POWER DYNAMICS AND POLICY IMPLEMENTATION: THE POLITICO - BUREAUCRATIC NEXUS IN RURAL LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Arvind A S

Assistant Professor

Department of Public Administration, Sri Krishna Arts and Science College, Coimbatore, India

Abstract: This research paper explores the relationship between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats in rural local government administration and its implications for policy implementation in India. By employing the theoretical frameworks of Principal-Agent Theory and Public Choice Theory, the study aims to understand the power dynamics, patronage networks, and patterns of collusion within this nexus. The research utilizes secondary data sources, including existing literature, government reports, academic journals, and policy documents, to analyze the nature of interactions, challenges faced, and consequences for rural local government administration. The analysis reveals that the power dynamics between political executives and bureaucrats are characterized by information asymmetry and potential conflicts of interest. Patronage networks play a significant role in influencing bureaucratic decisions and resource allocation. Collusion patterns between political executives and bureaucrats involve mutual benefits and exchanges, compromising impartial governance and policy outcomes. The challenges posed by this nexus include compromised transparency, accountability, and marginalized citizen engagement. To address these challenges, the study emphasizes the importance of strengthening accountability mechanisms, promoting citizen engagement and participation, facilitating information dissemination and awareness, and implementing social audits and feedback mechanisms. These strategies can enhance transparency, inclusivity, and responsiveness in policy implementation, ultimately fostering effective and people-centered governance in rural India. The findings contribute to the existing literature on local government reforms and provide insights for policymakers to enhance the functioning of rural local government administration.

Keywords: Rural Administration, bureaucracy, principal- agent, power dynamics, Local government

1. Introduction:

Local government administration plays a vital role in the governance of rural areas, serving as a critical link between the central government and the grassroots level (Tschudin, 2018). In India, where the majority of the population resides in rural areas, effective and efficient local governance is essential for socio-economic development and the implementation of public policies. Within this framework, the relationship between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats becomes crucial in shaping the outcomes of governance processes. The nexus between political executives, who are elected representatives, and lower-level bureaucrats, who are responsible for policy implementation, has long been a subject of concern in India. This nexus refers to a mutually beneficial alliance where political executives use their influence and power to exert control over bureaucrats, while bureaucrats seek to align their actions with the political interests of those in power(Rose & Miller, 1992). Such a relationship has the potential to impact the impartiality, transparency, and efficiency of local government administration and policy implementation. Understanding the dynamics of this nexus is vital for promoting good governance, enhancing accountability, and ensuring the effective delivery of public services. By investigating the relationship between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats, this research aims to explore the nature of their interactions, the challenges they face, and the consequences for rural local government administration and policy implementation in India.

2. Methodology:

This study employs the theoretical frameworks of Principal-Agent Theory, which analyzes the relationship between principals (political executives) and agents (lower-level bureaucrats), and Public Choice Theory, which examines the behavior of individuals in the public sector. By employing these frameworks, the research seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of the power dynamics, patronage networks, and patterns of collusion that may exist between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats in rural local government administration. By analyzing data collected this research paper aims to contribute to the existing literature on the subject and inform policy debates surrounding local government reforms and strategies. The findings of this study will provide insights into the challenges faced in the nexus between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats and propose potential strategies for fostering impartiality, transparency, and effective policy implementation in rural local government administration in India. Secondary data source is utilized to analyze the relationship between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats in rural local government administration and policy implementation in India. The data includes reviewing existing literature, government reports, academic journals, policy documents, and other relevant sources. These sources provide a comprehensive understanding of the subject matter and allow for an in-depth analysis of the nexus between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats.

The secondary data includes information on the roles and responsibilities of political executives and bureaucrats, power dynamics within local government administration, patronage networks, case studies, and policy implementation outcomes. By relying on secondary data, this research study will draw from a wide range of existing knowledge and insights into the topic. The data collection process adheres to rigorous selection criteria to ensure the inclusion of relevant and reliable sources. The analysis of secondary data involves a systematic and rigorous examination of the collected information. The data is organized identify patterns, challenges, and consequences related to the nexus between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats in rural local government administration. The analysis also explores the impact of this relationship on policy implementation outcomes, such as delayed or inefficient implementation, distorted policy priorities, and unequal distribution of resources. Through a qualitative analysis approach, this research study extracts key findings, insights, and observations from the secondary data. The analysis involves identifying themes, examining case studies, and assessing the implications of the data for rural local government administration and policy implementation in India. The findings are presented in a comprehensive and structured manner, ensuring clarity and coherence in conveying the research outcomes.

