



WIDER Working Paper 2016/156

# The politics of promoting social protection in Zambia

Kate Pruce and Sam Hickey\*

December 2016

**Abstract:** This paper examines the rise of the social protection agenda in Zambia, and demonstrates that this has two alternative drivers: shifting dynamics within Zambia's political settlement and the promotional efforts of a transnational policy coalition. We compare the cases of social cash transfers and social health insurance to investigate how the interplay of these drivers has shaped the uneven commitment to the respective policies. Social protection has yet to displace existing interests, ideas, and rent-allocation practices. However, cash transfers are gaining localized support. What matters now is the way in which such transfers become integrated within Zambia's distributional regime.

**Keywords:** cash transfers, ideas, political settlements, social health insurance, social protection, Zambia

**JEL classification:** H51, H53, I13, I38

**Acknowledgements:** Support from UNU-WIDER is gratefully acknowledged. The authors would like to acknowledge Tom Lavers for his guidance and advice. We would like to thank Stanfield Michelo, Miguel Niño-Zarazúa, Kelley Toole, Paul Quarles van Ufford, and the two anonymous reviewers for their critical input on earlier versions of this paper. In addition we are grateful for comments received at workshops organized by CSSR (Centre for Social Science Research) at the University of Cape Town, June 2015 and by UNU-WIDER in Mexico City, February 2016.

The background research and field work used in this study was supported by DFID/UK Aid under the auspices of the Effective States and Inclusive Development Research Centre, based at the University of Manchester, UK.

---

\* Global Development Institute, University of Manchester, UK; corresponding author: [kate.pruce@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:kate.pruce@manchester.ac.uk)

This study has been prepared within the UNU-WIDER project on 'The political economy of social protection systems', which is part of a larger research project on 'The economics and politics of taxation and social protection'.

Copyright © UNU-WIDER 2016

Information and requests: [publications@wider.unu.edu](mailto:publications@wider.unu.edu)

ISSN 1798-7237 ISBN 978-92-9256-200-7

Typescript prepared by Sophie Richmond.

The United Nations University World Institute for Development Economics Research provides economic analysis and policy advice with the aim of promoting sustainable and equitable development. The Institute began operations in 1985 in Helsinki, Finland, as the first research and training centre of the United Nations University. Today it is a unique blend of think tank, research institute, and UN agency—providing a range of services from policy advice to governments as well as freely available original research.

The Institute is funded through income from an endowment fund with additional contributions to its work programme from Denmark, Finland, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

Katajanokanlaituri 6 B, 00160 Helsinki, Finland

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author(s), and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Institute or the United Nations University, nor the programme/project donors.

## 1 Introduction

In 2013, the President of Zambia announced that there would be a 700 per cent increase in the budget for what was then a pilot social cash transfer (SCT) programme. The move took everyone by surprise, including the coalition of international donors, government officials, and civil society actors that had been responsible for promoting the pilot programme and had been calling for its scaling-up amid support for a broader social protection agenda in Zambia for nearly a decade. Over roughly the same period, barely any progress had been made over other elements of this agenda, including efforts to promote social health insurance (SHI). By mid 2016, the SCT scheme had received another boost, with the 2015 budget being further increased by two-thirds, from ZMW180 million to just over ZMW300 million, enabling a scale-up from 50 to 78 districts by the end of the year. On the other hand, the SHI scheme remained firmly on paper with little strong political backing. Although this scheme is included in the National Social Protection Policy and the National Health Policy, there have been no signs of implementation to date.

In seeking to account for the politics of this uneven commitment to social protection in Zambia, this paper goes beyond the focus on elections and institutions within mainstream accounts of how social protection is likely to emerge in Africa, and draws attention instead to the underlying and dynamics of politics and power that shape elite commitment. Based on these two cases, the paper argues that the nature and strength of the policy coalition, the political importance attached to the policy issue by the ruling coalition, and the ideological fit of proposed social protection programmes are all significant in influencing the levels of capacity and commitment. These insights flow directly from our employment of an alternative conceptual approach to understanding the political economy of social protection in Africa. This framework focused on the nature of the ‘political settlement’ and interactions with the policy coalitions involved in the redistributive development strategies within which social protection sits (Lavers and Hickey 2016).<sup>1</sup> The approach is based on an ‘adapted political settlements’ framework incorporating insights from the literature on welfare state development and social protection in both industrialized countries and the global south (e.g. Huber and Stephens 2012; Kpessa and Béland 2013; see also Barrientos and Pellissery 2012; Hickey 2007; Niño-Zarazúa et al. 2011); on the role of ideas in shaping political behaviour and institutional change (Schmidt 2008); and the role of global policy networks (Stone 2008). The framework is expanded in depth in Lavers and Hickey (2016).

The two contrasting policy cases examined here help illustrate the potential of this approach. In this paper we demonstrate that struggles to promote social protection in Zambia have occurred both within and between policy-level and ruling coalitions. This is taking place in a transnationalized context in which global actors and flows of both resources and ideas are embedded within these coalition-building processes. For example, the efforts of a transnational policy coalition to promote SCTs over the 2000s had been heavily contested by officials and politicians, particularly those within the Ministry of Finance. By 2012, the transnational policy coalition had made some inroads into this opposition, producing a wealth of evidence in support of cash transfers and undertaking extensive informal lobbying. And, by 2011, a new political

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper is part of a comparative project which takes as its starting point the varying levels of interest in and progress on social protection in different African countries, hypothesizing that politics holds the key to explaining much of this variation. It examines the interaction between political settlements, policy coalitions, and ideas in shaping the adoption and implementation of social assistance and health insurance programmes in five African countries: Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Uganda, and Zambia.

party was in power with a mandate to distribute resources to poorer groups. However, our evidence shows that the actual decision to scale up government support in 2013 flowed not from these enabling factors per se but from the shifting dynamics of Zambia's political settlement and, in particular, a perceived crisis within existing means of distributing resources to rural areas.

The framework also helps explain the relative lack of progress on SHI in Zambia, despite such a policy having been tabled in the early 1990s. In contrast to cash transfers, SHI has been championed largely by a small team in the Ministry of Health and a relatively small donor agency, rather than a broader and well-resourced coalition of more powerful players among the donor community in particular. There is also limited support, and in some cases outright opposition, from other key groups that have 'holding power' within Zambia's political settlement, including unions. As currently formulated, the scheme does not fit with the ideas and interests of either key bureaucrats or political actors. Not only does it lack the kind of credible, evidence-based operational plan required to persuade technocrats, but the idea of getting citizens to contribute towards the costs of health care runs against the logic of patron–client politics within Zambia's clientelist political settlement, notably the continued commitment to avoiding user fees.

These narratives, which we set out in more detail below, emerge from our adoption of a process tracing methodology. This starts with the key outcomes to be explained, in this case the political decisions about which forms of social protection should receive support, and seeks to identify the causal mechanisms that led to these outcomes. This involved using a variety of data sources, including documentary analysis and semi-structured key informant interviews with the main stakeholders involved in the process. The interviews included government representatives, both politicians and technocrats (18 interviews); Zambian organizations ranging from trade unions and civil society organizations (CSOs) to think tanks and consultancies (10 interviews); representatives of cooperating partners, mainly the multilateral and bilateral donors engaged in the process (13 interviews); and several key individuals who are currently unaffiliated (four interviews), as well as four public speeches. The interviews were conducted during fieldwork undertaken in Zambia in April–May 2015.

The paper now proceeds by outlining the shifting political settlement in Zambia from independence to the present day (section 2). Section 3 then establishes an overview of the SCT and SHI programmes respectively, while section 4 provides an analytical discussion through the lens of our political settlements framework. Section 5 concludes.

## **2 The political settlement in Zambia**

Zambia's political settlement, understood here as 'the balance of power between contending social groups on which any state is based' (di John and Putzel 2009: 4), has undergone a series of shifts in the decades since independence. Strongly informed by the legacy of colonial rule, under which projects of state formation and governmentality took shape around the construction of ethno-linguistic groups, the efforts of successive ruling coalitions to enforce a stable set of institutions capable of delivering an acceptable distribution of rents have been influenced by this balance of power (Khan 2010). Colonial rule saw the country divided into five ethno-linguistic groupings: Bemba (43 per cent of the population), Nyanja (18 per cent), Tonga (including Ila and Lenje, 19 per cent), Lozi (8 per cent) and the Northwest region (12 per cent) (Scarritt 2006). As Scarritt notes, 'these linguistic groups were constructed before they were politicized through conflicts within the nationalist movement and post-independence parties', with the Northwest region, where none of the four major lingua francas, predominate 'constructed ... in response to the politicization of the other groups' (2006: 239). With no single group able to dominate alone, the politics of forming ruling coalitions in post-colonial Zambia has been shaped by efforts to

form coalitions across these groups, with a tendency to seek ‘inclusive or over-sized rather than minimum winning coalitions’ (Scarritt 2006: 234).

