

Human Development and Democratic Governance: A Correlation

Priyanka Tripathi

Phd scholar sis (sas)
School of international studies (sis)
Jawahar lal nehru university(jnu)

Human Development and Democratic Governance: A Correlation

The paper is an attempt to examine the correlation between human development and democratic governance. Taking the help of various studies, the paper would analyse human development and governance as a concept, its relation with governance and would find out how democratic governance promotes human development contributing to overall development of human wellbeing.

Development is the process of bringing out fundamental and substantial changes in society. It comprises not only capital accumulation and economic growth but also the condition in which a country has adequate food and job and income inequality among them is greatly reduced. There is a strong correlation between democracy, governance and development.

Development is the process of bringing about fundamental and substantial changes in society. It comprises not only capital accumulation and economic growth but also the condition in which a country has adequate food and job and income inequality among them is greatly reduced. There is a strong correlation between democracy governance and development.

The concept of governance matches more with the conceptual framework of humane and responsive governance. The aim of responsive governance is to develop a system and process whereby a condition is created to extend and consolidate the room for the proper and disadvantaged section of society. Democracy provides an important instrument and incentive for good governance. For the governance to be responsive and accountable, the affective role of democratic governance needs to be highlighted. Democratic governance creates an environment in society to move forward with the ultimate goal of equitable growth and human development.

I. Human Development as a concept

Human Development is a process of enlarging peoples' choices by building human capabilities to lead lives that they value. This involves the capabilities to lead long and healthy lives, to be educated, to access social protection and fair employment. Human development is fundamentally concerned with human rights including those of life, health and wellbeing. Human development is expanding the choice for all people in society. This means that men and women particularly the poor and vulnerable are at the centre of development process. It also means protection of the life opportunities of future generations and the natural systems and all the circumstances on which all life depends (UNDP, Human

Development Report 1996). Human development affirms that development must be woven around people, for this development should be participatory and people must have opportunity to put their capabilities in health, education and growth. They must have an opportunity to put their capabilities to use, by participating fully in community decisions and to enjoy human economic and political freedom (Sen, 2000, Diemer and Biswas-Diemer, 2000 ; Helliwell, 2002; Clark 2005 ;

Strong 2007).

Human development is usually captured by composite index (UNDP 1998) called HDI. The index inspired by the capabilities approach to development pioneered by Amartya Sen was created as part of UNDP under the leadership of Mahbulbul Haq.

Rather than concentrating on commodity based measures of human welfare, the capabilities approach concentrates on functioning in terms of educational attainment, longevity and views the goal of development as enhancement of capability to live a long, healthy and active life (Anand ad Ravallion 1993; Haq 2003 ; Sen 1999, 2001 ; Ramis et al. 2000). UN system task team on post2015 development Aagenda, governance and development defines humandevelopment as consisting of three factors :

1. **People :** Human development focusses on improving the lives, people lead rather than economic growth. Income growth is seen as means to development rather than an end in itself.
2. **Opportunities :** Human development is giving people more freedom to live lives they value. This means developing peoples' abilities and giving them a chance to use them. Three foundations for human development are to live a long healthy and creative life, to be knowledgeable and to have access to resources needed for a decent standard of living once the basics of human development are achieved, they open opportunities for progress in other aspects of life thus contributing to development.
3. **Choice :** Human development is about more choices. It is for providing people with opportunities not insisting they make use of them as the choices people make are their own concern.

Human development should at least create an environment for people, individually and collectively to develop their full potential and to have a reasonable chance of leading productive and creative lives they value. Indicators of human development thus comprise 3 basic indicators measured by human development index (HDI)

Longenrity	Knowledge	Living Standard
Life expectancy	Adult literacy (2/3rd---wt. and combined enrollment rate)	Income per capita (US \$ppp)

Thus a person having these three basic choices will to a large extent determine his development criteria. When a person is educated, he is more

aware of the needs, his wellbeing and the circumstances that may help him to develop. As an educated

person, he is able to live his life in healthy way and also able to earn money for his living thus contributing to his overall human development.

Here the role of governance comes into forefront as human development is greatly determined by the system of governance a country has where the proper system leads to better performance and development. Democratic governance will ensure that it is available to the most needy and the poor so that the person is able to make choices for his development.

