



# Assessment of Good Governance in Delhi: A Study of Stakeholder's Perception

Surender S.Ghonkrokta, Anu Singh Lather

## ABSTRACT

*The changing social, political and economic scenario in the world as well as in India has brought about changes in the aspirations and expectations in governance. Assessment of good governance is essential to keep the development relevant, purposeful and focused. Good governance helps create an environment in which sustained economic growth becomes achievable. Conditions of good governance allow citizens to maximize their returns on investment. Delhi as a cosmopolitan city represents a large section of citizens of the country and as a capital city state is unique in governance. The concern for good governance in Delhi becomes even more important because as capital it is the face of the country to the world and reference for the rest of the country. With this premise the present study aimed at assessing the perception of stakeholders about the good governance in Delhi. Views and perceptions of all stakeholders are taken for nine government departments/ agencies with which citizens have maximum interaction. Stakeholders are classified in five categories and studied for their response in three different age groups and both the genders equally. The result indicated that except official categories, the rest of the stakeholders did not agree that identification of initiatives and priorities was satisfactory. Only two agencies are perceived to have system in place to the satisfaction of stakeholders. There was uniformity in the opinion expressed by stakeholders in all age groups and both the genders with few exceptions that much more is required to be done to improve transparency, accountability and efficiency of the administrative system. These results indicated that stakeholders intend to have more participation in identification of priorities, more transparency and improvements in the system.*

*Keywords: Good Governance, Stakeholders, Perception, Accountability, Assessment*

## INTRODUCTION

The citizens across the globe expects from their nation state and its organs to perform at its best for their development. Good governance helps create an environment in which sustained economic growth becomes achievable. It does not occur by chance. It must be demanded by citizens and nourished explicitly and consciously by the nation state. India has always believed in practice of good governance and its traces can be found in our epics where Lord Ram followed accountability, responsibility, responsiveness, and transparency in his regime. Also Mahabharata is presumably the first Indian treatise on the science of governance. There is one huge Rajdharama section discussing various aspects of governance. The focus on good governance has amplified since globalization because of two major reasons. One, it contributes to the economic development and second it helps in building the image of the nation state in front of the rest of the world. Not only the implementation of good governance is important but also there is a need to assess the directions and quantum of the efforts made by the government. A very important question, which is needed to be answered before any evaluation of such activities is undertaken, is, 'Do the citizens perceive that the actions/initiatives were required/needed?' And if it is needed, then "what will be the shape and priority." Only after this question has been answered, the issue of evaluation will come next, essentially to know if enough has been done in various fields. In the final reckoning, government must not only appear to be but should also be measurably effective. Economic growth not necessarily results in equitable human development and resources. Polarization of resources, both national and human can lead to greater economic and social disparities. To counter this polarization, assessment, analysis and action are critical managerial inputs in every human endeavour. Correct assessment of systems and processes is important for policy and program development. Improvement and additions to good governance initiatives, if any, can be done only after true assessment of all these initiatives is done. Any attempt at measuring good governance must have clear ideas about indicators to assess the effectiveness of inter play among these regimes. Some of the results of these interplays may not be too easily discernible and measurable. Yet, the overall impact can be measured by creating a tool, which can measure the physical target achievement as well as attitude and perception of the citizens. All stakeholders must have a consensus on what indicates good governance. There are different types of indicators. Firstly, there are input/output level indicators, which generally assess performance quantitatively. This may not help in behavioural processes. Secondly there are outcome/impact level indicators meant to assess the effectiveness of the efforts made. These can be used in summative evaluations at the end of long-term efforts. Thirdly there are condition-stress-response indicators. They measure the ground realities (condition), the challenges (stress), systematic approaches employed to meet these challenges (Response). Third type of indicators are more important for evaluating the good governance as it cannot be measured quantitatively as attitude, perception and views are assessed to know the effectiveness of the governance.

This study aims at assessing the good governance in Delhi because it is the seat of federal governance and also houses

Embassies/High Commissions of different countries. However this city-state (with less than 7% of people living in rural areas) has an elected state government headed by the chief minister. Delhi has a unique system of governance and multiplicity of authority. Municipal Corporation of Delhi and the New Delhi Municipal Council deals with matters like sanitation, house tax, building constructions but issues like electricity, water, sewer etc are with Delhi government and policing, land etc with central government. The seat of the union government i.e. New Delhi area which is about 3.0% of the total area of the state is administrated by a Municipal Council having a majority of official members. Similarly Cantonment Board administers another 3.0% of it, which is an official body with nominal elected presence. Municipal Corporation of Delhi, which has elected representatives as councillors, has major power vested with Municipal Commissioner, a government official. Government of Delhi has its own elected MLA's but powers of the government are limited. The police (which is responsible for law and order), land and its handling agency, Delhi Development Authority, and top level personnel matters, pertaining to top Indian Administrative Services, Delhi Andaman Nicobar Island Civil Services, Public work Department and Health services are with the central government.

