.M. The Implementation of Operations Research. New York: John Wiley Interscience, 1970.
32. Jain, R.B. Contemporary Issues in Indian Administration. New Delhi: Vishal Publications, 1976.
33. Jones, Charles. An Introduction to the Study of Public Policy. Belmont, Cal.: Wadsworth, 1970.
34. Kaufman, Herbert. Administrative Feedback. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute, 1973.
35. Kaul, Om P. "Enhancing Implementation Ability." Prashashinka, April-June 1973, pp. 87-88.
36. Levine, Robert. Public Planning: Failure and Redirection. New York: Basic Books, 1972.
37. Levy, Frank. "Observations of a Participant." Policy Analysis 1 (Spring 1975):439-450.
38. Malhotra, Ran C. "Operational Planning or How to Bridge the Gap between Plan Formulation and Plan Implementation." Nepal: Center for Economic Development and Administration, 1970.
39. Meltzer, Arnold J. Policy Analysts in the Bureaucracy. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.
40. _____. "Political Feasibility and Policy Analysis." Public Administration Review 32 (November-December 1972): 859-867.
41. Moynihan, Daniel P. Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding. New York: Free Press, 1969.
42. Murphy, Jerome. "Title I of ESEA: The Politics of Implementing Federal Educational Reform." Harvard Educational Review 41 (February 1971):35-63.
43. Panandiker, V.A. Pai, ed. Development Administration in India. New Delhi: Macmillan, 1974.
44. Pressman, Jeffrey L. and Aaron B. Wildavsky. Implementation. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.
45. Quade, E.S. Analysis for Public Decisions. New York: American Elsevier, 1975.
46. Rabinovitz, Francine et al. "Policy Implementation: Guidelines." Policy Sciences 7 (December 1976):399-518.

47. Ripley, Randall B. et al. "The Implementation of CETA in Ohio." Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 1977.
48. Rivlin, Alice. Systematic Thinking for Social Action. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute, 1971.
49. Rondinelli, Dennis. "Public Planning and Political Strategy. Long Range Planning, April 1976, pp. 75-82.
50. _____. Urban and Regional Development Planning: Policy and Administration. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1975.
51. Sharkansky, Ira and Donald Van Meter. Policy and Politics in American Government. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
52. Smith, Thomas B. "The Policy Implementation Process." Public Sciences 4 (1973):197-209.
53. _____. "Policy Roles: An Analysis of Policy Formulators and Policy Implementors." Policy Sciences 4 (1973): 297-307.
54. Stillman, Richard J. Public Administration: Concepts and Cases. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1976.
55. Swerdlow, Irving. The Public Administration of Economic Development. New York: Praeger, 1975.
56. Van Gigch, John P. Applied General Systems Theory. New York Harper and Row, 1974.
57. Van Gunsteren, Herman R. The Quest for Control: A Critique of the Rational-Central-Rule Approach in Public Affairs. New York: Wiley, 1976.
58. Van Meter, Donald S. and Carl E. Van Horn. "The Implementation of Intergovernmental Policy." In C.O. Jones and R.D. Thomas, eds., Public Policy Making in a Federal System (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1976).
59. _____. "The Policy Implementation Process: A Conceptual Framework." Administration and Society 6 (February 1974): 445-488.
60. Wildavsky, Aaron. "Why Planning Fails in Nepal." Administrative Science Quarterly 17 (December 1972): 508-528.
61. Williams, Walter. "Implementation Analysis and Assessment." Policy Analysis, Summer 1975, pp. 531-566.

62. Young, Dennis. "Institutional Change and the Delivery of Urban Public Services." Policy Sciences 2 (December 1971):425-438.