

ERC Starting Grant 2022

Relational State Capacity: Rethinking State Capacity and Welfare Delivery in the Developing World

RSC

- Principal Investigator (PI) : Dr. Dan Honig
- Host institution for the project: University College London
- Proposal duration in months: 60 months

Abstract

Citizens' welfare depends on the state's capacity to generate public goods like health care, education, and safety. State capacity has traditionally been thought of as the state's ability to deliver *to* citizens; capacity is conventionally operationalized and measured by the presence of physical infrastructure (e.g. roads, planes, clinics), public servants (e.g. teachers per capita), or the state's technical capacities (e.g. having advanced disease surveillance abilities).

The Relational State Capacity (RSC) project builds on and draws in a range of disciplines in suggesting a new manner of conceptualizing what capacity in fact "is" – relational contracts, relations of trust and mutual accountability between citizens and public servants. In contrast with conventional approaches, this perspective brings the role of citizens - and their active participation in achieving policy outcomes - to the forefront (e.g. COVID vaccine uptake; citizen information provision to police to identify perpetrators and enhance public safety). RSC will be particularly useful in understanding the state's ability to produce welfare outcomes (and thus what can be done to improve citizen welfare) in the many contexts the state cannot just 'deliver to' citizens, but needs to 'work with' them.

Using quantitative (observational econometric analysis; meta-analysis; pilot interventions) and qualitative (interviews and case study process tracing) methods, this project will:

- 1) define RSC, develop methodologies and measures for the systematic study of RSC;
- 2) validate RSC's relationship with substantive welfare outcomes and
- 3) generate knowledge regarding how, and under what circumstances, RSC emerges and can be strengthened;
- 4) Catalyze the formation of an epistemic community engaging with RSC-related questions of both theoretical and practical relevance in efforts to improve the lives of some of the world's poorest citizens.

Section a: Extended Synopsis of the scientific proposal

State capacity is traditionally conceived of as a technical feature of the state. Our current conceptions of state capacity are steeped in the notion of a state that delivers ‘to’ the people; of a contracting relationship wherein the state is an agent of the body politic, a service provider whose responsibility it is to “deliver” public goods like public health, safety, and cleanliness. This project proposes state capacity be conceptualized as the quality of the relationship -a relational contract - between citizens and state agents.

Myriad public services require action not just by state actors, but by citizens. Citizens must agree to take vaccines when provided for community transmission of COVID to be reduced; voluntarily provide information to police to identify criminals and promote public order; citizens must voluntarily place trash and recycling in appropriate places for waste collection to function efficiently and the streets to remain clean. The capacity of the state is contingent not just on the abstract strength of the state, but on the actions of citizens who interact with the state. Citizen action is in turn conditioned by relationships with, state actors. This project will explore relational state capacity – bringing economics’ relational contracting (Baker et. al. 2002) to the study of interactions between citizens and state representatives for the first time.

The most recent World Bank Governance Forum opened with a keynote which declared that “we face a crisis of citizen trust in governance today”, which in turn threatens “the foundation upon which the legitimacy of public institution is built”. (Pradhan 2021) Trust in government influences citizens’ behaviors, e.g. their propensity to comply with public health guidance during an epidemic (Blair et. al. 2017) or voluntarily pay taxes. (Luttmer & Singhal 2014) But citizens’ beliefs are also formed by their interactions with representatives of the state. This project aims to provide new insight into this “crisis” by making legible to scholars and policymakers the day-to-day interactions between citizens and state upon which good outcomes depend using the framing and tools of relational contracting. **The first work program of this project will focus on developing new understandings of state capacity in relational terms, and developing new approaches to measure relational state capacity.**

Relational state capacity will be useful in particular for scholarship and practice in the developing world. Scholars of development studies, development economics, and political economy of development are increasingly focused on what is oft framed as the “implementation gap” – the long road to be traveled between policy formulation and implementation. While there are of course higher-capacity and lower-capacity states, there is also an emerging literature focused on so-called “pockets of effectiveness” – the notion that within a given state there are widely ranging levels of capacity to implement. (Hickey 2019; McDonnell 2020; Roll 2014) I will examine whether this subnational variation in welfare delivery is related to differences in relational state capacity. **The second work program of this project will focus on identifying qualitative and quantitative variation in relational state capacity across and within India (in partnership with CPR, a leading Indian governance think tank) and how it emerged, relating these differences to variation in public welfare outcomes.**