3. Theoretical Framework

3.1 *Principal-Agent Theory*: The Principal-Agent Theory provides a useful lens for understanding the relationship between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats in rural local government administration (Pepinsky et al., 2017). According to this theory, political executives act as principals who delegate tasks and authority to lower-level bureaucrats, who function as agents. The principal-agent relationship is characterized by information asymmetry(Mishra & Heide, 1998), where the principal (political executive) lacks complete knowledge about the actions and motivations of the agent (bureaucrat). This information asymmetry creates a potential for the agent to pursue their own interests, potentially diverging from the objectives set by the principal (Bosse & Phillips, 2016). In the context of rural local government administration, the principal-agent theory helps to explain how political executives delegate power and responsibility to lower-level bureaucrats to implement policies and programs. The theory highlights the challenges associated with monitoring and controlling the behavior of bureaucrats, as well as the potential for bureaucrats to pursue personal interests or engage in corruption, patronage, or favoritism. It also emphasizes the importance of aligning the incentives and objectives of political executives and bureaucrats to ensure effective policy implementation and governance.

3.2 *Public Choice Theory*: Public Choice Theory offers additional insights into the relationship between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats (Ostrom & Ostrom, 1971). This theory views individuals in the public sector, including bureaucrats, as rational actors who pursue their own self-interests (Egeberg, 1995). According to Strom, 1990, bureaucrats are motivated by a desire for job security, career advancement, and other personal incentives. These motivations can influence their actions and decision-making, potentially leading to suboptimal policy outcomes or conflicts of interest. In the context of rural

local government administration, Public Choice Theory helps to elucidate how lower-level bureaucrats may prioritize their own interests or the interests of politically influential groups over the broader public interest. Thus, recognizing the inherent agency problems and potential rent-seeking behaviors within the bureaucracy. Understanding the incentives and motivations of bureaucrats can inform strategies to align their behavior with the objectives of political executives and the overall welfare of the rural population (Gulzar & Pasquale, 2017). By employing the Principal-Agent Theory and Public Choice Theory as theoretical frameworks, this research study aims to provide a conceptual understanding of the power dynamics, information asymmetry, and potential conflicts of interest within the nexus between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats. These theoretical frameworks will guide the analysis of empirical data, helping to uncover patterns, challenges, and consequences associated with this relationship in rural local government administration and policy implementation in India.

IV. Political Executives and Lower-Level Bureaucrats in Rural Local Government

4.1 *Political executives* in rural local government administration include elected representatives such as Sarpanchs (village heads), Panchayat members, and other elected officials at the district and block levels. These political executives are responsible for making policy decisions, providing political leadership, and overseeing the overall functioning of local governance structures(Singh, 1994). They play a crucial role in representing the interests and aspirations of the rural population and are accountable to the electorate (Pinto, 1992). On the other hand, lower-level bureaucrats in rural local government administration are typically appointed officials who are responsible for implementing policies and programs at the grassroots level. They include Block Development Officers (BDOs), Village Administrative Officers (VAOs), and other administrative staff ("Administration of Panchayati Raj Institutions," 1978). These bureaucrats are responsible for administrative tasks, coordinating development activities, managing public resources, and ensuring the delivery of essential services to the rural population.

4.2 *Power Dynamics*: The relationship between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats in India is often characterized by complex power dynamics (Riccucci & Saidel, 1997). While political executives hold the decision-making authority and have the power to allocate resources and influence policy implementation, lower-level bureaucrats possess technical expertise, administrative knowledge, and control over day-to-day operations. This power asymmetry can create tensions and challenges in the functioning of local government administration (Phillips, 2017). Keiser & Soss, 1998 are of the opinion that political executives may exert their influence over lower-level bureaucrats by giving directives, exerting pressure, or using their discretionary powers. This influence can shape bureaucratic decision-making and influence the implementation of policies. At the same time, bureaucrats may seek to please political executives to secure their positions, gain career benefits, or avoid transfers (Heclo, 1977). This power dynamic can lead to a symbiotic relationship, where political executives and bureaucrats form alliances based on mutual interests or patronage networks