Delhi had been a district till 1997 when it was divided into 9 revenue districts. Delhi caters not only to its residents, but also to an unusually large number of outsiders who visit Delhi for social, economic and political reasons. Delhi attracts large number of foreign visitors. Its historic past also contributes towards increased floating population. A large number of people also visit Delhi from the satellite towns and the neighboring states for trade, tourism and employment. Delhi is also probably the biggest business centre of North India. Health care and studies are other reasons, which contribute towards the floating population. The annual growth rate of population of Delhi during 1991-2001 was 4.18 percent, almost double the national average. The main reason for this unprecedented growth is the migration of population from different parts of the country to take advantage of livelihood opportunities offered by Delhi. Delhi is one of the states with the highest per capita income in India. In 2002-03, per capita income was estimated at current prices at Rs. 47,441 which has reached Rs. 1,21,000 in 2009-10. The main contribution for this increase is growth in service sector. Delhi has a legacy of 7 historical cities and thus has a unique heritage and vibrant culture, which represents different religions, regional classes and creeds. This specialty is extended to its cultural values and climatic conditions as well. Delhi is characterized by inhabitants living in large number of unauthorized colonies, urban villages, resettlement colonies, the walled city and other residential pockets. Delhi is predominantly dependent on road transport due to distances and metro for specific routes it provides. Buses constitute only 1.2 percent of the total vehicular population but cater to about 60 percent of the total travel demand while personal vehicles account for about 30 percent. The growth in population and floating population has been putting pressure on services in the city. Poverty and disparities in incomes are more glaring in Delhi. In 1999-2000, it was estimated that 1.15 million people i.e. 8 % of Delhi's population lived below the poverty line. Delhi Human Development Report 2006 states that Delhi government has

planned to reduce the population of people living below poverty line to half i.e. 4 % by 2015 but still since population will also be doubled by 2015, the number of people below poverty line will remain the same. Delhi being a big metropolitan has bigger problems due to large, fast increasing and migrating population. The problems have multiplied over the years as planning did not match the expectations and requirements of the citizens. Economic activity did bring in expansion and growth, but at the cost of environmental degradation and living space. Per capital income of Delhi citizens increased followed by increase in purchasing power and living standard, but filth and squalor also multiplied with all associated problems. Typical governance structure and status of Delhi also did not help in mitigating the miseries, but enhanced confusion and inactivity. Since responsibilities were not clearly demarcated, accountability suffered.



### LITERATURE REVIEW

United Nations has listed 132 indicators as indicators of sustainability and has categorized these in social economic, environmental and institutional categories (Bell and Morse, 1999). These measurements of sustainability are not confined to few quantitative parameters but consist of wider qualitative indicators. These qualitative indicators can also be placed under three categories. In fact these are initiatives, which are essential and can be thus measured for attainment of sustainable development. Even if we never use a single indicator the process (of their development) has given us so much that one learns during process itself (Meter, 1999). Indicators are a logical device to use in sustainable development, especially given their long record of use in fields such as economics, social accountability and environmental science (Bell and Morse, 1999). Kaufmann et al. (1999) highlight a number of reasons why it is useful to gather data on governance perceptions although the data collected is inherently subjective. For example, perceptions may often be more meaningful than objective data, especially when it comes measuring the public faith in institutions.

The concept of good governance has been clarified by the work of the U.N. Commission on Human rights (2001) in its resolution 2006/64. The commission identified the key attributes of good governance as: Transparency, Responsibility, Accountability, Participation and Responsiveness (to the needs of the people). Resolution 2000/64 linked good governance to an enabling environment conducive to the enjoyment of human rights and 'prompting growth and sustainable human development'. Thus resolution links good governance to sustainable human development and emphasis on accountability, participation and the enjoyment of human rights. UNESCAP (United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific) has identified that Good Governance has 8 major characteristics. It is participatory, consensus oriented, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive, follows the rule of law and ensures accountability.

Court et al (2002) concluded that measuring issues of governance poses challenges that are not encountered in the economic or social development fields. While it is easier to provide firm indicators of such things as economic growth or

primary school enrolment, it is much more difficult to find and agree upon indicators of a political macro phenomenon like governance or political rights. Perhaps because it is a broad and complicated concept, there exists no regular, systematic and cohesive data collection effort centered on the concept of governance. All these indicators are not inclusive. Involvement of stakeholders is very essential to know the indicators. Still indicators may appeal to a mind set for measurement yet they do not appeal to the popular imagination and this must limit their appeal to real people-the global community that is the target for the sustainability project (Bell and Stephen, 2003).

There is no consensus on the elements or indicators of good governance as different agencies have identified different elements as per their need, requirement and experience. In contrast there is a broad agreement inside and outside India on indicators of bad governance. (Human Development Report, 2003) Major among these is incidence of competition co existing with high level of mass poverty, illiteracy, and under-development and increasing criminalization of politics. In the good governance discourse, democracy emerges as the necessary political framework for successful economic development, and within this discourse democracy and economic liberalism are conceptually linked: bad governance equals state intervention; good governance equals democracy and economic liberalism (Abrahamsen, 2004). Development is a planned change process, which basically entails deviations from the present situations and balances. To achieve sustainable development, it is essential that such development takes place in a way and by making such adjustments to the human activities so as to sustain and consume the natural wealth. Term social development and sustainable development are being used interchangeably only because it has been realized that development in society is long lasting only if it does not disturb the delicate environmental balance. This means that all natural assets including human, deserve to be given their rightful place and treatment and cared for whenever such planned change of development takes place. Under the circumstances, effective governance within the available frame of resources and capabilities is the solution to minimize the managerial stress and maintain an adequate level of urban services and facilities. The response to these challenges lies in good governance. Good governance makes accountability, transparency, participation and rule of law mandatory administrative functions. They are vital pre-requisites for sustainable development also. Government has to function in a more missionary, egalitarian and energized manner (Barthwal, 2003).