Following Khan (2010), forming such coalitions involves navigating the balance of power both in horizontal terms, regarding relations between elite factions, and also vertically, regarding the relationship between elites and wider social groups. This section sets out the historical character of the political settlement in Zambia since independence until the current moment, with a focus on the shifting balance of power along these dimensions, and the dominant incentives and ideas that have prevailed within different ruling coalitions over this period. Although this history includes the shift from the single-party tendencies of the United National Independence Party (UNIP) to the return of multi-party politics in 1991, our focus on the underlying logics of how ruling coalitions are formed enables the analysis to move beyond the limits of formal institutional analysis in examining the politics of development in Zambia.

## **2.1 Inter-elite relations and coalition-building in post-colonial Zambia**

In the first period following independence, the strategy of building inclusive ruling coalitions, the related discourse of ‘One Zambia, One Nation’, and modernist narratives of development as part of the nationalist, state-building project led by the first president, Kenneth Kaunda (Larmer et al. 2014), helped underpin an often progressive period of economic and social development. Underpinned by high copper prices, the initial political and development strategy had positive pay-offs in terms of generating stability, a sense of nationhood, and a degree of human development (Noyoo 2010).

However, the centralization of power within the presidency and the emergence of a system of neopatrimonialism, both to satisfy the demands of factions and for personal gain, undermined the bureaucratic capacity required to deliver development (Erdmann and Simutanyi 2003). The inclusive strategy also incurred its own political and economic costs. The work of incorporation involved the establishment of numerous ministerial positions and the nationalization of several economic enterprises in the late 1960s, primarily as a means of allocating rents between dominant groups (Lindemann 2011). The falling prices of copper during the 1970s threw this politics of development into sharp relief: drastic reductions were made to expenditure on social services, the greater proportion of which was spent on personal emoluments with only 2.3 per cent being spent on programme-related expenses in 1980 (Dixon 1987).

The centrality of the Copperbelt to the extractive strategies of the colonial administration led to both widespread migration into the area, which resulted in a more mixed ethnic basis of the population, and the formation of socio-political identities along class rather than ethnic lines. As a result, ‘the multi-ethnic Copperbelt gave rise to a broad-based nationalist movement’ (Lindemann 2011: 1848) that closely shaped the politics of independence in Zambia. Lindemann (2011) suggests that the use of ethno-linguistic ties as the basis for political inclusion by Kaunda, along with the suppression of dissent, contributed to the exclusion of other types of factions, such as urban and unionized classes. Importantly, it was the excluded leaders and members of these factions who eventually mobilized a coalition that was strong enough to challenge Kaunda’s dominance. The major force here was the trade union movement, which, along with businessmen, churches, and intellectuals, formed the Movement for Multi-party Democracy (MMD). The MMD mobilized actively for democratic reforms and took power in 1991 (Erdmann and Simutanyi 2003).

The reintroduction of multi-party politics at this time changed but did not fully transform how politics works in Zambia. Once in power, successive political parties have sought to cement inclusive coalitions in horizontal terms through allocating key positions within the executive,

administration, military, and parastatal sector in a balanced way across the main groupings (Lindemann 2011). This strategy has been highly successful in terms of maintaining stability, although with largely negative implications for development. This sense of being represented at elite level has helped to secure the support of lower-level factions (Scarritt 2006),<sup>2</sup> with subordinate groups further included through the vertical distribution of rents via public sector employment and agricultural food subsidies in particular. Investment in public spending deemed to be politically important has continued to be prioritized at the expense of social expenditure:

The total number of ministries and deputies grew from 54 in 1990 to 67 in 1998.... This growth ran contrary to functional necessity and economic rationality ... and was solely a response to the political need to preserve a 'tribally-balanced' government. Moreover, the MMD governments struggled hard to avoid cuts in the size of the civil service. This indicates that sufficient scope for patronage was still privileged at the expense of economic considerations. While the civil service as an important bastion of the elite bargain was protected, expenditure cuts were implemented in public investment and social spending, with obvious implications for economic development. (Lindemann 2011: 1864)

This strategy reflects the tendency of elites in Zambia to first look across at each other rather than downwards to their followers when it comes to strategies for maintaining power and seeking to influence the distribution of resources (Khan 2010). There was also an important ideational element to this apparent reluctance to redistribute resources downwards in a systematic way: a survey of Zambia's elite in the first decade of independence found that they tended to emphasize equality of opportunity over equality of outcome (Scarritt 2006: 242).

The requirement to forge an inclusive coalition inevitably directs a great deal of energy inwards to managing competing factions within the ruling coalition, thus reducing the level of elite cohesion and focus on development (Levy 2014). The extension of political space offered by the return of multi-party politics has arguably intensified this by creating a clearer exit option for elites dissatisfied with their status within the ruling coalition. The incentives for dissatisfied elites to leave and form their own challenger parties are further raised by the presidentialist character of the political system in Zambia, whereby the president holds significant personal powers concerning appointments and rents. This creates a strong incentive for internal squabbles over party leadership and succession issues (Scarritt 2006), and raises the attractiveness for elites of leaving and forming their own party as a basis for running for office. This occurred during Chiluba's push for a third term (Lindemann 2011), which saw MMD minister Michael Sata leave and form his own party, the Patriotic Front (PF) (Scarritt 2006).<sup>3</sup>

## **2.2 The increased importance of vertical power relations under multi-party politics in Zambia**

Under the MMD there was a breakdown of trust within the coalition of economic and social interest groups, partly because unions were sidelined in decision-making (Lindemann 2011). The ongoing project of economic liberalization also meant that the productive and organizational basis of all socioeconomic groupings was being undermined at the time (Rakner 2003). With the

---

2 Scarritt (2006: 236) quotes Posner (2005: 91) on how people expect representatives of their own ethnic group in power to distribute resources to them.

3 Contrary to earlier history (Scarritt 2006), this proved to be an electorally successful strategy in the end, perhaps because Sata worked out how to mobilize a different kind of coalition based on urban support, as the MMD did when they gained power in 1991.

political loyalties of lower-level factions now up for grabs within the new political market-place certain forms of clientelism intensified, including the use of agricultural subsidies (Mason et al. 2013).

The distribution of food subsidies under the MMD during the 1990s and 2000s was highly politicized, with universal subsidies in agriculture giving way to more targeted approaches. While ostensibly aimed at cost-cutting these also enabled government to target such resources politically. The increased vulnerability of the MMD ruling coalition over the 2000s directly shaped the size and targeting of government's agricultural subsidy programmes, such as the Farmer Input Support Programme (FISP) and the Food Reserve Agency (FRA). These include the provision of subsidized inputs, mainly in the form of fertilizer and maize seed. According to Mason et al. (2013: 2) 'The scale of the programs ... has increased dramatically over the last decade, e.g. from 48,000 MT of fertilizer in 2002 to 184,000 MT in 2012', and most of the resources being distributed went to those districts which returned MMD candidates by the largest majorities. Then, just before the September 2011 elections, 'Banda dramatically scaled up FISP from 100,000 MT in 2009/10 to 178,000 MT in 2010/11. The move proved insufficient to secure a victory, however, and Michael Sata (PF) defeated him by nearly seven percentage points' (Mason et al. 2013: 4).

A more populist element to politics also emerged over this period (Cheeseman and Hinfelaar 2010), not least in the pursuit of urban constituents. Although there is little evidence that Zambians have historically voted along opposed rural–urban lines, the urban vote has become increasingly crucial to the electoral turnovers (Rakner and Helle 2012) that help define Zambia's competitive clientelism. When the MMD took power in 1991, they gained 95 per cent of seats in urban areas, and urban voters were again critical in bringing the PF to power.<sup>4</sup> Under Sata's leadership, the PF has promoted a distinctive urban-based populist political discourse (Larmer and Fraser 2007). This has appealed to a group that felt disenfranchised by policy shifts under the MMD which came at the expense of urban voters. The PF was able to create credible challenges in the 2006 and 2008 elections then finally gained power in 2011, winning the majority of the urban vote.