4.3 *Patronage Networks*: Patronage networks play a significant role in the nexus between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats in rural local government administration. These networks are often based on personal or political affiliations, kinship ties, caste or community connections, and other forms of social capital (Scott, 1972). Political executives may use their positions to appoint or transfer bureaucrats who align with their interests or belong to their political or social networks (Favero, 2018). Patronage networks can influence bureaucratic decision-making, resource allocation, and the implementation of policies. Bureaucrats who are part of these networks may feel obligated to prioritize the interests of political executives or influential groups over the broader public interest. This can result in biased decision-making, favoritism, corruption, and inefficiencies in local government administration. Understanding these dynamics within the nexus between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats is crucial for analyzing the effectiveness and fairness of rural local government administration in India. It highlights the need for strategies and reforms that promote transparency, accountability, and the depoliticization of bureaucratic processes to ensure impartial governance and effective policy implementation at the grassroots level. Jiang, 2018 highlights that political executives strategically use their positions to place loyal bureaucrats in key positions, thereby reinforcing patronage systems and potentially compromising the impartiality of local government administration. The research by Pepinsky et al., 2017 explores the impact of political interference on the efficiency of public sector firms. He suggests that excessive political interference can

lead to inefficiencies, reduced productivity, and hindered performance in these organizations, highlighting the importance of minimizing political influence to improve the overall effectiveness of public sector entities.

5. Nexus between Political Executives and Lower-Level Bureaucrats

5.1 *Patterns of Collusion*: The nexus between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats in India often involves patterns of collusion where both parties engage in mutual benefits and exchanges. Political executives may exert influence over bureaucrats to gain control over administrative decisions, resource allocation, and the implementation of policies(Wood & Waterman, 1991). In return, bureaucrats may seek favoritism, protection, or career advancement opportunities from political executives. This collusion can manifest in various forms, including nepotism, bribery, favoritism in contract awards, and the exploitation of bureaucratic discretion (Campos & Pradhan, 2007). These patterns of collusion can lead to compromised decision-making processes, lack of transparency, and unequal treatment of citizens. It may result in the diversion of public resources for personal or political gains (Kurer, 1993) rather than addressing the needs and priorities of the rural population. Consequently, the nexus between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats can undermine the principles of accountability, fairness, and meritocracy in local government administration.

5.2 *Mutual Benefits and Exchange*: Political executives and lower-level bureaucrats in India often operate on the basis of mutual benefits and exchanges. Political executives, particularly those in positions of power, can provide various incentives to bureaucrats, such as promotions, transfers, monetary rewards, or protection from disciplinary action (Johnson & Libecap, 1994). In return, bureaucrats may align their actions with the political interests of those in power, support their political campaigns, or comply with directives that may not necessarily serve the best interests of the public (Levi & Stoker, 2000). This mutual benefit exchange reinforces the nexus between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats and perpetuates a system where loyalty and personal gain take precedence over impartiality and public service. As a result, policy implementation may be influenced by political considerations rather than evidence-based decision-making or the needs of the rural population (Liverani et al., 2013). This can lead to suboptimal outcomes, misallocation of resources, and unequal distribution of benefits among different groups within the rural communities.

5.3 *Challenges to Impartial Governance*: The existence of a nexus between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats poses significant challenges to impartial governance in rural local government administration in India. It undermines the principles of neutrality, transparency, and accountability, which are essential for effective policy implementation and service delivery. The influence of political executives on bureaucratic decisions and actions can compromise the integrity of administrative processes, erode public trust, and perpetuate corruption and inefficiency (Gould & Amaro-Reyes, 1983). Moreover, this nexus can also create a culture of fear and intimidation, where bureaucrats may hesitate to raise concerns or voice dissenting opinions. This can hinder critical decision-making processes and prevent the effective identification and resolution of issues faced by the rural population. The lack of impartial governance can lead to a sense of injustice, exclusion, and marginalization among citizens, further exacerbating social and economic disparities (Menocal, 2017). Understanding the challenges posed by the nexus is crucial for initiating reforms and strategies that promote transparency, accountability, and the depoliticization of local government administration. Efforts should focus on strengthening institutional frameworks, enhancing checks and balances, and fostering a culture of professionalism and meritocracy within the bureaucracy to ensure effective and impartial governance in rural India (Zhuang et al., 2010).