As part of the World Governance Survey (WGS) project, a comprehensive assessment of governance at the national level in India was conducted in 2001. 177 experts from four states – Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Delhi and Kerala; completed a questionnaire providing their ratings and comments to 30 indicators of governance. The findings do suggest that even in a country of the diversity and complexity of India it is feasible and valuable to carry out such governance assessments. Nevertheless, due to some methodological challenges, findings are indicative rather than conclusive. The survey does highlight some bright spots, including high levels of freedom of expression and association; high levels of political



competition; a respected bureaucracy; and a military that accepts its subordination to civilian government. However, there was an overarching concern that policy-making is rather divorced from the people – especially the poorest members of society. Democracy in India is more impressive in form than substance. More specifically, the survey found that corruption was the most important governance challenge in the country (Court, 2003). This kind of surveys are necessary to have assessment of the aspirations of the people and to identify the problem areas for course correction.



#### OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To assess the perception of stakeholders about good governance initiatives.
- To understand the perception of stakeholders about the good governance initiatives of nine government departments of Delhi.

#### HYPOTHESES

- H1. There will be significant differences in the policies and procedures of government agencies of Delhi state as perceived by stakeholders.
- H2. There will be no difference in the good governance assessment of different Delhi state agencies as perceived by different categories of stakeholder i.e. general public/citizens, political persons/elected representatives, legal professional/judiciary/advocates, bureaucracy/officials and media & communication professionals on characteristics of good governance.
- H3. There will be no difference in the good governance assessment of different Delhi state government agencies as perceived by the stakeholders of different age groups i.e. young adults (18-35 years), middle aged (36-55 years) and elderly (56 & above years) on 8 characteristics of good governance.
- H4. There will be no difference in the perception of the stakeholders of both the genders on 8 characteristics of governance.



#### METHODOLOGY

To achieve these objectives, the effort was made to have a comparative analysis of the policies and procedures of the different government agencies on certain identified indicators or characteristics.

There are different departments and agencies of government of India, Delhi government and local self-governments like Municipal Corporation of Delhi, New Delhi Municipal Corporation, Delhi Cantonment Board which are collectively responsible for upkeep of the city. Some departments directly affect the lives of the citizens of Delhi on day to day basis. The following nine departments/agencies have been selected which have an impact on a large number of its citizens who have to visit the field offices of these agencies for one purpose or other. The selection of agencies was based on a general survey conducted asking people to respond to a single

question that in their view which agency of the government affect their day to day lives in a major way and so they have to deal with the agency more frequently. In response, people named the field units of the agencies like local electricity Sub-Stations, zonal office of Municipal Corporation of Delhi, Motor Licensing Officer's office of transport department, Station House Officer's office of police, Sales Tax Office of Value added Tax Department, Sub-Registrar office of Deputy Commissioner, Revenue or Rationing Shop/Ration card office. However it was thought appropriate to consider Department as a whole instead of Individual Branch of the Department as Department is responsible for controlling the policies and its implementation. Health and education are two of the major areas which could not be considered for study even when survey had identified these. The main reason for not considering these areas is that the services in these two areas are provided by public and private sectors equally. It would have been difficult to separate the efforts of government and private players in these fields. After initial exercise of identification of selection of government agencies was completed, these 9 departments were listed. These nine agencies / department of state of Delhi are

S. No.	Agency
1.	Delhi Development Authority (DDA)
2.	Delhi Police (DP)
3.	Delhi Jal Board (DJB)
4.	Food and Civil Supply Department (FCS)
5.	Municipal Corporation of Delhi (MCD)
6.	Revenue Department (RD)
7.	Trade and Taxes Department (TTD)
8.	Electricity Department (ED)
9.	Transport Department (TD)

All stakeholders were kept in five major categories.

S. No.	Stakeholders Category
1.	General Public/Citizen (GP)
2.	Political Persons/ Elected Representatives (PP/ER)
3.	Legal Profession/ Judiciary/ Advocates (LP/JA)
4.	Bureaucracy/ Officials (B/O)
5.	Media and Communications (MAC)

All respondents are considered in three age groups.

1. Junior Age Group -18-35 years (JAG)
2. Middle Age Group -36-55 years (MAG)
3. Senior Age Group -55+ years (SAG)

Five respondents for each category of gender, age group and stakeholder groups were taken. Sample size was 1350.

A 2(Gender) X 3 (Age groups) X 5 (Stakeholders) X 9 (Agencies) factorial design was planned to conduct the study.