The PF's sweeping electoral victory appeared to mark a shift within the political and ideational dynamics and tendencies of Zambia's political settlement, more so than the transition from the UNIP to the MMD in 2001. The social basis of support for the PF was derived mainly from the urban working classes and intelligentsia, which led to a leftist policy agenda focused on the labour market: minimum wages, labour relations, and being tough on businesses (Rakner and Helle 2012), amid broader claims to be pro-poor. The significance of the urban vote for the PF has driven a particular form of populism in Zambia, which plays on dissatisfaction among mineworkers in particular, and has arguably led to a ruling coalition that is more directly oriented downwards to subordinate groups in vertical terms than its predecessors. It has also broadened Sata's ethnic support base (Cheeseman et al. 2014), as the PF polled only 3 per cent in 2001, when it was considered to be a 'potentially ethnic' Bemba party (Erdmann and Simutanyi 2003; Scarritt 2006).

Initially, the transition allowed more democratic elements to flourish, including a vibrant independent media and civil society, but these have struggled to become institutionalized. Although civil society recorded an historic victory in preventing President Chiluba from amending the constitution in order to allow him to stand for a third term (Gould 2006), more

---

4 See: <http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/internationaldevelopment/2015/01/26/catherine-boone-zambia-presidential-elections-why-is-it-so-hard-to-predict-a-potential-winner/>

recent campaigns around the constitution in 2007 and democracy in 2012 have not been as successful. The continued predominance of patron–client rather than citizenship-based politics, despite the shift to competitive multi-party elections, has led observers to characterize Zambia’s political settlement as ‘competitive clientelist’ in character, whereby elite fragmentation and electoral incentives tend to result in short-term horizons and the politicization of the public bureaucracy (Levy 2014).

Efforts by external actors to promote social protection in Zambia from the early 2000s encountered a challenging context, not only in terms of the political settlement but also with regard to the country’s framing of development in institutional and ideational terms. From 1975 onwards, reform and structural adjustment programmes had promoted the role of the market, rather than the state, as the mechanism for allocating resources in Zambia (Mhone 2004). This reduced the expectations that citizens had of the state, with Zambia’s ‘welfare regime’ reflecting the growing ‘externalization of social provision’ (Larmer et al. 2014), and with an increased role for a wide range of non-state actors. The ‘social protection agenda’ was non-existent, although the pressing HIV and AIDS crisis had led the government to extend the Public Welfare Assistance Scheme (PWAS) (Harland 2014). Established in the 1950s, PWAS is an unconditional in-kind transfer with the aim of meeting the basic needs of people unable to support themselves.

Zambia was also highly indebted and, under the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries initiative, signed up to the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper experiment in 2001. Although this provided a window through which donors could start promoting social protection there was strong opposition from within government to pursuing a redistributive agenda which was at odds with both the ‘growth-first’ approach and underlying ideas around deservingness. For example, Hickey et al. (2009) note that ‘as indicated by the views of the Minister of Finance, the prevailing political discourse in Zambia tends to favour the “productive” segment of the population. This is reflected in a variety of programmes targeted at “vulnerable but viable” farmers and the productivist, infrastructure-oriented character of Zambia’s Fifth National Development Plan’ that replaced the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers.

Towards the end of the 2000s it was increasingly clear that Zambia’s impressive rates of growth of 5–6 per cent had not translated into poverty reduction. The number of people falling below the poverty line remained stubbornly high at 60.5 per cent in 2010, with the number in extreme poverty standing at 42 per cent; in the 2010 Living Standards Monitoring Survey, headcount poverty was almost 78 per cent in rural areas compared to 27.5 per cent in urban areas (Central Statistical Office 2011). The convergence between questions being raised over the growth-first strategy and the ascent to power of the PF in 2011 on a pro-poor agenda raised hopes that Zambia’s national development planning would become more focused on poverty reduction, and particularly social protection, given the promise to ‘put money in the pockets’ of ordinary people.

### **3 Social protection in Zambia**

In June 2014 the Zambian government published a National Social Protection Policy that encompassed range of instruments, including a scaled-up SCT programme, a new SHI scheme, and proposed reforms to public sector pensions. This umbrella approach was proposed by a Cabinet sub-committee chaired by the Cabinet Secretary and the various stakeholders had little choice but to support it, despite disagreements between the Ministry of Community Development and Ministry of Health, and their respective cooperating partners, regarding which of their preferred policy instruments should be pursued as a priority.



The rest of this section traces the process through which SCTs and SHI were promoted as part of a new policy agenda on social protection in Zambia.

### 3.1 Social cash transfers

There have been three main phases in the development and promotion of SCTs in Zambia to date: the first involved the introduction by the German Development Agency (GTZ) of a pilot cash transfer scheme in 2003, followed by a concerted effort by donors to form a broader constituency of support behind social protection. Once a scaled-up SCT programme was agreed in 2010, the next phase involved donors building the capacity of the government to deliver this, alongside continued lobbying and advocacy efforts. Finally, the current phase began in 2013 with the announcement of a 700 per cent increase for SCTs in the national budget, from a base of ZMW17.4 million to ZMW150 million. This reversed the balance of government and donor contributions and enabled further expansion to 50 districts by end of 2014. Progressive increase of the SCT budget allocation was confirmed in 2015 and the programme will reach 78 districts in 2016.

#### *Promoting social protection and cash transfers in Zambia*

In 2003, GTZ approached the Ministry of Community Development with the suggestion of a pilot cash transfer scheme. The government had three years earlier relaunched its long-standing PWAS scheme in response to Zambia's HIV and AIDS crisis. The GTZ model was similarly designed to respond to high levels of food poverty and labour-constrained households, exacerbated by the burden of HIV (Schubert 2005). Despite requests from relevant officials that the pilot scheme be integrated within a scaled-up PWAS, which the then minister of finance supported (ZK1), the project was designed as a separate entity, with GTZ focusing its assistance only on the structures and capacity needed for implementation in a small part of Kalomo district (Harland 2014). This scheme would go on to generate what one respondent referred to as 'Kalomo mania' for several years (ZK1), while the resources and attention directed to the new national PWAS scheme dwindled (Harland 2014).

In late 2003, social development advisers from the UK Department for International Development (DFID) and the World Bank proposed to the government that they establish a Sector Advisory Group on Social Protection, which would be chaired by the Ministry of Community Development and directly inform the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper review process. The two agencies were not always well coordinated, with the World Bank focusing on promoting its 'social risk management' approach while DFID chose a consultant to write the strategy paper for the new sector (Hickey et al. 2009). Nonetheless, these combined efforts were effective to the extent that a chapter on social protection did make it into what would become the Fifth National Development Plan. Although the numerous programmes listed there received little funding or political attention, social protection had been established on the policy, if not the political, agenda.

DFID funded the extension of the cash transfers so that by 2007 variants of the Kalomo scheme were operating in parts of five districts, with some 12,000 beneficiary households (Harland 2014). The Ministry of Community Development was assisted on a day-to-day basis by GTZ in terms of delivery (Schubert 2005), with CARE International and HelpAge also supporting the implementation. In terms of advocacy and policy development, Zambia's adoption of the Joint Assistance Strategy in 2007, informed by Paris Declaration principles concerning harmonization, saw both GTZ and the World Bank leave the social protection sector. This cleared the way for DFID to take a lead, alongside like-minded donors such as UNICEF (the UN children's fund) and Irish Aid.

The commitment of the Ministry of Community Development to the social protection agenda was initially limited; both this and its marginal role within the government made it very difficult to secure buy-in from more powerful ministries (Hickey et al. 2009), particularly the Ministry of Finance (ZG9). From 2005 onwards, DFID Zambia started to adopt a more politically informed approach to building a constituency for social protection, informed in part by their commissioning of a ‘drivers of change’ study (Barrientos et al. 2005). This strategy had both technical and political elements, from building the evidence base for social protection through to study tours (including to Kalomo, South Africa, Lesotho, Brazil and Chile) and informal meetings, increasingly targeted at powerful players within the Finance Ministry and the political elite.