II. Concept of governance :

First introduction of the term good governance in 1989 by the World Bank, has become more common and preferred. Now it is taken as an important aspect of countries to promoting economic growth and reducing poverty by creating the overcoming environment for investors, providing incentives to producers, establishing certainty in market and enhancing competitiveness (Haq & Zia 2009).

The World Bank economist Kaufmann et al (1999, 2002, 2010) describes the term governance as the traditions and institutions by which authority in a country is exercised.

The definition further includes three perspective :-

- (1) The procedure by which government are elected monitored and replaced,
- (2) Ability of the government to effectively formulate and exercise sound policies.
- (3) The respect of citizens and the state for institutions that govern economic and social interactions between them.

According to IMF (1996), good governance which is the form of rule of law, improving the efficiency and accountability of public sector and tackling corruption, is the key for economic growth.

According to UNDP (1997), the result of good governance is that which gives priority to poor, advances cause of women sustains the environment and creates needed opportunities for employment and other livelihoods. In other words it is a manner in which power is exercised in the management of country's social and economic resources for development (ADB, 1998). The concept of good governance is synonymous with sound development management.

The conceptual framework of good governance is characterized by features such as :-

- Participatory
- Rule of law
- Transparency
- Responsiveness
- Equity and inclusiveness
- Effectiveness and efficiency

Thus good governance covers a very wide concept. Good governance should be conceptualised as a goal and as a process that accelerates growth, equity and human development potential for people and society (Baslay & Person 2011) define governance in terms of its contribution to economic

prosperity on the basis of three pillars :-

- Fiscal capacity
- Judicial capacity &
- Peace

Their focus is to avoid internal conflict in a society. Specifically governance is -

- (i) Process by which government are selected, held accountable monitored and replaced,
- (ii) Capacity of government to manage resources efficiently and to formulate, implement and enforce sound policies and regulations.
- (iii) Respect for institutions among them (Kanfmann et al. 2002).

According to international institute of administrative sciences (IIAS 2009) governance refers to the process whereby elements in society wield power and enact policies and decisions concerning public life and economic and social development (International Institute of Administrative Science (IIAS 2009)).

As per 10th 5 year plan 'Governance relates to the management of all such processes that in any society define environment which permits and enables individuals to raise their capability levels on one hand and provide opportunities to realize their potential and enlarge the set of available choices on the other (10th 5 year plan Planning Commission 2002-2007). UNDP (2007) defines governance as a system of values policies and institutions by which a society manages its economic political and social affairs through interactions within and among the state civil society and private sector. Analysing various factors (UNDP 2007-2009) has come with nine characteristics of good governance. These are :

- (1) Participation
- (2) Rule of law
- (3) Transparency
- (4) Responsiveness
- (5) Consensus orientation
- (6) Equity
- (7) Effectiveness
- (8) Accountability
- (9) Strategic vision

All the characterized thus comprising good governance should be conceptualized as a goal and as a process that accelerates growth equity and human development potential for the people and society.

The linkage of good governance and development may be understood in three senses:-

- (1) Democratic governance which implies legitimacy, accountability and human rights. The report of the development assistance committee of OECD asserts that investment of resources in democratic

governance will contribute to progress in development goals (OECD 1997).

(2) Concerns effective governance which relates more to the ability to govern rather than the form of government (Leftwich 1993).

(3) Coordination function which leads to order as result of interplay of actions and interactions between the state and other players.

Order is usually secured through various modes of governance consisting of hierarchical rules, market exchanges and shared values (Larmour 1998).

III. Relationship between democratic Governance and Human Development :

Development as whole depends on each individual's capabilities. Capabilities define the freedoms to choose a valuable life in accordance with individual preferences. This concept inspired emergence of pluralist and integrative conception of human development and operationalisation in the form of UNDP's Human Development Index.

Political institutions are an appealing topic of research as they organize socioeconomic and political life and here, the role of governance comes into forefront.

From an ideological perspective democracy appears to be the ideal political system for human development as at the end of the day people are politically free and those who decide. Therefore democracy is also considered as an end of development process and a piece of puzzle of the more comprehensive picture of human development (Sen 1999, 2000).

According to Fukuda Parr (2003), Democratic governance through political institutions that expand the power and voice of the people, and ensure the accountability of decision maker, is an important condition for promoting human development.

Growing evidence shows quality of governance is related to differentials in growth and development (Ranchandran 2002; Dwived & Mishra 2005; Moore 2001; Razp and Vande Sijpe; 2007).