### Sample Size:

A total sample of 1350 was taken for the study. The stratified random sampling was applied for sampling where 5 respondents each were taken for nine different agencies in five different stakeholder groups, 3 different age groups and from both the genders.

### Tool

A questionnaire (Annexure II) was developed for assessment of the perceptions of the stakeholders. The questionnaire measured the responses on five point scale ranging from Strongly agree-5, Agree-4, Undecided-3, Disagree-2 and Strongly disagree-1. These statements were to evaluate the organization if its policies and procedure are consensus oriented, equitable and inclusive, participatory, effective & efficient, follows the rule of law, transparent, responsive and accountable. The survey form has eight characteristics each containing ten questions or statements. So the score for each characteristic can vary from 10 to 50 and 30 was a midpoint score between agreement and disagreement. In case of overall assessment of good governance, there were 80 statements altogether. So, the scores will vary from 80 to 400. 240 was a midpoint score between agreement and disagreement.

### Validity and Reliability

The validity test was done by taking comments from 7 specialists in the field representing 5 categories of stakeholders. There were 2 officials, 2 educationists, 1 from legal field, 1 from media and 1 from political field. Face validity was assessed after getting the questionnaire examined from experts. Test-retest reliability was checked, giving 45 days gap with 30 separate set of stakeholders. Pearson co-relation coefficient was calculated. The correlation coefficient for Consensus Oriented was found to be 0.882, for Participatory it was 0.862, for Follow the Rule of Law coefficient was 0.859, for Responsiveness coefficient was 0.881, for Equitable and Inclusive coefficient was found to be 0.848, for Effective and Efficient coefficient was 0.881, for Transparency 0.772 and for Accountability correlation coefficient was found to be 0.896. All these correlations were found to be significant at 0.01 level of significance. Overall Pearson correlation coefficient was 0.868, which is high enough to substantiate the reliability of the questionnaires.



## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of Variance was applied to see the perceptual differences of various categories of stakeholders in various age groups and both the genders about the nine basic departments of Delhi. Table 1 shows that there is significant difference in the perception of stakeholders about different departments and also perceptions of various groups of stakeholders vary significantly. However the stakeholders from various age groups and both the genders do not differ in their perceptions. People perceive that these agencies have differences in performance on collective parameters of governance. There is significant difference in the perception of the stakeholders. The Stakeholders feels that Delhi Jal Board is much better than other departments on good governance followed by Electricity

Department, Transport Department, Trade and Taxes Department, Revenue Department, Delhi Police and Municipal Corporation of Delhi. The least rated departments by stakeholders are Delhi Development Authority and Food and Civil Supply Departments (Table 2). Delhi Jal Board and Electricity department are only two agencies which are good governance agencies in the opinion of the stakeholders. Rests of the seven agencies are not good governance agencies.

Amongst the stakeholders' perception (Table 3) about good governance, the Bureaucrats scores the highest followed by General Public, Media, Legal Professionals. The Political Persons and Elected Representatives perception scores are the lowest on overall good governance parameters. This may be so because the Bureaucrats are somewhere the part of the same system while the Political Persons and Elected Representatives are answerable to citizens for the efficient delivery of the services provided by these departments to the public. Moreover the party in opposition is always critical of services maintained by the ruling party.

Looking to the results of Department wise perception of Males and Females (Table 1, Department X Gender), males found Delhi Police, MCD, Trade and Taxes, Electricity Department and Transport better governed as compared to females. Females found Delhi Jal Board, Delhi Development Authority, Food and Supply, and Revenue Department to be better governed as compared to males (Table 4). Further the scrutiny of means (Table 4) revealed that males feel Electricity Department to be best governed department followed by Delhi Jal Board, Transport, Trade and Taxes, Delhi Police, Municipal Corporation, and Revenue Department. According to Males the least governed departments are Food and Supply and Delhi Development Authority. However according to Females, Delhi Jal Board is the best governed department followed by Revenue, Food and Supply, Electricity, Trade and Taxes, and Transport Department. They feel Municipal Corporation to be the least governed department followed by Delhi Development Authority, and Delhi Police. In all both Males and Females unanimously feel that Delhi Jal Board follows the best good governance practices followed by Electricity Department and Delhi Development Authority and Municipal Corporation of Delhi are the worst of good governance practices.

In case of different age groups (Table 5), the mean score is less than 240, which is indicative that all age group people are uniform in expressing their opinion that in overall ratings, agencies do not qualify to be accepted as good governance agencies. However, young persons for Delhi Jal Board, middle aged for Delhi Jal Board, Trade and Taxes and Electricity have a mean score of more than 240, which shows that middle aged have still accepted that at least few agencies have good governance system. In table of mean (Table 5), it is very striking that elderly person have not rated any one of the agencies in their assessment as to qualify to be good governance agency. They appear to be disillusioned with all the agencies. Table 5 shows that for all of agencies, there is marginal differences in mean scores for three different age groups except in case of Food and Civil Supplies where respondents have showed the department at very low in its evaluation of characteristics of good governance. In case of six agencies out of nine, middle aged have given highest mean

score, which explains that middle aged have still appreciated the agencies more than younger or older lot on assessment of characteristics of good governance.