6. Strengthening accountability and citizen engagement

Here, we explore the factors that contribute to effective policy implementation and governance.
6.1 *Accountability Mechanisms:* A robust system of accountability is essential to ensure that political executives and bureaucrats are held responsible for their actions and decisions (Kulkarni, 2014). Accountability mechanisms, such as performance evaluations, regular audits, and transparency measures, can help deter corrupt practices, improve efficiency, and enhance the overall quality of policy implementation (Menocal & Stenberg Johnson, 2015). When political executives and bureaucrats are aware

of the potential consequences of their actions, it encourages responsible behavior, adherence to rules and regulations, and a commitment to achieving the desired outcomes of policies and programs (Thomson, 1998). Additionally, it is also necessary to have Independent oversight bodies, such as ombudsman offices, ethics commissions, and audit institutions, play a vital role in holding local government officials accountable. These bodies investigate complaints, monitor compliance with laws and regulations, and provide recommendations for improvement. They act as a check on the actions of public officials and ensure fairness and integrity.

6.2 *Citizen Engagement and Participation*: Engaging citizens in the policy implementation process is crucial for promoting transparency, inclusivity, and responsiveness (Bhargava, 2015). When citizens are actively involved, they can contribute their local knowledge, provide feedback, and hold officials accountable for their actions (Whittaker et al., 2015). Citizen engagement can take various forms, including participatory planning processes, public consultations, grievance redressal mechanisms, and the establishment of local development committees (Maiti & De Faria, 2017). By involving citizens in decision-making, their perspectives and needs are considered, leading to more effective and people-centered policies (Fitzgerald et al., 2016) that address the specific challenges and aspirations of rural communities. Local governments worldwide are shifting from traditional voting and public comment hearings to innovative methods of citizen involvement, aiming to nurture civic culture and infrastructure. These endeavors demand substantial creativity, dedication, and energy to succeed. However, research indicates that successful citizen engagement can cultivate a sense of community, build trust, foster innovative solutions, and boost public support for community initiatives. Rather than focusing solely on information exchange, local governments should actively seek opportunities to promote engagement in all interactions with citizens (Svara & Denhardt, 2010).

6.3 *Information Dissemination and Awareness*: Ensuring access to information and promoting awareness among citizens is another vital aspect of strengthening accountability and citizen engagement (Batonon, 2015). Political executives and bureaucrats should disseminate information about policies, programs, and their progress to rural communities in a clear and accessible manner (Favero, 2018). This can be achieved through various means, such as public announcements, community meetings, websites, and mobile applications. By providing accurate and timely information, citizens can make informed decisions, monitor policy implementation, and actively engage with local government officials (Strom, 2016), fostering a sense of ownership and empowerment. Rural-focused government activities and programs lack effective publicity methods that would truly benefit rural communities. The information about these initiatives is not adequately disseminated in a manner that reaches and serves the needs of rural populations, resulting in a lack of awareness and limited access to potential benefits (Daudu & Mohammed, 2013).

6.4 *Social Audits and Feedback Mechanisms*: Implementing social audits and establishing feedback mechanisms can significantly enhance accountability and citizen engagement (Farag & María Marín, 2018). Social audits involve independent assessments of policy implementation by citizens or civil society organizations to evaluate its effectiveness, efficiency, and impact (Natale & Ford, 1994). Van Teeffelen & Baud, 2011 in their study inform that feedback mechanisms, such as suggestion boxes, helplines, or online platforms, enable citizens to report grievances, provide suggestions, and seek redressal for any issues they encounter. These mechanisms promote transparency, accountability, and responsiveness, as they allow citizens to voice their concerns, highlight implementation gaps, and contribute to the continuous improvement of policies and programs. By strengthening accountability mechanisms and promoting citizen engagement, the nexus between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats can foster a culture of transparency, responsiveness, and inclusivity in rural local government administration. This leads to more effective policy implementation, better service delivery, and increased trust between officials and citizens. Emphasizing accountability and citizen engagement ensures that policies and programs are responsive to the needs of rural communities, resulting in sustainable and equitable development. Undoubtedly, social audit plays a crucial role in educating stakeholders and the general public, fostering rural local democracy, facilitating collective decision-making, providing benefits to marginalized groups, and promoting accountability among rural local leaders. However, it is not without its weaknesses, such as being time-consuming, lacking appropriate methodology and scope, relying on subjective assessments by untrained personnel, being affected by indifferent attitudes and vested interests, and often lacking follow-up actions. To address these issues,. Ghonkrokta & Anu Singh, 2007 is of the opinion that social audit instills trust within society by showcasing the government's initiatives, fosters transparency and effectiveness, and