Armed with this understanding, I will then move to studying efforts to improve relational state capacity – which will involve, but not be limited to, studying pilots of new methods of state-citizen engagement (e.g. citizens’ fora that incorporate state actors and citizens) and bureaucratic reforms that shift the accountability of street level bureaucrats from managers to citizens - e.g. making good performance assessments contingent on the relationships street level bureaucrats build with communities, rather than meeting process-level key performance indicators. **The third work program of this project will focus on studying interventions to improve relational state capacity and performance, synthesizing available evidence as to when, where, and how improving relational state capacity can lead to greater public agency performance and improved citizen welfare.**

This project will establish a new way of conceiving of state capacity that better captures the contextual and relational nature of this concept, thus making the concept of capacity more useful for understanding and improving the state’s ability to positively impact citizens’ welfare. This project will develop an operationalization of state capacity more predictive than existing notions in explaining real-world outcomes; explore how relational state capacity contributes to citizens welfare; and reveal the ways relational state capacity can be built. The project will thus contribute to scholarship in public management, political science, development studies, development economics, and many other related fields. It will also produce 2 books and at least five articles; publicly accessible case studies (e.g. for use as teaching cases); and a public database of existing attempts to strengthen relational state capacity.

Why Do We Need “Relational State Capacity”?

The conventional approach to conceptualizing and operationalizing state capacity has either implicitly or explicitly followed in the tradition of Michael Mann’s (1984) “infrastructural power” – the ability of the state to deliver. This can lead to state capacity being operationalized by measures of state “strength” – including the military ability to deter challenges (Hendrix 2010), fiscal capacity to raise taxes (e.g. Besley & Persson 2011), the number of bureaucrats in a given area (e.g. Brown et al. 2009) or more generally the power of state leaders to “get people in the society to do what they want them to do” (Migdal 1988).

There is general consensus that state capacity is a contested concept, and existing approaches are not wholly satisfying; a prominent recent review of the state capacity literature begins by noting that “what state capacity is and how to strengthen it remain open questions.” (Berwick & Christia 2018). A number of scholars have gone further, suggesting state capacity is unhelpful and e.g. the term should be abandoned altogether (Williams 2021), or scholars should instead focus on “state capability” (Andrews et. al. 2017). Work that helps address the questions Berwick & Christia describe – what in fact state capacity ‘is’ and how it can be improved – is likely to be of use to the wide range of scholars who make use of the concept.

My view is that over a substantial range of state functions this “infrastructural” perspective is unhelpful. By way of illustration, the 2019 Global Health Security Index (GHSI) scores the US and UK as number one and number two in the world, respectively, in their ability to respond to a pandemic. (GHSI 2019) How could this be, given the relative deficiencies of both countries’ pandemic responses? The GHSI measured what was quantifiable and visible – the existence of disease monitoring abilities, hospital beds, expertise. It did not include the likelihood that citizens would follow public health guidance, volunteer information to contact tracers, or be willing to accept the state’s assurances that vaccines were safe and effective. Put more simply, the GHSI ignored the capacity (or lack thereof) that related to the state’s relationship with its citizens. Public health outcomes, like many others, involve not just the passive acceptance of state action but citizens’ active participation. Citizens are not merely ‘clients’ to whom elites deliver welfare; citizens and states must communicate and collaborate to produce welfare. Where this is true, the state’s ability to deliver is at minimum deeply influenced by – and in many cases at core a function of – the nature and quality of the relational contract between the state and citizens.

Relational contracts are typically incomplete contracts (Schwartz 1992); contracts where important features cannot be pre-specified, and thus good outcomes rely on mutual understanding regarding the scope and likely use of discretion. This in turn requires credibility and clarity. Clarity is the degree to which there is shared understanding between parties – as Gibbons & Henderson (2012) put it, clarity interrogates “whether others will *understand* one’s promises” rather than “whether others will believe one’s promises”. In RSC terms, then, clarity is the extent to which citizens and state agents *understand* what the other expects them to do and why. Credibility is whether parties are expected to keep one’s commitments (Gibbons & Henderson 2012). In RSC terms credibility is distinct from broad “trust in government” in that it is consequentialist; the question is whether state agents believe citizens (and vice versa) will live up to their commitments.

Relational state capacity (RSC), then, is a latent capacity present in the relationship between citizens and representatives of the state (or a given unit of the state – an agency or sub-agency team) which can be assessed, measured, and built. RSC suggests that a good deal of citizens’ ‘macro’ trust of the state is built from the ‘micro’ – individual interactions between state agents and citizens. RSC, like any relational concept, is generally enhanced by contact, which may or may not be structured through formal fora. RSC is also reciprocal, implying mutual action and horizontal relations. Trust and understanding are built not merely through citizens’ appraisal of the state’s delivery, but also by citizens’ participation and engagement in producing public goods via their quotidian, everyday interactions with public servants.