Democracy and Development :

Democracy encourages government to be accountable to voters so that government is able to adopt social and economic policies that encourages popular support. After democratization government is bound to checks and balances than before. In democracy ruling elites are less likely to abuse state resources as they are constrained by free media and punished by law and elections. Due to strong competition, the government has a stronger incentive to attract popular votes by adopting redistributive policy in favour of citizens, strengthening public goods provisions (Bueno de mosquita et al. 2003).

Although Ross 2006 and others do not find evidence on short run relationship between democracy and actual policy outcomes like IMR, there is much evidence suggesting that democratic countries have higher social spending (education, health and social security spending) than their autocratic counterparts (Avelino et al. 2005; and Nelson 2007).

Government spending on policy package implementation take considerable time until the programmes

bear fruit, specially with respect to reduction in poverty, improvement in public health and narrowing economic disparity. The time lags between policy adoption and policy enactment may hinder the immediate effect of democratization on human welfare. Government implements a particular policy but policy implementation results in policy outcomes only in the long run. As democratization puts strong redistributive pressure on government, social spending has to be increased for the ruling party to convey a signal that political leaders care about voters. Let us consider four of the numerous possible causal pathways linking democracy and human development (Mc Guire, 2004; Ross, 2006), taking into account time dependent nature of this relationship.

(1) Competition among elites for voters favour should produce a situation in which elites are accountable to citizenry - or at least to a plurality of the voting electorate.

Democratically elected leaders may be more likely to concern themselves with issues of Human development than leaders who maintain their positions through other means (Lake and Bomb 2001). Authoritarian leaders might also be concerned with potentially destabilizing effect of widespread poverty however they may be more likely to control this kind of bad news than their democratic counterparts because they face a much smaller electorate (Beuns de Mesquita et al 2003).

As authoritarian regimes' core constituency for example, authoritarian, military ruling party and economic elites is well compensated, it is unlikely that suffering of the masses will threaten their control over the state (Kane 1989 Riskin 1995).

While in a new democracy there is little Assurance that democratic Framework will hold a country's most recent election maybe its last. Under this it is clear that politicians and voters may approve policies where pay offs are short term than long term when free and fair elections continue, losing party may reasonably expect to regain power at a later date. Meritorious actions taken while a party is in office may have beneficial consequences for that party after their term of office has expired.

(2) Second institutions of democracy tend to foster a well-developed civil society. This is because political rights and civil rights are highly correlated and existence of civil rights usually leaves over time to a dense network of voluntary associations which may be religious or secular, national or international, issues specific or broadly pitched (Parker 1994). These voluntary associations are often instrumental in providing services for poor in association with official state bodies or international actors. They lobby for legalization that address needs of the poor and improve quality of public administration (Sondhi 2000).

(3) Third, democracy serve to inaugurate a culture of equality that empowers corporate groups in process of granting formal citizenship rights to outgroups lower castes and classes, peasants, racial, ethnic and religious minorities. Democracy may nurture political dynamic in which these groups conceptualize their interests as a matter of rights and take a corresponding aggressive approach to satisfying these rights in political social and economic spheres (Slvarcy, Bognina and Scolar 1998 ; Piven and Cloward 1997 ;Rubin 1997).

These initiatives have an important impact for societal human development as it leads to extension and improvement of government services and increased utilization of those services.

Finally we expect that older democracies will benefit from greater institutionalization in political

sphere. Although it is difficult to define political institutionalization, there seems to be a general consensus that procedures in a well institutionalized polity are functionally differentiated regularized (predictable), professionalized (including meritocratic methods of recruitment and promotion), rationalized (explicable, rule based non arbitrary) and infused with value (Huntington 1968; Leevistiky 1928 ; Polsby 1968) while in authorization , government ,the sovereign may rule directly. In a democratic setting, resolving conflict is complicated and take a good deal of time. Once procedures are established for negotiation, resolving differences and finding solutions, democratic government is far more effective than those of authoritarian government. Democracy is a political system whose structure and procedures permit the rule of people. Important characteristics for this are free and fair elections, political competition, rule of law, political and civil liberties. Democracy behind its intrinsic value is of eminent importance for process of development because of constructive and instrumental role it plays in formation and aggregation of values and their translation into well designed policy benefitting the society (Sen 1999).