Looking to the results of gender wise perception of stakeholders, it is found that all the stakeholders have mean score of less than 240 except (Table 6) for the category of officials/bureaucrats. Female ordinary citizens have a very high mean score (249.60), which is indicative that they find the functioning of these agencies good. Apart from this, official females have also mean score above than 240, which means that as their assessment the administration is good calculated on eight characteristics. Females have rated high on good governance, males have rated it very low. Political person's category is opposite to this, while both males and females have mean score much below 240, females have rated agencies very low on good governance. Out of five stakeholders' categories, females in four categories have more mean scores as compared to males.

In case of different age groups and gender, elderly males (Table 7) have scored the least (224.13) while elderly females have scored highest (243.95) which shows that opinion of the males and females in elder age group is opposite to each other group.

In case of three ways interactions (Table 8), young males for Delhi Development Authority, Delhi Police, Municipal Corporation of Delhi, Revenue Department, Trade and Taxes, Electricity and Transport Department have mean score more than 240 which is indicative that young males have opinion that these seven agencies, out of nine, have governance which can be termed as good based on eight characteristics of good governance. Middle-aged males have mean score more than 240 only for Delhi Jal Board, Electricity and Transport Departments. In contrast, elderly males have not rated any department more than 240, which means they do not agree that any of these agencies can be termed as good governance agency. In young female category, only Delhi Jal Board has mean score more than 240. Middle-aged females have assessed Food and Civil Supplies, Revenue Department, Trade and Taxes and Transport Department as good governance organization as mean score here is more than 240. Elderly female category has rated all agencies more than 240 except Trade and Taxes, which means they are convinced that good governance is adopted. So young males and elderly females are two categories who have agreed that good governance practices are being followed in government agencies except that young males have little reservations about Delhi Jal Board and Food Civil Supplies while elderly females have reservations about Trade and Taxes. Young males for Municipal Corporation of Delhi, middle aged females for Trade and Taxes, middle aged males for Electricity Department and middle aged males for Delhi Jal Board have crossed even mark of mean score of 250, thus, these categories have evaluated these four agencies as quite high on good governance. In contrast, young males have rated Food and Civil Supplies very low, as it did not reach even 150 points.



## CONCLUSION

The exercise of development of questionnaire and evaluation of reliability and validity confirms that these eight indicators are

sufficient and essential elements for assessment of good governance. Thus as a result of this study not only a valid and reliable tool/questionnaire has been designed but it also confirms the contention of UNESCAP (United Nation Economic and Social Condition for Asia and the Pacific) that the identified eight major characteristics of good governance are valid for India also.

The study testifies that there are differences in the policies and procedures of government agencies of Delhi state as perceived by stakeholders. The agencies of government of Delhi have been evaluated on its overall performance and evaluation on good governance as below

(I) Delhi Jal Board, (II) Electricity Department, (III) Trade and Taxes Department, (IV) Transport Department, (V) Revenue Department, (VI) Delhi Police, (VII) Municipal Corporation of Delhi, (VIII) Delhi Development Authority, (IX) Food and Civil Supplies.

Delhi Jal Board and Electricity Departments are at the top on assessment of good governance indicators and performance. Delhi Development Authority and Food and Civil Supplies are at the bottom in the good governance. The reason for this can be that every citizen has to deal with Delhi Jal Board, and Electricity Department, so these two agencies are always under pressure from stakeholders and in the eyes of storm. This has done some good for the working of the departments as on individual and collective characteristics, the functioning of these agencies improved. The constant pressure of responding to grievances and complaints forced these two agencies to improve their efficiency and interaction with public. Delhi Development Authority and Food and Civil Supplies have to handle only limited number of persons, only those persons who have flats/ properties purchased from DDA or poor people who rely on their food requirements on food and supplies department. Thus these agencies are not in a position to improve above a certain point. Municipal Corporation of Delhi appears to be a deviation to this assumption as this agency deals with almost all citizens, but have been ranked lower. This may be because Municipal Corporation of Delhi is too big and unmanageable and it becomes difficult to implement good governance practices. The services of sanitation and upkeep of colony parks roads etc. which has impact on each and every one has not shown any improvement. This also applies to sanitation and other improvements which are expected from Municipality. Same is true for the deliverables expected from agencies like transport, Taxation, Revenue departments as all deliverables are within the control of these agencies and dependent on efficiency of these departments. This is a positive result as it makes clear that public do appreciate the genuine problems faced by agencies. They do not have exaggerated and false expectations and aspirations. At the same time they expect that service be delivered where there are not externalities involved. To sum up, agencies which respond or react to the problems of the stakeholders, their efforts and attempts are appreciated by everyone.

This study also agrees that there is difference in the good governance assessment of different Delhi state agencies as perceived by different categories of stakeholders' i.e. general public/citizens, political persons/elected representatives,



legal professionals, bureaucracy/officials and media & communication professionals on 8 characteristics of good governance. This is so because all five type of stakeholders have differences in their experiences, knowledge, information and expectations from any government agency. These differences are reflected on their evaluation and assessment of these agencies on governance. Only officials are of the opinion that agencies of government of Delhi qualify to be good in governance. Other stakeholders i.e. politicians, legal professionals, media professionals and ordinary citizens do not agree that governance is good. The reason for this can be because officials are aware of the thought which goes behind the policy formulation or its implementation. Other stakeholders are only concerned about the results while they are not involved in the prioritization of works/initiatives. Officials are also a part of governance structure, thus may be defensive of the administrative system.