RSC is likely to be particularly important in the developing world, environments in which monitoring by those at higher administrative levels (e.g. a headquarters in the national capital) is likely to be more difficult, all else equal; discretionary judgments by agents are thus all the more critical to welfare delivery in developing countries. (Andrews et. al. 2017; Honig 2018) Yet as McDonnell (2021) puts it in her recent book highlighting pockets of excellence in the developing world public sector, “Currently dominant approaches to state reform... seek to limit discretion”. She adds that “current approaches advocate for abstract monitoring systems that can monitor across large scales and at a distance, assuming only a pinnacle principal can be trusted to monitor his interests.”

My prior work on Mission Driven Bureaucrats suggests there are many public sector personnel who wish to deliver welfare, and might benefit from relationships of accountability with citizens that allow them to focus ‘down’ to citizens rather than ‘up’ to these abstract monitoring systems. (Honig 2021; Honig forthcoming). RSC, then, offers the promise of reconceptualizing state capacity in ways that make more legible the relationship between citizens and street-level bureaucrats. (Lipsky 1980) Doing so offers the prospect of better capturing the reality of delivering welfare-enhancing public services in a way that will help catalyze a new generation of state capacity scholarship and may also lead to better welfare outcomes.

RSC is distinct from public input into decisions through e.g. public hearings (Cabannes 2004); structured involvement of citizens in setting policy through e.g. participatory budgeting or citizens’ fora (Warren & Pearse 2008); or citizens’ ability to offer feedback on service delivery (Aroustoupoulou et al. 2019). These structured fora for citizen input in design or implementation may (or may not) strengthen relational state capacity but are distinct from the day-to-day relationship between citizens and the state. RSC builds on recent calls for relational public administration more broadly (Ali et. al. 2021) in centering the everyday, quotidian interactions between citizens and the state in the implementation of policy.

RSC in practice will involve some activities where users and communities both contribute to delivery that other scholars have labelled variously co-production (Bovaird 2007; Whitaker 1980), bureaucratic embeddedness (Evans 1995), or co-Governance (Ackerman 2003). RSC, in addition to including actions which may fall outside these various concepts, focuses not on actions but on the relational contracts which undergird successful co-production and co-governance – the reciprocal relations of trust and mutual accountability. That mutual accountability relationships are necessary conditions for the success of collaborations between citizens and the state has already been mooted by other scholars (e.g. Schmitt & Gilman 2021). RSC, then, can assist with the systematic exploration of an important necessary condition for these approaches for scholars studying and practitioners participating in these approaches.

Where RSC is high, citizens and the states are not merely coming together to ‘produce’ – they are parties to an ongoing relationship. In this sense RSC has echoes, too of political philosopher Jane Mansbridge’s (2019) calls for recursive representation as a means of enhancing public accountability. RSC in some sense brings democratic theory, public trust, and state capacity into conversation with one another, and will be of benefit to scholars attempting to gain purchase on a range of theoretically and practically important questions.

RSC also offers the potential to shift accountability relationships – a topic of central concern in particular to scholars of governance in the developing world. (e.g. Bardhan & Mukherjee 2006; Fox 2015; Mbiti 2016) The World Bank has a “Voice and Accountability Index” as part of its Worldwide Governance Indicators (World Bank 2021), suggesting the centrality of the concept to aid practitioners as well. Many scholars have noted that developing country governments and aid agencies may frequently err in using too top-down a management approach based on meeting targets and quantitative metrics (e.g. Andrews et. al. 2017; Eyben et. al. 2015; Honig 2018; Levy 2014; McDonnell 2020). RSC offers the possibility of shifting the primary accountability relationship of street level bureaucrats away from an orientation ‘up’ towards key performance indicators conceived at higher levels of the hierarchy and towards citizens themselves. Whether this shift in fact occurs results in better welfare outcomes for citizens is one of the key foci of this project.

State capacity is critically important to understanding the state’s ability to achieve public welfare outcomes (safe streets, schools where students learn, healthy citizens). RSC builds on and draws in a range of disciplines in suggesting a new manner of understand what capacity in fact “is” – a set of relations, not merely physical infrastructure (e.g. roads, planes, clinics), bureaucratic presence, or the state’s technical capacities. In so doing RSC holds the potential to contribute to ongoing cutting-edge conversations in a number of disciplines. This project aims to 1) develop methodologies and measures for the systematic study of RSC and catalyze scholarly community engagement around the study of RSC (WP1); 2) validate RSC’s relationship with substantive welfare outcomes (WP2); and 3) generate knowledge regarding how, and under what circumstances, RSC can be strengthened.