### *Strengthening and scaling up*

By 2009, DFID had been joined by UNICEF as co-leads of the social protection cooperating partners group and succeeded in gaining government support for the Social Protection Expansion Programme. This included a gradual expansion of SCTs targeting the poorest and most vulnerable households made up of the elderly above the age of 60, children under the age of 5, and adults who are chronically ill, affected by HIV and AIDS, or living with disabilities, to be increasingly funded by the government. At the meeting scheduled for signing this agreement, the Minister of Finance Dr Situmbeko Musokotwane was ‘very nervous’ that DFID were proposing a programme of GB£32 million over only seven years, after which the responsibility for its continuation would fall to the Zambian government. He therefore requested that DFID commit for 10 years, which it duly did to the tune of GB£38 million (ZC2). This marked a significant shift regarding the ministry’s erstwhile opposition to social protection, with the previous Finance Minister N’gandu Magande (2003–8) ‘ferverly opposed SCTs on personal and financial grounds’ (Kabandula and Seekings 2014: 26). Committed to the trickle-down model of growth, Magande believed that SCTs would encourage dependency (ZG1, ZC12, ZG9), rather than upward mobility (ZC2). However, when President Mwanawasa passed away in office in 2008 and Rupiah Banda was elected as his replacement in the presidential by-election, the resulting Cabinet reshuffle led to Magande’s replacement by a finance minister less ideologically opposed to cash transfers.

From 2010 onwards, there was a concerted effort to build a stronger evidence base in support of SCTs. This went beyond the initial evaluations of the Kalomo pilot (MCDSS and GTZ 2007; Wietler 2007), which lacked a control group. Instead it focused on randomized control trial (RCT) evaluations carried out by independent consultancy firms (ZG1), as this approach was considered more politically persuasive: ‘they certainly like evidence, ministers love it, they’re all doctors so they love RCTs’ (ZC2). According to multiple interviewees, this effort peaked at a high-level workshop during which the results of both the RCTs and a recent World Bank assessment of SCTs were delivered and discussed with senior civil servants from all key ministries, including the Ministry of Finance, with the Cabinet Secretary chairing. This level of buy-in derived both from the convening power of the World Bank and the more informal, backstage efforts of a senior Zambian consultant hired by DFID to deploy his long-established elite-level networks to generate awareness of and support for social protection in Zambia. These studies enabled the Ministry of Community Development to refute the belief that people would work less and offer clear evidence that the transfers could reduce poverty and contribute to the economy (ZG1). Importantly, the World Bank assessment not only reported favourably on the impact of SCTs in Zambia, but also revealed how badly other programmes such as agricultural subsidies were faring in comparison, both in terms of their cost-effectiveness and success in reaching poor people.

### *Government budget increase for SCTs*

When the PF gained power in 2011 on a pro-poor ticket, including a manifesto commitment to rolling out ‘social transfers’, this raised hopes that social protection would now become a political priority. Nonetheless, the minister of finance’s announcement on 11 October 2013 that the 2014 budget that would increase government financing for SCTs by 700 per cent and that a national social protection policy would be prioritized (Chikwanda 2013), came ‘out of the blue’ (ZC2) to proponents of the programme. The commitment exceeded both the co-financing agreement within the Social Protection Expansion Programme and the budget request from the Ministry of Community Development for that year, which was only ZMW53 million (ZG2).

It came about amid an apparently strong attack by the president on the waste incurred by agricultural subsidies, following a scandal in 2013 concerning massive overspending on the budget lines for the FISP and the FRA (ZC6, ZK2). This crisis led to a public announcement by Sata that resources would be channelled to ‘the very poor citizens of our society’<sup>5</sup> and some funds were redirected to the SCT programme, which was framed as a more effective and pro-poor alternative to the subsidies. SCTs were only seen as the solution because the scheme had already been accepted by the Finance Ministry as a credible means of reaching the poor, and because a degree of capacity existed within government to deliver, through the donor-supported Ministry of Community Development, particularly the Department of Social Welfare and the SCT Unit.

The amount allocated to the SCT programme is still tiny compared to such subsidies.<sup>6</sup> Programmes such as FISP and FRA continue to pull significant resources away from other forms of social protection, with budgeted amounts for FISP actually increasing in 2014–15, despite Sata’s rhetoric about reducing agricultural programmes following the 2013 scandal. When the SCT budget flatlined in 2015 there were fears that the scale-up would stall, confirmed by the Medium Term Expenditure Framework for 2015–17, which indicated that the budget for SCTs would remain at ZMW150 million per year until 2016/17 (Ministry of Finance 2014). However, these fears have been allayed by renewed government promises to progressively increase the SCT budget allocation supported by the new Medium Term Expenditure Framework for 2016–18 in which the domestically financed contribution to SCTs will be increased to ZMW350 million by 2018 (Ministry of Finance 2015).

Despite this, and the SCT budget being the only ring-fenced programme within the Ministry of Community Development, doubts remain about the wider commitment of the Zambian government to social protection, particularly following the death in 2014 of President Sata, its apparent champion. Before analysing the shifting level of commitment to SCTs in more depth, however, we first examine efforts to promote SHI during an overlapping period.

### **3.2 Social health insurance**

Discussions about SHI in Zambia date back to the liberalization reforms of the early 1990s when the World Health Organization (WHO), an external consultant and the Ministry of Health

---

5 ‘President Michael Sata Defends the Removal of Maize Subsidies’, *Lusaka Times*, 15 May 2013, <https://www.lusakatimes.com/2013/05/15/president-michael-sata-defends-the-removal-of-maize-subsidies/>

6 In the 2015 budget, ZMW1.3 billion is included for social protection, which is 2.7 per cent of the total budget but the majority is for the Public Service Pension Fund. The amount allocated to SCTs—ZMW180 million is only 0.4 per cent of the total budget (Chikwanda 2014). A further ZMW1.1 billion (2.3 per cent of the total budget) has been allocated to the FISP.

sought to introduce SHI in Zambia. There was also support from within the health sector for insurance schemes that would protect health workers, who suffered badly during the country's HIV and AIDS crisis (ZG5, ZG6). However, efforts to promote SHI failed due to poor design, a lack of buy-in within the political leadership, and limited interest from within the international community (ZK3). These problems have continued to bedevil progress with this policy agenda in Zambia, despite strong progress elsewhere in the region.

Health financing is an ongoing issue in Zambia. The introduction of user fees during the 1990s contributed to the 'externalization' of health services (Larmer et al. 2014) including high-profile cases of politicians or their family members being sent out of the country for health care (ZG5). Out-of-pocket costs are very high, and also regressive with greater impact in rural areas with high poverty levels (Ministry of Health 2008). The National Health Accounts 2002–4 revealed that households were one of the largest contributors to health expenditures, peaking at 40 per cent in 2000 (Econ/UNZA, MoH/SIDA/IHE 2006). The move to abolish user fees again in 2006 was presented by then President Mwanawasa as a first step towards achieving universal access to health care and in the run-up to the 2011 election the PF claimed that health care was 'free throughout the country'. However this only applies to primary health coverage in rural and peri-urban areas (Ministry of Health 2011) and in reality direct payments continue to exist in rural and urban areas. In addition, the funding gap created by this removal of user payments was not fully covered by an increase in government budget and costs continue to go up, making this model unsustainable (ZG5). The majority of the population are not currently covered by insurance but civil servants often take out private insurance schemes. One government worker explained that he only registers his children as the insurance is too costly: 'we all live very risky lives' (ZG5).

The health sector suffered a further financial blow in 2009 when both Sweden and the Netherlands suspended their aid contributions to the sector following an alleged misappropriation of funds within the health ministry.<sup>7</sup> Government informants emphasize that this withdrawal of funds was a key driver in the revived interest in the idea of SHI as it forced the government to consider how it could finance health through domestic revenues alone (ZG5, ZG6). Following its suspension of donor funding, SIDA (the Swedish International Development Agency) has re-engaged to support SHI, providing technical assistance to the Ministry of Health. Tanzania has also provided technical support for the actuarial report on health insurance in Zambia and the design of the programme.<sup>8</sup>

A further influence was Premier Aid, a company from Zimbabwe that set up an insurance scheme for civil servants in Zambia in 2006. This created demand among teachers, who started to ask why Zambia could not come up with its own scheme (ZC11). Following consultations with the International Labour Organization and consultants, the Ministry of Health decided that the new scheme should include all formal sector workers and indigents from the outset, with contributions from the former group supporting the latter along with funding from the government and donors, with informal sector workers covered in the second phase (ZG4, ZC7). Although promoted as a means of making health care more affordable for the government, the scheme would require the government to increase its allocations to the sector.

---

7 'Corruption Watch (Ministry of Health)', *Zambian Economist*, 28 May 2009, <http://www.zambian-economist.com/2009/05/corruption-watch-ministry-of-health.html>

8 One policy expert who has suggested that Zambia learn from Rwanda's experience of promoting and implementing SHI notes that the government is unwilling to look in that direction due to Zambia's alliance with DRC.