The study does testify that there is no difference in the good governance assessment of different Delhi state government agencies as perceived by the stakeholders of different age groups. The stakeholders of different category had different opinion but within that particular stakeholder group they responded in the same way even if they belong to different age group. This is significant as we always assume that due to generation gap the perception of the people in different age groups differs. However, middle age group has shown more consistency and uniformity in their responses. This may be due to the fact that younger generation have more expectations and aspirations which agencies are not able to meet. Older stakeholders get impatient and frustrated when they see no improvement in governance over a period of time.

The study does confirm that there is no difference in the perception of the stakeholders of both the genders on 8 characteristics of governance as the results are not significant on overall basis. This confirms that gender has no discrimination in evaluating or assessing governance. Both the sexes are equally unbiased in their perception that governance needs to be improved.



#### MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

The study indicates that stakeholders are unanimous that more participation and involvement of public is required in setting up priorities in process of making implementation strategies and also during actual

implementation. There is a need to have attempts to reach consensus and follow rule of law. Policies need to be more equitable and inclusive, and implementation, effective and efficient. The administration should be more responsive, transparent and accountable. By rating the initiatives taken by some departments at different level, stakeholders have indicated that irrespective of age or sex, they do appreciate if any good initiative is taken by any department. Stakeholders, by rating Electricity and Jal Board higher have also made it clear that it is not the shortage in supplies they are not satisfied with, but it is service delivery and management against which they have grievances. Public do not accept reality and appreciate genuine difficulties. Another very important finding is that government official category had no complain about participation and awareness about government procedures and policies. This only indicates that still the decisions are taken by people who are managing the governance system and general public is not adequately involved and also aware of procedures and policies. Government needs to do more to have actual participation before any policy or procedures are finalized. Public needs to be associated in prioritizing expenditure, setting of processes and procedures. Once these procedures are final, adequate awareness generation and education of stakeholders is necessary. These procedures need to be simple, easy and known to all stakeholders. More decentralization of planning process and also involvement of stakeholders in implementation is required. Participation of the public, which was achieved to some extent through initiatives like Bhagidari movements, stakeholder's survey etc. needs to be strengthened further by including other classes as well and also by involving grass root level units/stakeholder bodies in decision making. The observations of Sh. Bimal Jalan (2004), former Governor of Reserve Bank of India are apt when he claims that the results on the ground in terms of social and economic development since independence are rather disappointing and this has happened when we have rich human and other resources, comparable capacities and capabilities which are second to none in the world. Government cannot meet people's aspirations unless their decision makers are prepared to look afresh at service delivery system, poverty and administrative management system. Such change in perspectives must be accompanied by change in their attitudes, leadership styles and goals. Harmonizing the attitudes, structures and processes of government with the aspirations and needs of its citizens is the first step.

#### ANNEXURE I

Table 1: Summary of Analysis of Variance for Assessment of Good Governance

Source of Variation	SS	df	MSS	F	P
Department A	74689.3	8	9336.15	4.23	>.01
Stakeholders B	29308.5	4	7327.12	3.32	>.01
Department X Gender	80806.4	8	10100.8	4.58	>.01
Department X Age Group	135527	16	8470.42	3.84	>.01
Stakeholder X Gender	76809.1	4	19202.3	8.71	>.01
Gender X Age Group	41546.5	2	20773.2	9.43	>.01
Department X Gender X Age Group	122783	16	7673.96	3.48	>.01
Department X Stakeholder X Gender X Age Group	238920	64	3733.13	1.69	>.01

Note: Only Significant results are shown

Table 2: Showing Means of Department wise Perception on Good Governance

	Delhi Development Authority (DDA)	Delhi Police	Delhi Jal Board (DJB)	Food and Civil Supply Department (FCS)	Municipal Corporation of Delhi (MCD)	Revenue Department (RD)	Trade and Taxes Department (TTD)	Electricity Department	Transport Department
Dept Wise Means	229.46	234.88	241.01	215.48	232.48	236.87	237.76	240.74	237.8

Table 3: Showing Means of Stakeholder wise Perception on Good Governance

	General Public	Political Persons	Legal Profession	Bureaucracy	Media and Communication
Stakeholders Wise Means	236.21	228.19	230.08	241.37	234.42

Table 4: Showing Means of Department X Gender Interaction

	Delhi Development Authority (DDA)	Delhi Police	Delhi Jal Board (DJB)	Food and Civil Supply Department (FCS)	Municipal Corporation of Delhi (MCD)	Revenue Department (RD)	Trade and Taxes Department (TTD)	Electricity Department	Transport Department	Gender Wise Total Means
Male	227.24	237.14	239.32	192.2	236.52	235.02	238.18	242.9	238.61	231.9
Female	231.69	232.62	242.7	238.77	228.45	238.72	237.34	238.58	236.98	236.21
Dept Wise Total Means	229.46	234.88	241.01	215.48	232.48	236.87	237.76	240.74	237.8	