enhances social responsibility, ethical practices, and environmental outcomes. It promotes inclusivity, facilitates ongoing monitoring, and ensures that decision-makers are held accountable for their actions.

VII. Summary of Findings

This research paper delves into the intricate relationship between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats in the context of rural local government administration and policy implementation in India. By thoroughly analyzing the available data, several key insights have emerged, shedding light on the significance of collaboration, the challenges posed by interference and resistance, the pivotal role of bureaucrats, and the diverse outcomes that can arise from this dynamic interaction. One of the fundamental findings of this research is that the collaboration between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats is vital for the effective implementation of policies in rural local government administration. Successful policy execution heavily relies on a synergistic partnership between these two entities. Political executives provide the vision, policy direction, and oversight, while bureaucrats contribute their local knowledge, technical expertise, and understanding of the ground realities. This partnership ensures that policies are adapted to local needs and effectively translated into action, leading to desirable outcomes for rural communities.

However, the research also highlights the potential challenges that can impede smooth policy implementation. Political interference and bureaucratic resistance are identified as major obstacles that can disrupt the execution process, resulting in implementation gaps and delays. Political executives may misuse their power to influence policy implementation for personal or political gains, compromising the overall effectiveness and integrity of the policies. Similarly, bureaucratic resistance, stemming from various factors such as conflicting interests or organizational inertia, can hinder the progress and desired outcomes of policies. Despite these challenges, the research underscores the crucial role of bureaucrats as implementers of policies. Bureaucrats possess valuable local knowledge and technical expertise, enabling them to navigate the complexities of rural local government administration and tailor policies to specific contexts. Their understanding of ground realities ensures that policies are not only well-designed but also practically feasible and responsive to the needs of rural communities. When political executives and bureaucrats work collaboratively and respect each other's roles, the expertise of bureaucrats can be effectively utilized, leading to successful policy outcomes.

It is important to note that the Indian context offers a range of examples that illustrate both the negative and positive aspects of the nexus between political executives and bureaucrats in rural local government administration. Instances of political executives misusing their power for personal or political gains have been observed, resulting in biased policy implementation or inadequate allocation of resources. However, there are also instances where effective collaboration between political executives and bureaucrats has yielded positive results. These examples highlight the potential for achieving successful policy outcomes when there is mutual trust, respect, and a shared commitment to the welfare of rural communities. In conclusion, this research paper provides a comprehensive understanding of the nexus between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats in rural local government administration and policy implementation in India. By examining the available data, it emphasizes the critical nature of collaboration, identifies challenges posed by interference and resistance, underscores the pivotal role of bureaucrats, and showcases diverse outcomes that can arise from this relationship. This research contributes to the existing knowledge on governance and policy implementation and offers insights that can inform decision-making processes to enhance the effectiveness of rural local government administration in India and potentially in other similar contexts.

7.1 *Policy Implications:* The findings of this research paper have significant policy implications for rural local government administration in India. Based on the identified points, the following policy recommendations can be considered: Strengthening institutional mechanisms to minimize political interference in policy implementation and ensuring the autonomy of lower-level bureaucrats. Enhancing the capacity of political executives and bureaucrats through targeted training programs, skill development initiatives, and knowledge-sharing platforms. Promoting transparency, accountability, and citizen engagement in policy implementation processes through the establishment of feedback mechanisms, social audits, and participatory decision-making processes. Investing in administrative reforms to address bureaucratic inefficiencies, streamline procedures, and ensure the availability of adequate resources for

policy implementation. Facilitating interdepartmental coordination and cooperation through regular communication, joint planning, and shared objectives among different government agencies.