Political and civil liberties, those relating to free speech , public debate and criticism, as constituent part of democratic regime permit the formation of preferences and values as well as access to relevant information. Consequently a better understanding of social needs is possible. Democratic procedures facilitate the transmission of these needs into political arena where power is distributed amongst legitimate representative of society as a whole. It guarantees that otherwise disadvantaged groups, whether they are minorities or only a broad mass of poor people in developing country get a voice and opportunity to be heard and represented ; while indirect democracies they decide themselves.

In search of political objectivity and through the facilitation of public reasoning democracy helps to construct policies that are matched to the needs of the citizens (Sen 2004 : 9). Competitive elections in democracy tries to hold corrupt behaviour.

Political institutions not only determine via electoral rules which actors and preferences can access political arena and get heard. They also provide the means to aggregate those preferences by establishing procedures for decision making and distributing political power i.e. right to decide (Person 2002; 886). The common output of institutions are policies, although actors and other environmental constellations may change, one time policies in general will reflect the political institutions that produce them (Person/Tabellini 2006 ; 32 ; Peterson 1999).

Thus two types of policies most favourable to human development are :

- (1) Policies for protection of property rights;
- (2) Policies for redistribution

Policies for protection of property rights encourage economic investment and contribute to economic development and economic growth. (Johnson ; Robinson 2002). On the other hand policies for redistribution have an equalizing impact on distribution of wealth in society through broad based programmes and provision of public goods and services.

The matching of society and individual needs with an adequate redistribution scheme and appropriate public provision of goods and services provides a more direct link between political institutions and human development than property rights protection.

Although redistribution from rich to poor and vice versa exist both in autocratic and democratic systems, however distribution from rich to poor is more pronounced and at a higher level in democracies. In authoritarian system, the distribution of wealth does not play a decisive role. All or a substantial part of electorate is excluded from decision making process. As a result the size of public sector on an average remains small (Boix 2001-2).

Thus we arrive at some common characteristics of democratic governance which are:-

- Proper utilization of resources
- Promote public trust
- Leads to better decision
- Improves efficiency
- Supports ethical decision making
- Helps local government meet its legislative responsibilities.
- Encourages elected members and council officers to be confident
- Transparency

These will bring positive changes in society contributing to no corruption, economic growth and public satisfaction. As we have seen democratic governance will bring more redistributive development process and will in turn result in optimum development leading to sustainable development and overall human development.

Bibliography

1. Acemoglu, D., and J. A. Robinson (2005), *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, Cambridge University Press.
2. Acemoglu, D., S. Johnson, J. A. Robinson and P. Yared (2008), Income and Democracy, in: *American Economic Review*, Vol. 98, No. 3, pp. 808-842.
3. ADB (1998): Annual Report, *Asian Development Bank (ADB)*, Manila.
4. Anand, S. and Ravallion. M. (1993), "Human Development in Poor Countries: On the Role of Private Incomes and Public Services". *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 7 (1): 135-150
5. Avelino, G., D. Brown, and W. Hunter (2005), "The Effects of Capital Mobility, Trade Openness, and Democracy on Social Spending in Latin America", 1980-1999." *American Journal of Political Science* ,49:625-41.
6. Barro, R. J. (1996), "Democracy and Growth", in: *Journal of Economic Growth*, Vol. 1, pp. 1-27.
7. Barro, R. J. (1999): Determinants of Democracy, in: *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 107, No. 6, pp.158-183
8. Besley, T. and R. Burgess (2002), "The Political Economy of Government Responsiveness: Theory and Evidence from India", in: *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 117, pp. 1415-1451
9. Besley, T., and Kudamatsu M. (2006) "Health and Democracy", *The American Economic Review* ,Vol. 96:313-318.
10. Blondel, Jean et al., 1970, "Legislative Behavior: Some Steps Towards A Cross- National Measurement", *Government and Opposition* 5(1) pp. 67-86.
11. Boix, C. (2001), "Democracy, Development, and the Public Sector", in: *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 45, No. 1, pp. 1-17.
12. Boix, Carles, and Sebastian Rosato (2001), *A Complete Data Set of Political Regimes, 1800-1999*, Chicago:

human development and democratic governance: a correlation

University of Chicago.