Table 5: Showing Means of Department X Age Group Interaction

	Delhi Development Authority (DDA)	Delhi Police	Delhi Jal Board (DJB)	Food and Civil Supply Department (FCS)	Municipal Corporation of Delhi (MCD)	Revenue Department (RD)	Trade and Taxes Department (TTD)	Electricity Department	Transport Department	Gender Wise Total Means
18-35 years	232.16	237.64	240.74	173.52	237.66	236.3	237.86	238.14	238.42	230.27
36-55 Years	230.86	234.4	243.38	237.12	224.26	239.08	244.7	244.9	242.1	237.87
Above 55 years	225.38	232.62	238.92	235.82	235.54	235.24	230.74	239.2	232.88	234.04
	229.47	234.89	241.01	215.49	232.49	236.87	237.77	240.75	237.8	

Table 6: Showing Means of Stakeholder X Gender Interaction

	General Public	Political Persons	Legal Profession	Bureaucracy	Media and Communication	Gender Wise Total Means
Males	222.82	238.34	227.52	237.12	233.71	231.9
Females	249.6	218.03	232.64	245.62	235.13	236.21
Stakeholders Wise Total Means	236.21	228.19	230.08	241.37	234.42	

Table 7: Showing Means of Gender X Age Group Interaction

	Males	Females
18-35 Years	232.99	227.55
36-55 Years	238.6	237.12
55 Years and above	224.12	243.95

Table 8: Showing Means of Department X Gender X Age Group Interaction

	Males			Females		
	18-35 Years	36-55 Years	Above 55 Years	18-35 Years	36-55 Years	Above 55 Years
Delhi Development Authority (DDA)	241.48	234.24	206	222.84	227.48	244.76
Delhi Police	251.48	236.6	223.36	223.8	232.2	241.88
Delhi Jal Board (DJB)	239.72	250.24	228	241.76	236.52	249.84
Food and Civil Supply Department (FCS)	122.52	231.8	222.28	224.52	242.44	249.36
Municipal Corporation of Delhi (MCD)	255.36	228.72	225.48	219.96	219.8	245.6
Revenue Department (RD)	248.64	229.68	226.76	223.96	248.48	243.72
Trade and Taxes Department (TTD)	249.12	236.44	229	226.6	252.96	232.48
Electricity Department	241.44	256.4	230.88	234.84	233.4	247.52
Transport Department	247.16	243.32	225.36	229.68	240.88	240.4



## ANNEXURE II

## ASSESSMENT OF GOOD GOVERNANCE

Sex: Male ☐Female ☐Age Group: Young adults (18-35 years) ☐Mid. age adults (36-55 years) ☐Senior adults (55 years & Above) ☐

## Profession of Stakeholder

General Public/Citizen ☐Political persons, /Elected representatives ☐Legal Professional /Judiciary/Advocates ☐Bureaucracy/ officials ☐Media and Communication ☐

Strongly Agree-SA, Agree-A, Undecided-UN, Disagree-DA, and Strongly Disagree-SD

(a) Consensus Oriented	SA	A	UN	DA	SD
Policies of the Department have been developed on consensus.					
Views of Public/Stakeholders have been taken while framing policies.					
The policy of the Department reflects the mediation of different interest groups.					
Policies confirm to the aspiration and needs of all the stakeholders.					
Procedures and rules are framed in confirmation with mutually accepted norms.					
Decisions in the Department are taken keeping in view the needs/requirement of all.					
Decisions taken in the Department are based on broad consensus.					
Activities and actions of the Department are always in the best interest of the whole community.					
Implementation of policies of the Department helps in sustainable human development.					
Decisions taken in the Department are based on the understanding of historic, cultural and social context.					
b) Participatory					
All Stakeholders are involved in decision making process.					
Procedures/practices are evolved through participation process.					
Department takes up activities which are recognized on priority basis by the community.					
Department aims at community self-determination.					
Department engages the community in an active way in solution of the problems.					
Department moves at a pace that is comfortable for the community.					
All the activities in the Department involve participation in organized way.					
Stakeholders are well informed about activities of the Department before they are involved in decision making.					
The decision making bodies are created based on representations of various stakeholders.					
The suggestions & recommendation of organized civil societies are valued in the Department.					