While an SHI bill has passed through the review stage, progress has stalled, which is likely due to lack of agreement on coverage and clear plan for implementation. For example, there are some plans to roll out SHI to vulnerable groups using the existing SCT structures, although as of May 2015 discussions with the Ministry of Community Development over this had not progressed very far. Ministers have been sent on study tours to Thailand and Ghana, although without a pilot scheme in Zambia itself that can be visited and evaluated as with SCTs, this effort seems not to have had the same positive results (ZC11).

In terms of securing wider buy-in, the public sector union was involved in the early stages of the process, negotiating for health insurance (ZC7). One trade union representative claimed that unions have been ‘pioneers’ of health insurance and that ‘we brought the idea of introducing a voluntary medical scheme to cover medical expenses, that is voluntary on the part of the employees. This was the genesis of SHI in Zambia’ (ZO9). However, there have been some concerns regarding the goal of a universal system that will also support informal and vulnerable groups. These concerns seem to be less about the inclusion of these groups per se, but rather that the efforts to design a universal scheme are causing delays in implementation that are affecting the formal workers. Both union and employer representatives stated that they were supportive of the idea of a universal approach, echoing the language of the solidarity principle (ZO8, ZO9, ZO10). The discussions about contributions focus on the negotiations between employers and workers about the percentage that each will contribute, with an assumption that the government will provide the funds to cover the informal and vulnerable groups (ZO8, ZO9).

Private sector actors have also raised concerns about financing the SHI scheme (ZO10). Zambia’s informal sector accounts for between 40–60 per cent of the country’s GDP (gross domestic product; Nhekairo 2015), and the Zambia government has been reluctant to impose regulations on this sector (e.g. around taxation) for fear of resistance and losing votes (ZO8). Despite some resistance, initial results from the Zambia Household and Health Expenditure and Utilization Survey indicate that there is a willingness to pay for SHI (removing the poorest deciles) up to a rate of ZMW80 per month, which is higher than the average estimates of 2.5–3 per cent of salary in the informal sector. The estimate for the formal sector is 5 per cent of salary (ZC7). These figures will need to be confirmed when the survey is published, but initially demonstrate a willingness to join and to pay for such a scheme among workers.

This effort to promote SHI in Zambia compares unfavourably with the sustained effort to forge a constituency of support around an evidence-based agenda on SCTs. Promoted less by a coalition than a disparate set of players acting in a fairly uncoordinated way, there does not seem to be a clear and credible plan of how the scheme would actually work in practice. Nor is there a compelling evidence base to justify its introduction amid other pressing concerns in the health sector. More broadly, there is little evidence as yet that SHI is in alignment with Zambia’s political settlement dynamics, the patron–client logics of which seem more attuned to the abolition of user fees rather than efforts to secure contributions from below.

#### **4 Policy coalitions, the political settlement, and the role of ideas**

Our investigation suggests that the varying levels of elite commitment to different aspects of the social protection agenda in Zambia can be understood in relation to transnational efforts to form policy coalitions, political settlement dynamics, and the cross-cutting role of ideas. This section analyses the relative progress of each policy reform in relation to these key elements of the conceptual framework outlined in the introduction to this paper and expanded in Lavers and Hickey (2016).

#### 4.1 Transnational policy coalitions and local wars of position

The formation of a transnational policy coalition in favour of social protection within Zambia has been a critical aspect of the story to date. In Ravi Kanbur's (2001) terms, this involved building the capacity and commitment of the 'civil society tendency' within Zambia (involving social sector ministries, certain donors, and CSOs), to engage in a struggle with the Finance Ministry tendency, with its often paradigmatically opposed ideas about development.

The struggle to promote social protection has been defined in terms of the efforts by actors within the civil society tendency to forge a strong coalition among themselves and to persuade their opponents in the Finance Ministry tendency of the legitimacy and importance of their case. Building the technical case for SCTs through an evidence base that was perceived as legitimate among leading bureaucrats was critical here. The dissemination of this evidence base, alongside the strategic use of study tours and informal networks, reflected a politically astute reading of the policy-making process in Zambia. This included the targeting of rising stars within Ministry of Finance (of whom two would become permanent secretary and director of planning) and ensuring that the Ministry of Community Development had a desk officer in Ministry of Finance. The use of a 'broker' with high-level political and bureaucratic connections and the skills to facilitate discussions across competing positions assisted this process. This politically attuned strategy was further enabled by the nature of the development advisers and agencies involved. Two of the key proponents working for DFID and UNICEF were strongly rooted in the Zambian context and remained in their posts much longer than is normal within the development industry's usual three-year posting cycle. This, and their close working relationship, further embedded the improved levels of donor co-ordination that characterized the building of this policy coalition after the departure of the World Bank and others in 2007, along with strong support from the headquarters of each agency.

In 2012 the World Bank re-entered the social protection sector in Zambia, citing the persistently high poverty rate and the need to address poverty through shared growth (ZC3). This has raised concerns that earlier disagreements and differences in approach will resurface and undermine the policy coalition in favour of social protection. The critical 2013 workshop revealed the benefits of having the convening power of this 'knowledge broker' onside, not least as the World Bank has so far been the only agency brave enough to tackle the government of Zambia concerning its use of agricultural subsidies (ZC2). However, the fact that donors needed to place so much on working in this way may also reflect the declining influence of donors since the heyday of their influence between the 1980s and mid-2000s.<sup>9</sup>

The relative positioning of the key domestic protagonists in the struggle between policy coalitions over SCTs has also been significant, irrespective of transnational manoeuvring. For most of the 2000s the Ministry of Community Development and Social Services was 'not seen by more powerful ministries as a particularly convincing policy champion in the field of poverty reduction' (Barrientos et al. 2005). Under the PF government, the ministry was renamed the Ministry of Community Development and Mother and Child Health. With its new remit over a significant proportion of the health budget and health sector personnel, this ministry became the second biggest-spending ministry after the education ministry, seeing its status rise in relation to the Ministry of Finance and among the broader political class (ZG2, ZK1). However, this

---

<sup>9</sup> Assistance to the budget from traditional donors has declined in recent years from around 60 per cent in the early 1990s to less than 30 per cent in 2009, with official development assistance down to 11.2 per cent of GNI in 2009 (Bertelsman Stiftung BTI 2012). This reflects debt relief and economic growth and the growing role of new donors such as China and private foundations (Faust et al. 2012).

realignment has now been reversed, with mother and child health being moved back to the Ministry of Health, so it remains to be seen whether the increased status and capacity brought about by the larger mandate are retained. The position of the Ministry of Finance, meanwhile, has evolved through a mixture of leadership changes, growing concerns with the distributional failures of growth and strategic efforts by the pro-social protection lobby to persuade certain key actors of the benefits of SCTs.

In contrast to the SCT coalition, the proponents of SHI have largely failed to secure the support of the most powerful players within either government or the donor community. They have not generated the ideas and evidence required to turn SHI into a credible policy agenda in the way that the coalition in support of SCTs eventually managed to do. The scheme is largely championed by a small team in the Ministry of Health led by a small donor with little buy-in from either larger donors or senior players in the ministry itself. Indeed, it seems unlikely that their rather disparate efforts have managed to form a force that even qualifies as a 'coalition' of the type that Leftwich (2012) argues is critical to the promotion of new policy agendas in developing countries.

Most significantly, there is little buy-in for SHI from the ruling coalition. Although the PF party manifesto, commits to extending health services, this is through abolishing user fees rather than increasing the costs to citizens. This is perhaps not surprising given that the PF's political base resides primarily in urban areas, and the scheme would involve a redistribution of income from urban workers to rural dwellers.

#### **4.2 Political settlement dynamics in Zambia: the deepening of competitive clientelism and the rent distribution challenge**

While the efforts of the policy coalition helped to turn SCTs into a credible policy instrument, the dramatic increase in their funding in 2013 came following a change of the ruling coalition and a crisis in the main means of rent distribution to rural areas that directly reflected the wider workings of Zambia's competitive clientelist political settlement. Elected in late 2011 on a promise to 'put money into people's pockets', the PF president was actively searching for policy instruments which could help him to fulfil this pledge. Despite a commitment to 'social transfers' appearing in the PF's 2011 manifesto, and Sata's reputation as a champion of poverty reduction,<sup>10</sup> the president did not turn to SCTs in the first instance. According to one insider, he had actually struck out any mention of cash transfers in red ink from the first draft of the manifesto (ZG19).<sup>11</sup> This is perhaps unsurprising given that the social basis of support for the PF was derived mainly from the urban working classes and intelligentsia, which led to a leftist policy agenda focused on the labour market, including minimum wages, labour relations and being tough on businesses (Helle and Rakner 2012: 11) rather than a focus on reducing rural poverty. This lack of a clear perspective on tackling rural poverty may have informed the contradictory approach of the PF to agricultural subsidies, whereby the increase in funding for SCTs was directly informed by a public scandal in 2013 concerning overspend on the budget lines for the FISP and the FRA (ZC6, ZK2). The budgetary boost to SCTs thus flowed more clearly from this crisis of how to keep social goods flowing to rural areas than from a programmatic commitment to poverty reduction.