13. Boix, Carles, Michael K. Miller, Sebastian Rosato (2013), "A Complete Data Set of Political Regimes, 1800-2007," *Comparative Political Studies*, 46:12, 1523-54.
14. Boix, Carles. 2001. "Democracy, Development and the Public Sector." *American Journal of Political Science*, 45 (January): 1– 17.
15. Bueno de Mequita, Bruce, Alastair Smith, Randolph M. Siverson, and James D. Morrow (2003), *The Logic of Political Survival*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
16. Collier, P. (2001), (Implications of ethnic diversity), *Economic Policy Analysis*, Vol.16, No. 32, pp. 129-166.
17. Collier, Ruth Berins, and David Collier. 1991. *Shaping the Political Arena: Critical Junctures, the Labor Movement, and Regime Dynamics in Latin America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
18. Crush, Jonathan (1995), *Power of Development*, New York: Routledge.
19. Drazen, A., and S. Fischer (1997), "Conditionality and Selectivity in Lending by International Financial Institutions", Paper presented at the Symposium in Memory of Michael Bruno, Jerusalem, November 23–24. <http://www.ile.com/fischer/pdf/Fischer139.pdf>.
20. Dreze, Jean, and Amartya Sen (1989), *Hunger and Public Action*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
21. Falashetti, Dino (2009), *Democratic Governance and Economic Performance*,
22. New York: Springer.
23. Filmer, Deon, and Lant Pritchett (1999) "The Impact of Public Spending on Health: Does Money Matter?" *Social Science and Medicine*, 49 (November): 1309–23.
24. Fukuda-Parr, S. (2003), "Rescuing the Human Development Concept from the HDI: Reflections on a New Agenda", In Fukuda-Parr, S. and Shiva Kumar, A. K. (eds.), *Readings in Human Development*, UK: Oxford University Press.
25. Gerring, John, Philip Bond, William Barndt, and Carola Moreno. 2005. "Democracy and Growth: A Historical Perspective," *World Politics*, 57 (April): 323–64.
26. Gerring, John and Strom C. Thacker (2008), *Centripetal Theory of Governance*, UK: Cambridge press.
27. Ghali, Boutros Boutros (2002), *Interaction between Democracy and Development*,
28. Paris: UNESCO.
29. Haq, Ehsanul. (1997), *Education Polity and Society*, Delhi: Shipra Publication.
30. Haq, Mahbubul (2000), *Reflections on Human Development*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
31. Haq, Mahbubul, (1996) "Human Development Paradigm for South Asia", *Mainstream*, 34(12):17-21.
32. Haque, M. S. (2004), Governance Based on Partnership with NGOs: Implications for Development and Empowerment in Rural Bangladesh, *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 70(2): 271-90.
33. Hardin, Russell (1999), *Liberalism, Constitutionalism, and Democracy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
34. Huntington, Samuel P. (1968), *Political Order in Changing Societies*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
35. Hyden, G, Court and Mease (2004), *Making Sense of Governance*, UK: Lynne and Reinner. International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS 2009), *Winning the Needed Change : Saving Our Planet Earth*, Vol 30 ed. Ignacio Pichardo, Pagaza, Demetrios Argyriades, ISBN 978-58603958-5.
36. Johnson Simon, James A. Robinson (2002), "Geography and Institutions in the making of the Modern World Income Distribution", *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 117(4) 2002.
37. Joshi, A. (2006), "Institutions and Service Delivery in Asia", *IDS Bulletin* 37(3): 115-129.
38. Kane, Penny (1989), "Famine in China 1959–61: Demographic and Social Implications," *In Differential Mortality: Methodological Issues and Biosocial*
39. *Factors*, ed. Lado Ruzicka, Guillaume Wunsch, and Penny Kane, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 231–53.