	SA	A	UN	DA	SD
c) Follow the Rule of Law					
Department respects Human Rights & Fundamental freedoms.					
Department has a well developed Grievances redressal system.					
Department ensures that deadlines are met for all activities					
Department follows rules & procedures strictly.					
Department provides Legal remedies which are available at all levels.					
Department ensures that there is protection of Human rights.					
Minorities are adequately protected in the Department.					
Work force of the Department is impartial in its dealings.					
There exists an Independent appellant authority in the Department.					
There are impartial decision making processes and procedures in the Department.					
d) Responsiveness					
Department has regards for public comfort and conveniences					
Disposal of application/requests is quick.					
Department has reduced the number of sections with which the citizen has to deal with.					
Handy details of information on benefits/procedures are available to the citizen.					
Staff is extra responsive and goes beyond the fixed activities to help the citizen.					
The staff exhibits genuine sincerity and commitment towards development of vulnerable and backward sections.					
Good institutions and procedures exist in the Department.					
Department serves all stake holders without any discrimination.					
Redressal of grievances is within reasonable time frame.					
Department allocates budget as per the priority identified and needs of the stakeholders.					
e) Equitable & Inclusive					
There is equal opportunity for women.					
Policies of the Department have universal coverage for the poor of all section.					
Department focuses on most vulnerable groups (SC/ST/minorities).					
Policies of the Department are targeted towards disadvantaged (aged, disabled & children).					
Department is always willing to consult and involve backward and illiterate people.					
There is equal treatment to all within the Department.					
All stakeholders feel that they have a stake in the Department.					
Vulnerable groups feel comfortable in dealing with the Department.					
There is freedom of association in the Department for all the age groups.					
There is no discrimination based on caste, creed or race.					
f) Effective & Efficient					
Projects/works are finished in time.					
Department is prompt in delivering services.					
There is decentralization of Power at all levels.					
Systems and Procedures are well developed.					
Computerization and automation in the Department are in advanced stage.					
High level of controls are exercised on expenditure.					
There is proper allocation of functional duties & responsibilities.					
Workload in the Department is distributed fairly.					
Delegation of powers at field office/Head office level is appropriate.					
Quality control systems do exist at all levels and for all services.					
g) Transparency					
Decisions are taken as per laid down rules and procedures.					
Enforcements/actions are as per rules and procedures.					
Stakeholders have accessibility to Information.					
All information is available in easily understandable form and medium.					

Citizen charter contains all relevant information.	SA	A	UN	DA	SD
The Right to Information Act is being enforced properly.					
There is a lot of transparency in dealing with citizen.					
Staff is adequately trained in communicating or dispersing information.					
There is a freedom of expression in the Department.					
Department adheres to work ethics.					
h) Accountability					
There is clear cut demarcation and fixation of responsibilities.					
The decentralization of power is adequate and appropriate.					
Department is fulfilling its duties and obligations as expected.					
Grievance redressal mechanisms are effective and responsive.					
Legal remedies are available at all levels.					
Public officials feel responsible to inform and explain about their actions.					
There are norms to impose sanctions and punish power holders who violate public duties.					
There are minimum Corruption opportunities.					
Corruption cases/ numbers are almost nil.					
There is less/no misuse of power.					

## REFERENCES

- 1 Abrahamsen, R. (2004), "Disciplining Democracy: Development Discourse and Good Governance in Africa" Zed Books, London.
- 2 Asian Development Bank (2000), Promoting Good Governance (2000) ADM's Medium Level Agenda and Action Plan: III Implementation of ADB's Governance Policy. <http://www.adb.org/documents/policies/goodgovernance>
- 3 Barthwal, C.P (2003) Good Governance in India (Edit.) Deep and Deep, New Delhi.
- 4 Bell, S. & Stephen, M. (1999). Sustainability indicators – Measuring the immeasurable, Earth Scan, London.
- 5 Bell, S. & Stephen M. (2003). Measuring Sustainability: Learning from Doing, Earth Scan: London.
- 6 Court, J., Goran, H. & Mease, K. (2002). Measuring governance: Methodological Challenges, World Governance survey Discussion paper 2. Tokyo : UNU
- 7 Court, J. (2003). Assessing and Analyzing Governance in India: Evidence from a New Survey". World Governance Assessment, Tokyo : UNU
- 8 Das, S.K. (2001) Public Office, Private Interest - Bureaucracy and corruption in India. Oxford University Press Delhi - 2201.
- 9 Delhi Human Development Report (2006): Partnership for Progress. Government of N.C.T. of Delhi. Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
- 10 Human Development Report 2003 [www.undp.org/hdr2003/](http://www.undp.org/hdr2003/)
- 11 International Monetary Fund: Good Governance - The IMF's Role, IMF Washington DC.20431 USA.
- 12 International Monetary Fund: The Interim Committee Declaration of Sept. 26,1996 on "Partnership for Sustainable Global Growth". <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/exrp/govern/govindex.htm>
- 13 Jalan, B. (2004) Economics, Politics and Governance. Convocation address at IIM Ahmedabad, April 13, 2004.
- 14 Kaufmann, D, Kraay, A.,and Zoido-Lobaton, P. (1999) "Aggregating Governance Indicators. Policy Research Paper NO. 2195. Washington D.C. The World Bank 1999.
- 15 Meter, K (1999) Neighbourhood Sustainability Indicators Guidebook, Crossroads Resource Centre, Minneapolis.
- 16 UNESCAP (United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific) [www.unescap.org/huset/gg/governance.htm](http://www.unescap.org/huset/gg/governance.htm)
- 17 United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (2001) Good Governance - Human Rights in Development OHCHR -Geneva, Switzerland. [www.unhchr.ch/development/governance-01.html](http://www.unhchr.ch/development/governance-01.html)
- 18 World Development Report (2004) Making Services Work for Poor People. World Bank and Oxford University Press.