---

10 'Sata Championed Poverty Reduction', *Zambia Daily Mail*, 10 November 2014, <https://www.daily-mail.co.zm/?p=10654>

11 It was later reinserted by another senior member of the PF Cabinet with a personal commitment to the agenda.

Nor, as it turned out, did it reflect a strong commitment to tackle political clientelism in favour of more effective and rules-based distributive mechanisms. Although Sata publicly condemned the profligacy of the agencies responsible for FISP and food relief, he lacked the capacity to challenge the interests vested in these programmes at multiple levels of governance and spending levels for these programmes were soon re-established. This reflects the wider sense in which the PF is 'populist' rather than programmatic, focused opportunistically on the unmet demands of distinct social groups rather than a particular ideology (Larmer and Fraser 2007). The pro-poor nature of PF has also been questioned, based on the government's expenditure priorities in the first two years, which focused on infrastructure, particularly roads, and tertiary education, including building new universities, that is, initiatives that produce tangible outputs which are useful for demonstrating progress.

More broadly, there is little sign that social protection has traction within the normative views of political elites in Zambia. Neither SCTs nor SHI were significant issues during the 2014 presidential by-election campaigns, and, when questioned directly on their policy agenda around social protection during a pre-election radio debate, presidential candidates revealed either a lack of awareness or outright hostility (ZO2). Our own interviews with opposition leaders suggest that members of the political elite see SCTs as a 'foreign grown programme' and as a form of dependency on the state (ZG7). Another leader has stated, in no uncertain terms, that 'I hate that stuff, explaining that creating jobs and business opportunities is a more decent approach, and that education and agricultural subsidies are more appropriate forms of social protection (ZS4).

However, support for the SCT programme among parliamentarians is growing. According to one former member of the current government: 'The rural MPs loved the idea, it was largesse without any bullshit, you just give money away' (ZG19). Increased interest from MPs is raising the possibility that the programme will become more politicized in nature. There is little evidence, as yet, that there are strong demands for either SCTs or SHI from voters, although this needs to be considered within the context of a somewhat passive political culture within which 'there is bugger all demand for anything anyway' (ZK1).

In terms of the distributional regime required to maintain ruling coalitions in power in Zambia, both the SCT and SHI initiatives have struggled to find policy space in relation to existing redistributive policies that have already secured a political constituency of support and which play a role in sustaining the current political settlement. As a form of state-subsidized support to rural areas, 'social protection' in Zambia is conceived of primarily in terms of agricultural and food subsidies (as in Malawi, see Chinsinga 2012). Programmes such as FISP and FRA still pull significant resources away from other forms of social protection, with budgeted amounts for FISP actually increasing in 2014–15, despite Sata's rhetoric about reducing agricultural programmes following the scandal in 2013. This situation continues despite reports, including not only the World Bank's 2012 assessment but also the government's own review of the Fifth National Development Plan, indicating that these subsidies, especially FISP, are not a cost-effective way of reducing poverty among the poorest, as those who benefit are mostly larger, non-poor farmers (Tesliuc 2013).

Although this evidence has encouraged officials within the Ministry of Finance to propose that funds currently going towards FISP should be moved to SCTs and Food Support Pack (FSP) programmes instead (ZG18), these subsidies are protected by powerful vested interests. They constitute 'an animal on its own, too big to challenge, very much a political programme' (ZC2), while SCTs are not politically popular enough to displace them (ZC8, ZO4). Powerful interests here include the so-called 'maize mafia', which controls and benefits from the distribution of fertilizer and collection of maize in rural areas. This includes not only national-level companies but also a widespread network of local bureaucrats, security officials and politicians who control



local distribution networks (ZC0, ZG). Studies show that agricultural subsidies in Zambia are used primarily to reward loyalty among the ruling party's voter base, particularly among wealthier households, although interestingly they do not have an impact on the share of votes won by the incumbent (Mason et al. 2013).<sup>12</sup> This form of political clientelism reflects the kind of decentralized rent-seeking that is characteristic of competitive clientelist settings, and which is particularly difficult to rein in or render developmental (Kelsall 2013).

A similar problem has also interrupted the progress of SHI, albeit not quite to the same extent. In particular, the political popularity of 'free health care' is something that is very difficult for the political class to contemplate undermining and acts as an obstacle to any significant attempt to restructure the nature of health sector financing in ways that would challenge the current 'deal' between government and citizens. This underlines the importance of viewing new instruments of social protection within the context of a wider distributional regime, not only in terms of competing funding priorities but with regard to the political work that such regimes do around maintaining ruling coalitions.

### 4.3 The role of ideas

Although the interests of the ruling coalition are clearly a determining factor in the uptake of social protection, ideas are also significant. This includes issues of 'fit' between the normative policy ideas of dominant players in the ruling coalition and the role played by more cognitive forms of evidence concerning problems of poverty with regard to the potential of social protection to act as a solution (Schmidt 2008). As illustrated above, the capacity of different policy coalitions to mobilize both normative ideas and a credible evidence base has closely shaped the progress of the social protection agenda. This may be through concerted efforts by donors to promote their agendas or through the unfolding of events, including new ministers of finance and realignments within the aid architecture that averted the early 'war of position' between competing donor visions of social protection (Deacon 2007).

While the current government's pro-poor ideas are cited by a wide range of informants as a reason for increased interest in SCTs since they took power, questions are also raised about whether this commitment is genuine, based on the government's priorities and expenditure, as well as the president's initial removal of cash transfers from the manifesto. These doubts suggest that the pro-poor messaging may have been used as legitimation for a decision that was actually triggered by the agricultural subsidy crisis. Framing SCTs as a more effective and pro-poor alternative to subsidies, then, may have been a form of 'communicative discourse' to persuade other stakeholders and the public (Schmidt 2002), particularly as it is a predominantly rural programme unlikely to appeal to PF's urban constituency.

In terms of the ideas that have underpinned notions of welfare in Zambia, the clearest linkages are to the 'humanism' that emerged under Kaunda, in the period following independence. Harland (2014) argues that this still resonates in Zambia, particularly through the continued use of the 'One Zambia, One Nation' rhetoric, and offers the basis on which a future welfare state might be built in Zambia. However, respondents contrast these former attitudes with young professionals and decision makers who today are 'nonchalantly happy to denounce poor people' for their poverty rather than wider structural forces (ZC3). This echoes earlier analyses of

---

<sup>12</sup> In the same paper Mason et al. (2013) also demonstrate that poverty reduction gains more votes than agricultural subsidies and on this basis recommend that the government invests in programmes that reduce poverty and inequality.

negative attitudes towards the poor among Zambia's political elite (Barrientos et al. 2005; Scarritt 2006).

Moreover, the key developmental paradigm in Zambia has been less concerned with social welfare than with 'modernity', which is where Zambia, with its high rate of urbanization and processes of class formation, seemed to be heading in the 1970s (Ferguson 1999). This still prevails today: 'Zambians have not stopped thinking about the potential for both national development and personal transformation in decidedly modernist ways' (Larmer et al. 2014). Neither the humanism nor the Christian ideals played on by certain leaders have gained the same degree of social and political salience. As such, one of the reasons why social protection has yet to become more fully established in Zambia may flow from the sense in which the discourse on social protection has not tapped into the deeper paradigmatic ideas (Schmidt 2008) that underpin the political settlement in Zambia (whether around humanism or modernity) nor to seriously challenge elite ideas about dependency and deservingness.

Interestingly, there may be a closer alignment between the solidarity principle that underpins SHI and similar immanent notions within Zambian society, perhaps around humanism. Apart from some initial protests by the unions, there has been limited public resistance to the coverage of vulnerable groups, even though it would explicitly involve both the government and better-off Zambians allocating finance to help vulnerable citizens become protected. This may be due to a lack of understanding about the implications of the contributions but also suggests that the solidarity principle underpinning the scheme is acceptable to Zambians, perhaps based on the strong tradition of providing support for family and community members at the local level (ZG5). Despite being a largely externally promoted effort, then, the idea of SHI appears to have some resonance with paradigmatic ideas within Zambian society. This remains largely untapped, however, due to the lack of a (cognitively) coherent case and policy plan for implementation.