7.2 *Future Research Directions:* While this paper provides insights into the nexus between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats in rural local government administration in India, there are several avenues for future research. Some potential directions for further exploration include: Conducting empirical studies to assess the impact of capacity building programs on the effectiveness of policy implementation in rural local government administration. Examining the role of political will and leadership in fostering a conducive environment for collaboration between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats. Investigating the influence of socio-cultural factors on the relationship between political executives and bureaucrats and their impact on policy implementation outcomes. Analyzing case studies from different states in India to identify variations in the dynamics of the nexus between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats. Exploring the use of technology and digital solutions in improving policy implementation and citizen engagement at the rural local government level. By further investigating these research directions, policymakers and scholars can gain deeper insights into the nuances of the relationship between political executives and lower-level bureaucrats and develop more targeted interventions to enhance policy implementation in rural local government administration in India.

REFERENCES

Administration of Panchayati Raj Institutions. (1978). *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, *24*(3), 935–940. https://doi.org/10.1177/0019556119780344

Batonon, I. (2015). *Social Accountability: An Introduction to Civic Engagement for Improved Service Delivery*. International Rescue Committee.

Bhargava, V. (2015). Engaging Citizens and Civil Society to Promote Good Governance and Development Effectiveness. *The Governance Brief*, *2*(23).

Bosse, D. A., & Phillips, R. A. (2016). Agency Theory and Bounded Self-Interest. *Academy of Management Review*, *41*(2), 276–297. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2013.0420

Campos, J. E., & Pradhan, S. (Eds.). (2007). *The Many Faces of Corruption: Tracking Vulnerabilities at the Sector Level*. The World Bank. https://doi.org/10.1596/978-0-8213-6725-4

Daudu, H. M., & Mohammed, Z. (2013). *Information dissemination, access and utilization for socio-economic empowerment of rural people in northern states of Nigeria*.

Egeberg, M. (1995). Bureaucrats as Public Policy-Makers and Their Self-Interests. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, *7*(2), 157–167. https://doi.org/10.1177/0951692895007002003

Farag, M., & María Marín, J. (2018). IMPLEMENTING SOCIAL AUDIT IN 20 STEPS. *Transparency International*.

Favero, N. (2018). Politics and Bureaucracy. In A. Farazmand (Ed.), *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance* (pp. 4730–4735). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-20928-9_1434

Fitzgerald, C., McCarthy, S., Carton, F., Connor, Y. O., Lynch, L., & Adam, F. (2016). Citizen participation in decision-making: Can one make a difference? *Journal of Decision Systems*, *25*(sup1), 248–260. https://doi.org/10.1080/12460125.2016.1187395

Ghonkrokta, S. S., & Anu Singh, L. (2007). Identification of Role of Social Audit by Stakeholders as Accountability Tool in Good Governance. *Journal of Management Research*, *7*(1), 18–26.

Gould, D. J., & Amaro-Reyes, J. A. (1983). *The effects of corruption on administrative performance: Illustrations from developing countries*. World Bank.

GULZAR, S., & PASQUALE, B. J. (2017). Politicians, Bureaucrats, and Development: Evidence from India. *American Political Science Review*, *111*(1), 162–183. Cambridge Core. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055416000502

Heclo, H. (1977). Political Executives and the Washington Bureaucracy. *Political Science Quarterly*, *92*(3), 395–424. https://doi.org/10.2307/2148500

Jiang, J. (2018). Making Bureaucracy Work: Patronage Networks, Performance Incentives, and Economic Development in China. *American Journal of Political Science*, *62*(4), 982–999. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12394

Johnson, R. N., & Libecap, G. D. (1994). *The Federal civil service system and the problem of bureaucracy: The economics and politics of institutional change*. University of Chicago Press.

Keiser, L. R., & Soss, J. (1998). With Good Cause: Bureaucratic Discretion and the Politics of Child Support Enforcement. *American Journal of Political Science*, *42*(4), 1133. https://doi.org/10.2307/2991852

Kulkarni, S. (2014). ACCOUNTABILITY TO THE GOVERNMENT. *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, *75*(1), 95–104.