40. Kapstein, Ethan B., and Nathan Converse (2008), *The Fate of Young Democracies*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
41. Kaufmann, D. A. Kraay, and M. Mastruzzi (2006), *Governance Matters V: Governance Indicators for 1996-2005*, Washington, DC: World Bank.
42. Kaufmann, D., A. Kraay, and M. Mastruzzi (2007), "Governance Matters VI: Governance Indicators for 1996-2006", in: *World Bank Research Working Paper No.4280*, World Bank: Washington DC.
43. Kaufmann, Daniel, Aart Kraay and Pablo Zoido-Lobaton (1999), "Aggregating Governance Indicators", *Policy Research Department Working Paper 2195*, World Bank: Washington DC.
44. Keefer, P. (2005), "Democratization and Clientelism: Why are young democracies badly governed", in: *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 359*, World Bank: Washington DC.
45. Keefer, Philip. 2006. "Clientelism, Credibility and the Policy Choices of Young Democracies," *American Journal of Political Science* 51 (October): 804–21, Washington DC.
46. King, Gary, James Honaker, and Anne Joseph, Kenneth Scheve. 2001. "Analyzing Incomplete Political Science Data." *American Political Science Review* 95 (March):49–69.
47. Kothari, Uma, and Minogu, Martin (2002), *Development Theory and Practice: Critical Perspectives*, New Delhi: Palgrave Publications.
48. Kumar, Shiv A.V. (2005), "Reflections as the Legacy of Human Development", *Radical Humanist*, (64):24-31.
49. La Porta, R., F. Lopez-de-Silanes, C. Pop-Eleches, and A. Shleifer (2004), "Judicial Checks and Balances", in: *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 112, pp. 445-470.
50. La Porta, Rafael, Florencio Lopez-de-Silanes, Andrei Shleifer, and Robert W. Vishny. 1999. "The Quality of Government." *Journal of Economics, Law and Organization* 15 (1): 222–79.
51. Lake, David A., and Matthew A. Baum (2001), "The Invisible Hand of Democracy: Political Control and the Provision of Public Services." *Comparative Political Studies* 34, (August): 587–621.
52. Leftwich (1996), "Democracy and Development: Theory and Practice", in Svante Ersson and Jan-Erik Lane (eds.), *Democracy and Development: A Statistical Exploration*, SS. UK: Blackwell Publisher.
53. Lipset, S. M. (1959), "Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and 26 Political Legitimacy", in: *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 53, No. 1, pp. 69-105.
54. Lipset, Seymour Martin (1959), "Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Development," *American Political Science Review* 53 (March): 69–105.
55. Majumdar, Krishna (2001), *Human Well Being: Socio-Economic Indicators, A Global Study*, New Delhi: Shipra Publication.
56. Marshall, Monty G., and Keith Jagers. 2000. "Polity IV Project: Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions, 1800–2000." <http://www.systemicpeace.org/polity/polity4.htm>.
57. McGuire M. C. and O. Mancur (1996), The Economics of Autocracy and Majority Rule: The Invisible Hand and the Use of Force, in: *Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol. 34, No. 1, pp. 72-96.
58. McGuire, James W (2004), *Democracy, Health Care, and Under 5 Mortality: A Cross-National Study of Developing Countries*, Wesleyan University. Unpublished manuscript.
59. McGuire, James W (2010), *Wealth, Health, and Democracy in East Asia and Latin America*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
60. Miller, Michael K. (2015), "Democratic Pieces: Autocratic Elections and Democratic Development since 1815." *British Journal of Political Science* 45:3, 501-30.
61. Muller, Edward N. (1988), "Democracy, Economic Development, and Income Inequality," *American Sociological Review* 53 (February): 50–68.