More broadly, then, and despite the claims in the National Social Protection Policy of a paradigm shift that will 'enhance access to justice for the poor' (MCDMCH 2014), the conditions do not yet exist for social protection to be institutionalized as part of a new social contract in Zambia. In particular, SCTs are not understood in this way at any level other than donors and CSOs, with Ministry of Community Development officials and recipients both seeming to perceive SCTs in terms of a gift rather than a right.

## 5 Conclusion

The uneven level of elite commitment to social protection in Zambia challenges mainstream accounts of how welfare states are likely to emerge in developing countries, and needs instead to be understood in relation to the interaction between the shifting nature of Zambia's political settlement and the promotional efforts of a transnationalized policy coalition and actors. Although it took ten years for a sufficient degree of convergence to emerge between these two, the interplay between them has been apparent since the onset of national debates around social protection in Zambia in the late 1990s, with both cash transfers through PWAS and health insurance initially promoted in relation to the country's experience of one of Africa's worst HIV and AIDS pandemics. However, it is notable that transnational efforts to promote social protection tended to overlook and undermine these domestic processes, and instead sought to create a new dynamic and constituency of support around more clearly imported policy agendas. Importantly, the HIV and AIDS crisis did not lead to the crisis of governance that some predicted at the time (Waal 2003), and had relatively little impact on the functioning and character of the political settlement in Zambia. Even where development agencies have managed to form a coherent policy coalition of sufficiently capable and committed powerful players, and

succeeded in developing and promoting a credible policy agenda around social protection (as eventually occurred over a decade-long effort in the case of SCTs), progress remained limited until there was a shift in political settlement dynamics which led social protection to become more aligned with the interests and ideas of a new ruling coalition.

The level of commitment to SCTs remains limited, particularly when viewed in relation to existing forms of rent-allocation that help sustain the clientelist settlement in Zambia. In comparison, the scaling-up of SCTs in Zambia reflects a one-off opportunistic decision by a populist leader, with the main driver being a perceived crisis during 2013 within the existing system of rent-allocation based on agricultural subsidies. This occurred within a political settlement context that privileges personalized rather than programmatic decision-making.

While the pro-poor, urban-based PF has to some extent extended the vertical reach to lower-level factions through its populist approach, it remains more clearly focused on maintaining the settlement through a 'maximum coalition' focusing on the horizontal distribution of power between elite factions. This practice heralds a continuation of existing political and developmental strategies, rather than a significant rupture in the way in which power is organized and resources allocated. The shift towards a pro-poor agenda marked a shift in ideational rhetoric that provided some space for the social protection agenda to gain ground, but only to a certain degree, and without having the power to displace more deeply embedded interests, policies and rent-allocation practices.

A political settlements framework is useful for understanding the development of social protection in Zambia because it allows for an analysis of the interaction between the ruling coalition and various policy coalitions. In the Zambia case, donor-driven policy coalitions played a vital role in developing and pushing the agenda until a combination of factors made it a politically useful option for the ruling coalition. The 'coalition' around SHI has been more fragmented, with little involvement from larger donors and senior political figures, and a lack of an evidence-based plan for how this complex scheme would work in practice. Each initiative has achieved a degree of ideational fit with dominant ideas, in part through generating sufficient evidence (or cognitive ideas) to re-shape normative perceptions, although neither as yet has managed this across all of Schmidt's three levels of paradigmatic, problem-framing and policy solutions.

How this all plays out in the future remains to be seen, although there are some initial signs that tensions are growing concerning the always fused technical and political aspects of this kind of programme, with interest from MPs increasing political pressure. If SCTs can be re-framed in ways that secures localized support, then it is difficult to see them being removed, even if there is a long way to go before they match the scale and political significance of agricultural subsidies as a form of rent-allocation.

## **APPENDIX**

### **Interviews conducted**

#### *Government representatives*

ZG1 SCT Unit, Ministry of Community Development, Mother and Child Health (MCDMCH) (5 people), Lusaka, 13 April 2015

ZG2 Director, MCDMCH Lusaka, 14 April 2015

ZG3 Accountant, MCDMCH, Lusaka, 14 April 2015

ZG4 Director, Ministry of Labour, Lusaka, 15 April 2015

ZG5 Deputy Director, Ministry of Health, Lusaka, 15 April 2015

ZG6 Director, Ministry of Health, Lusaka, 15 April 2015

ZG7 Opposition party leader, Lusaka, 15 April 2015

ZG8 Senior Officer, MCDMCH, Choma, 27 April 2015

ZG9 Provincial Officer, MCDMCH, Choma, 27 April 2015

ZG10 District Officer, MCDMCH, Monze, 28 April 2015

ZG11 Member of Parliament United Party for National Development (UPND), Lusaka, 29 April 2015

ZG12 Member of Parliament UPND, Lusaka, 30 April 2015

ZG13 Member of Parliament PF, Lusaka, 30 April 2015

ZG14 Member of Parliament MMD, Lusaka, 30 April 2015

ZG15 Member of Parliament PF, Lusaka, 30 April 2015

ZG16 Senior official, MCDMCH, Lusaka, 6 May 2015

ZG17 Director, MCDMCH, Lusaka, 7 May 2015

ZG18 Desk Officer, Ministry of Finance, Lusaka, 7 May 2015

ZG19 Politician, Lusaka, 17 April 2015 and 30 April 2015

#### *Zambian organizations (trade unions, CSOs, think tanks, consultancies)*

ZO1 CSO representative, Lusaka, 13 April 2015

ZO2 CSO representatives (3 people), Lusaka, 13 April 2015

ZO3 Consultant, Lusaka, 13 April 2015

ZO4 Consultant, Lusaka, 14 April 2015

ZO5 Think tank representatives (2 people), Lusaka, 16 April 2015

ZO6 Think tank representative, Lusaka, 23 April 2015

ZO7 CSO representative, Monze, 28 April 2015

ZO8 Trade union representative, Lusaka, 29 April 2015

ZO9 Trade union representative, Lusaka, 6 May 2015

ZO10 Employers federation representative, Lusaka, 6 May 2015

### *Cooperating partners*

- ZC1 representative of cooperating partner involved in SCT, Lusaka, 13 April 2015
- ZC2 representative of cooperating partner involved in SCT, Lusaka, 14 April 2015
- ZC3 representative of cooperating partner involved in SCT, Lusaka, 14 April 2015
- ZC4 representative of cooperating partner involved in SCT, Lusaka, 15 April 2015
- ZC5 representative of cooperating partner involved in SCT, Lusaka, 15 April 2015
- ZC6 representative of cooperating partner involved in SCT, Lusaka, 15 April 2015
- ZC7 representative of cooperating partner involved in SHI, Lusaka, 16 April 2015
- ZC8 representative of a cooperating partner involved in social protection, Lusaka, 20 April 2015
- ZC9 representatives (× 2) of cooperating partner involved in SCT, Lusaka, 21 April 2015
- ZC10 representative of cooperating partner involved in SHI, Lusaka, 22 April 2015
- ZC11 representative of cooperating partner involved in SHI, Lusaka, 23 April 2015
- ZC12 representative of cooperating partner involved in SCT, Lusaka, 30 April 2015
- ZC12 representative of cooperating partner involved in SCT, Lusaka, 6 May 2015

### *Key individuals*

- ZK1 Consultant and former Cooperating Partner (CP) representative, 17 April 2015 and 8 May 2015
- ZK2 Consultant, Lusaka, 13–17 April 2015
- ZK3 Consultant and former CP representative, email correspondence

### *Public speeches*

- ZS1 Nkole Chishimba, Zambia Congress of Trade Unions, Lusaka, 1 May 2015
- ZS2 Hon. Fackson Shamenda, Lusaka, 1 May 2015
- ZS3 President Edgar Lungu, Lusaka, 1 May 2015
- ZS4 Hakainde Hichilema, Cape Town, 5 June 2015