Kurer, O. (1993). Clientelism, corruption, and the allocation of resources. *Public Choice*, *77*(2), 259–273. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01047869

Levi, M., & Stoker, L. (2000). Political Trust and Trustworthiness. *Annual Review of Political Science*, *3*(1), 475–507. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.3.1.475

Liverani, M., Hawkins, B., & Parkhurst, J. O. (2013). Political and Institutional Influences on the Use of Evidence in Public Health Policy. A Systematic Review. *PLoS ONE*, *8*(10), e77404. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0077404

Maiti, S., & De Faria, J. V. (2017). Participatory planning processes in Indian cities: Its challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Sustainable Urbanization, Planning and Progress*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.18063/JSUPP.2017.01.001

Menocal, A. R. (2017). *The global state of democracy: Exploring democracy's resilience*. International IDEA.

Menocal, A. R., & Stenberg Johnson, J. (2015). *Why corruption matters: Understanding causes, effects and how to address them*.

Mishra, debi prasad, & Heide, Jan. B. (1998). Information Asymmetry and Levels of Agency Relationships. *JOURNAL OF MARKETING RESEARCH*, *35*(3), 277–295.

Natale, S. M., & Ford, J. W. (1994). The Social Audit and Ethics. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, *9*(1), 29–33. https://doi.org/10.1108/02686909410050442

Ostrom, V., & Ostrom, E. (1971). Public Choice: A Different Approach to the Study of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, *31*(2), 203. https://doi.org/10.2307/974676

Pepinsky, T. B., Pierskalla, J. H., & Sacks, A. (2017). *Bureaucracy and Service Delivery*.

Phillips, N. (2017). Power and inequality in the global political economy. *International Affairs*, *93*(2), 429–444. https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iix019

Pinto, M. R. (1992). RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND BUREAUCRACY IN INDIA. *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, *53*(3), 279–296.

Riccucci, N. M., & Saidel, J. R. (1997). The Representativeness of State-Level Bureaucratic Leaders: A Missing Piece of the Representative Bureaucracy Puzzle. *Public Administration Review*, *57*(5), 423. https://doi.org/10.2307/3109988

Rose, N., & Miller, P. (1992). Political Power beyond the State: Problematics of Government. *Wiley*, *43*(2), 173–205.

Scott, J. C. (1972). Patron-Client Politics and Political Change in Southeast Asia. *American Political Science Review*, *66*(1), 91–113. https://doi.org/10.2307/1959280

Singh, H. (1994). Constitutional Base for Panchayati Raj in India: The 73rd Amendment Act. *Asian Survey*, *34*(9), 818–827.

Strom, K. (1990). A Behavioral Theory of Competitive Political Parties. *American Journal of Political Science*, *34*(2), 565. https://doi.org/10.2307/2111461

Strom, K. (2016). Research on the Impact of Technology on Policing Strategy in the 21st Century, Final Report. *RTI International Police Executive Research Forum*.

Svara, J. H., & Denhardt, J. (2010). The Connected Community: Local Governments as Partners in Citizen Engagement and Community Building. *Arizona State University*.

Thomson, T. M. (1998). MANAGEMENT BY OBJECTIVES. *Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators the Pfeiffer Library*, *20*(2).

Tschudin, A. (2018). The Role of Local Governance in Sustaining Peace. *International Peace Institute*.

Van Teeffelen, J., & Baud, I. (2011). Exercising Citizenship: Invited and Negotiated Spaces in Grievance Redressal Systems in Hubli–Dharwad. *Environment and Urbanization ASIA*, *2*(2), 169–185. https://doi.org/10.1177/097542531100200203

Whittaker, J., McLennan, B., & Handmer, J. (2015). A review of informal volunteerism in emergencies and disasters: Definition, opportunities and challenges. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, *13*, 358–368. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2015.07.010

Wood, B. D., & Waterman, R. W. (1991). The Dynamics of Political Control of the Bureaucracy. *American Political Science Review*, *85*(3), 801–828. https://doi.org/10.2307/1963851

Zhuang, J., De Dios, E., & Martin, A. L. (2010). Governance and Institutional Quality and the Links with Economic Growth and Income Inequality: With Special Reference to Developing Asia. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1619116