human development and democratic governance: a correlation

62. Munck, G., 1994, 'Democratic Transition in Comparative Perspective', *Comparative Politics* 26(3), p. 362.
63. Nussbaum and A. K. Sen (1991), *The Quality of Life*, Oxford: Clarendon Press..
64. Nussbaum, Martha (2000), *Women and Human Development the Capabilities Approach*, London: Cambridge University Press.
65. Organization Economic Cooperation and Development OECD (1995): *Good Government Assessment Methodology*, Organization Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Paris.
66. Parenti, Michael (2002), *Democracy for the Few*, USA: Thomson Wadsworth.
67. Park, C.W., 1997, 'The National Assembly in the Consolidation Process of Korean Democracy', *Asian Journal of Political Science* 5(2) p. 97
68. Parker, Richard. 1994. "Policy, Activism, and AIDS in Brazil." In *Global AIDS Policy*, ed. Douglas A. Feldman. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey, 28–46.
69. Pei, Max (1999), "Economic Institutions, Democracy and Development", Paper presented on Feb. 26-27, 1999 at conference on Democracy Market Economy
70. Persson, T. (2002), "Do Political Institutions Shape Economic Policy", in:
71. *Econometrica*, Vol. 70, No. 3, 883-905.
72. Persson, T. (2002), "Do Political Institutions Shape Economic Policy", in:
73. *Econometrica*, Vol. 70, No. 3, 883-905.
74. Persson, T., G. Roland, and G. Tabellini (2000), "Comparative Politics and Public Finance", in: *The Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 108, No. 6, pp. 1121-1161.
75. Persson, T. and G. Tabellini (2000): *Political Economics. Explaining Economic Policy*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: MIT Press.
76. Peters, G. B. (2005), *Institutional Theory in Political Science*, New York: Continuum.
77. Pritchett, L. and L. H. Summers (1996), "Wealthier is Healthier", in: *The Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 31, No. 4, pp. 841-868.
78. Persson, T. and G. Tabellini (2006) "Democracy and Development: The Devil in Details", in: *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, Vol. 96, No. 2, pp. 319-320.
79. Pieterse, Jan Nederveen (2001), *Development Theory: Deconstructions/Reconstructions*, New Delhi: Nistaar Publications.
80. Planning Commission, 10th Five year Plan (2002-2007), Government of India, New Delhi.
81. Prabhu, K Seeta, (2003), "Engendering Human Development", Paper Presented on 9 Press, New York and Oxford.
82. Przeworski and Limongi (2000), *Democracy and Development: Political institutions and Well Being in the World (1950-1990)*, UK: Cambridge.
83. Przeworski, Adam, Michael Alvarez, Jose Antonio Cheibub, and Fernando Limongi. (2000), *Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Material Well-Being in the World, 1950–1990*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
84. Ramachandran, H. (2002), "Governance and People's Participation: Vision 2020", In *India Vision 2020: Report Plus Background Papers*, Planning Commission, Government of India, New Delhi.
85. Rayp, G. and Van de Sijpe, N. (2007): *Measuring and Explaining Government Efficiency in Developing Countries*. Journal of Development Studies, 43 (2): 360- 381 Reserve Bank of India (2006): *Hand Books of Statistics on Indian Economy*, Reserve Bank of India (RBI), Mumbai.
86. Riskin Carl (1995), "Food Poverty and Development Strategy in the People's Republic of China", in *Hunger in History: Food Storage Poverty and Deprivation*, ed. Lucile F; Newman et al., Cambridge: Blackwell 331-52.
87. S. Johnson, and J. A. Robinson (2002), "Reversal of Fortune: Geography and Institutions in the Making of the Modern World income Distribution", in *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 117, pp. 1231-1294.
88. Sen, A K. (1990), "Development as Capability Expansion", in K. Griffin and Knight, J (eds.) *Human Development and the International Development Strategy for the 1980s*, London: Macmillan Press.
89. Sen, A. K. (2000), "A Decade of Human Development", in: *Journal of Human Development*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 17-23.
90. Sen, A. K. and Anand, S. (2000), "The Income Component of the Human Development Index", *Journal of Human*

Development, 1 (1): 83-106.

91. Sen, Amartya (1984), *Resources, Values and Development*, Harvard University Press: Oxford.
92. Sen, Amartya (1985), *Commodities and Capabilities*, Amsterdam: North Holland. Sen, Amartya (2006), *Development as Freedom*, New Delhi: Oxford.
93. Sondhi, Sunil. 2000. "Combating Corruption in India: The Role of Civil Society." Prepared for the 18th World Congress of International Political Science Association (August 1–5), Quebec City, Canada.
94. Srinivas R. Melkote and Steeves, H. Leslie (eds) (2001), *Communication For Development in the Third World: Theory and Practice for Empowerment*, New Delhi: Sage Publication.
95. UNDP (1990), *Human Development Report 1990*, New York: Oxford University Press.
96. UNDP (1997), *Governance for Sustainable Development*, Policy Documents, United Nations Development Programme, New York: Oxford University Press.
97. UNDP (2003), *Human Development Report 2004*, Oxford University Press, New York: Oxford.
98. UNDP (2012), *Human Development Report 2011*, New York: Oxford.
99. World Bank (1998), *Strengthening Public Bangladesh*, Washington DC: the World Bank.
100. World Bank (2013), *World Development Indicators*, Washington, DC: World Bank. [World bank.org/INTWDR2007/Rsources/1489782-1158107976655/Overnew.pdf](http://Worldbank.org/INTWDR2007/Rsources/1489782-1158107976655/Overnew.pdf).