## References

- Barrientos, A. and S. Pellissery (2012). 'Delivering Effective Social Assistance: Does Politics Matter?' ESID Working Paper 9. Manchester: Effective States and Inclusive Development.
- Barrientos, A., S. Hickey, N. Simutanyi, and D. Wood (2005). *Final Report of Study on Drivers of Change for a National Social Protection Scheme in Zambia*. DFID Zambia. Available at: <https://www.ids.ac.uk/files/dmfile/DfIDZambianov2005.pdf> (accessed 15 Nov. 2016).
- Bertelsmann Stiftung BTI (2012). *Zambia Country Report*. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung.
- Central Statistical Office (2011). *Living Conditions Monitoring Survey Report 2006 and 2010*. Lusaka: Central Statistical Office.
- Cheeseman, N., R. Ford, and N. Simutanyi (2014). 'Is There a "Populist Threat" in Zambia?' In C. Adam, P. Collier, and M. Gondwe (eds), *Zambia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cheeseman, N., and M. Hinfelaar (2010). 'Parties, Platforms, and Political Mobilization: The Zambian Presidential Election of 2008'. *African Affairs*, 109(434): 51–76.
- Chikwanda, A. (2013). 2014 Budget Address by Hon. Alexander B. Chikwanda MP, Minister of Finance, delivered to the National Assembly on 11 October 2013.
- Chinsinga, B. (2012). 'The Political Economy of Agricultural Policy Processes in Malawi: A Case Study of the Fertilizer Subsidy Programme'. FAC Working Paper. Brighton: Future Agricultures Consortium.
- Deacon, B. (2007). *Global Social Policy and Governance*. London: Sage Publications.
- Di John, J., and J. Putzel (2009). 'Political Settlements: Issues Paper'. Governance and Social Development Resource Centre, University of Birmingham, June 2009.
- Dixon, J. (ed.) (1987). *Social Welfare in Africa*. London: Croom Helm.
- Econ/UNZA, MoH/SIDA/IHE (2006). *National Health Accounts for Zambia 2002–2004*. Lusaka: Ministry of Health.
- Erdmann, G., and N. Simutanyi (2003). *Transition in Zambia: The Hybridisation of the Third Republic*. Lilongwe: Konrad Adenauer Foundation.
- Faust, J., A. de Kemp, and S. Leiderer (2012). *Between High Expectations and Reality: An Evaluation of Budget Support in Zambia (2005–2010)*. Lusaka: SIDA and MINBUZA.
- Ferguson, J. (1999). *Expectations of Modernity: Myths and Meanings of Urban Life on the Zambian Copperbelt*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gould, J. (2006). 'Strong Bar, Weak State? Lawyers, Liberalism and State Formation in Zambia'. *Development and Change*, 37(4): 921–41.
- Harland, C. (2014). 'Can the Expansion of Social Protection Bring about Social Transformation in African Countries? The Case of Zambia'. *European Journal of Development Research*, 26(3): 370–86.
- Hickey, S. (2007). 'Conceptualising the Politics of Social Protection in Africa'. In A. Barrientos and D. Hulme (eds), *Social Protection for the Poor and Poorest*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hickey, S., R. Sabates-Wheeler, G. Guenther, and I. Macauslan (2009). 'Promoting Social Transfers: DFID and the Politics of Influencing'. Evaluation Working Paper/Evaluation Report A2. London: Department for International Development.
- Huber, E., and J.D. Stephens (2012). *Democracy and the Left: Social Policy and Inequality in Latin America*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Kabandula, A., and J. Seekings (2014). ‘The Minister of Finance and the Limits of Donor Influence on Cash Transfer Programmes in Zambia, 2003-2011’, unpublished paper.
- Kanbur, R. (2001). ‘Economic Policy, Distribution and Poverty: The Nature of Disagreements’. *World Development*, 29(6): 1083–94.
- Kelsall, T. (2013). *Business, Politics and the State in Africa: Challenging the Orthodoxies on Growth and Transformation*. London: Zed Books.
- Khan, M. (2010). ‘Political Settlements and the Governance of Growth-enhancing Institutions’. Working Paper (unpublished). London: School of Oriental and African Studies. Available at: <http://eprints.soas.ac.uk/9968/> (accessed 16 December 2014).
- Kpessa, M.W., and D. Béland (2013). ‘Mapping Social Policy Development in Sub-Saharan Africa’. *Policy Studies*, 34(3): 326–41.
- Larmer, M., and A. Fraser (2007). ‘Of Cabbages and King Cobra: Populist Politics and Zambia’s 2006 Election’. *African Affairs*, 106(425): 611–37.
- Larmer, M., M. Hinfelaar, B.J. Phiri, L. Schumaker, and M. Szeftel (2014). ‘Introduction: Narratives of Nationhood’. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 40(5): 895–905.
- Lavers, T., and S. Hickey (2016). ‘Conceptualising the Politics of Social Protection Expansion in Low Income Countries: The Intersection of Transnational Ideas and Domestic Politics’. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 25(4): 388–98.
- Leftwich, A. (2012). *Coalitions in the Politics of Development*. Research and Policy Workshop Report. Sydney: Developmental Leadership Program.
- Levy, B. (2014). *Working with the Grain: Integrating Governance and Growth in Development Strategies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lindemann, S. (2011). ‘Inclusive Elite Bargains and the Dilemma of Unproductive Peace: A Zambian Case Study’. *Third World Quarterly*, 32(10): 1843–69.
- Mason, N., T.S. Jayne, and N. van de Walle (2013). ‘Fertilizer Subsidies and Voting Patterns: Political Economy Dimensions of Input Subsidy Programs’. Selected Paper prepared for Presentation at the Agricultural & Applied Economics Association’s 2013 AAEA & CAES Joint Annual Meeting, Washington, DC, 4–6 August.
- MCDMCH (Ministry of Community Development, Mother and Child Health) (2014). *National Social Protection Policy: Reducing poverty, inequality and vulnerability*. Lusaka: Ministry of Community Development, Mother and Child Health.
- MCDSS (Ministry of Community Development and Social Services), and GTZ (2007). *Final Evaluation Report—Kalomo Social Cash Transfer Scheme*. Lusaka: MCDSS and GTZ.
- Mhone, G. (2004). ‘Historical Trajectories of Social Policy in Post-colonial Africa: The Case of Zambia’. In T. Mkandawire (ed.) *Social Policy in a Development Context*. Geneva: UNRISD.
- Ministry of Finance (2014). *The Proposed 2015–2017 Medium Term Expenditure Framework and Policies for the 2015 Budget*. Lusaka: Ministry of Finance.
- Ministry of Finance (2015). *The Proposed 2016–2018 Medium Term Expenditure Framework and the 2016 Budget*. Lusaka: Ministry of Finance.
- Ministry of Health (2008). *First Actuarial Assessment Report on the Establishment of a Social Health Insurance Scheme in Zambia*. Lusaka: Ministry of Health.
- Ministry of Health (2011). *National Health Strategic Plan 2011-2015*. Lusaka: Ministry of Health.

- Nhekairo, W. (2015). *The Taxation System in Zambia*. Lusaka: Jesuit Centre for Theological Reflection.
- Niño-Zarazúa, M., A. Barrientos, S. Hickey, and D. Hulme (2011). 'Social Protection in Sub-Saharan Africa: Getting the Politics Right'. *World Development*, 40(1): 163–76.
- Noyoo, N. (2010). *Social Policy and Human Development in Zambia*. London: Adonis & Abbey.
- Rakner, L. (2003). *Political and Economic Liberalisation in Zambia 1991–2001*. Uppsala: Nordic Africa Institute.
- Rakner, L., and S.-E. Helle (2012). 'The Interplay between Poverty and Electoral Authoritarianism: Poverty and Political Mobilization in Zambia and Uganda'. CMI Working Paper 2012:3. Bergen: Chr. Michelsen Institute.
- Scarritt, J.R. (2006). 'The Strategic Choice of Multiethnic Parties in Zambia's Dominant and Personalist Party System'. *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics*, 44(2): 234–56.
- Schmidt, V.A. (2002). 'Does Discourse Matter in the Politics of Welfare State Adjustment?' *Comparative Political Studies*, 35(2): 168–93.
- Schmidt, V.A. (2008). 'Discursive Institutionalism: The Explanatory Power of Ideas and Discourse'. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11(1): 303–26.
- Schubert, B. (2005). 'The Pilot Social Cash Transfer Scheme Kalomo District—Zambia'. SSRN Scholarly Paper ID 1753690. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network.
- Stone, D. (2008). 'Global Public Policy, Transnational Policy Communities, and Their Networks'. *Policy Studies Journal*, 36(1): 19–38.
- Tesliuc, C.M. (2013). 'Using Social Safety Nets to Accelerate Poverty Reduction and Share Prosperity in Zambia'. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Waal, A. de (2003). 'How Will HIV/AIDS Transform African Governance?' *African Affairs*, 102(406): 1–23.
- Wietler, K. (2007). *The Impact of Social Cash Transfers on Informal Safety Nets in Kalomo District Zambia*. Lusaka: MCDSS/GTZ.