Work Program 1. Conceptualizing & Operationalizing Relational State Capacity (PI; Post-doc; Research assistant pool)

Work Program 1 will develop a discussion/working paper on RSC, which will draw on a broad literature review and interviews with scholars whose work touches on central elements of RSC. This discussion paper will define relational state capacity; hypothesise the circumstances under which higher levels of RSC occur; and articulate the circumstances under which relational state capacity will improve outcomes. Particular

points of focus will be when and where RSC seems to be strengthened or weakened by A) digital intermediation of state-citizen relations (e.g. internet service portals & digital ID systems), B) bureaucratic management systems, C) interactions between state agencies and elected political sectors, and D) differences in the nature of tasks (e.g. their monitorability or transaction-intensiveness).

Work program 1, then, will address where and when we should expect RSC to be enhanced by good welfare outcomes, and where and when RSC is a likely prerequisite of improved citizen welfare outcomes. It will also codify falsifiable expectations regarding when and where RSC formation processes or RSC's association with better outcomes are mediated by the type of task or ministry and agency. In providing a foundation for exploring these questions and many more, WP1 will facilitate WP2 and WP3's empirical explorations.

RSC Forum (Applies to all 3 Work Programs): Building Epistemic Community Around RSC

RSC relates, as discussed above, to a range of cutting-edge ideas in political science, public administration, economics, sociology, political philosophy, and beyond. What seems to animate many of the communities that will find RSC valuable is a sense that the relationship between citizens and the state needs to be rethought; that our current conceptions seem not to be 'fit for purpose'. While the discussion paper will articulate a vision of where RSC might be rooted and useful, an important part of this project will be catalyzing formation of an epistemic community around the concept. A key element of this strategy is convening an annual RSC Forum, beginning in Year 1 of the project. The RSC Forum will 1) serve as a point of reference/steering community for this project and 2) gather potential contributors to an edited volume to emerge towards the end of this project.

RSC Forum participants will come from a range of disciplines – political science, public administration, development studies, development economics, sociology, psychology, and organizational behavior, and also include practitioners (e.g. World Bank and developing country government officials). Participants will also come from a range of geographies – Africa, North America, Europe, and South Asia. The RSC Forum will also incorporate both theorists and empiricists, inasmuch as relational state capacity challenges both existing notions of state capacity and existing notions of democratic accountability. While the outputs (e.g. the edited volume) will assist in introducing relational state capacity to the field, the building of community around RSC will also serve to introduce, develop, and validate the concept in the field. Scholars who I have or hope to engage on these ideas include Yamini Aiyar, Matt Andrews, Sarah Brierley, Aditya Dasgupta, Bob Gibbons, Guy Grossman, Hahrie Han, Patrick Heller, David Hulme, Niraja Gopal Jayal, Devesh Kapur, Mushtaq Khan, Mekhala Krishnamurthy, Akshay Mangla, Jane Mansbridge, Marta Troya Martinez, Erin McDonnell, Lant Pritchett, Rahul Sharma, and Martin Williams. The RSC forum will be involved in all parts of the project; with regards to WP1, the forum will provide an opportunity to interrogate the hypotheses, the project team's reading of the literature, and the measurement strategy, amongst other elements.

Work Program 2: Understanding Observational Variation in Relational State Capacity (PI; Post-Doc; Research Assistant Pool)

In collaboration with the State Capacity Program at India's Centre for Policy Research (CPR) – arguably India's leading think tank - this work program will focus on identifying subnational variation in relational state capacity in India. India is an excellent case for the study of RSC due to its large degree of administrative heterogeneity (by state, by management style of Indian Administrative Service officers, etc.) CPR's prior work points to the critical importance of understanding the motivations of state agents in understanding state capacity, and the limitations of rules, penalties, and regulations in achieving public goods-producing behaviour by state agents (Aiyar et al 2021) and citizens (Krishnamurthy et al 2021); their deep engagement in Indian state Government makes them the perfect partner for this project.

Work Program 2 will explore whether RSC appears to be present in the ways predicted in WP1, and where and when higher levels of RSC will be associated with better outcomes. WP2 will explore sub-national (state & district) variation both within-unit (e.g. the differences between agency-level RSC with citizens and how they differ within and across districts) and within-task (e.g. RSC between citizens and agricultural extension agents and how that relationship varies across place). WP2 will also build on Work Program 1's synthetic work, creating a database of all existing studies (regardless of methodology) which study attempts to improve clarity and/or credibility between citizens and state agents and coding important features of the study environment. Where studies include econometric analysis, the database will include the size of the study population, effect sizes, and standard errors. Econometric meta-analytic techniques will then be applied to this database to understand the conditions under which RSC is most likely to be successfully built.

The bulk of WP2 will focus on the collection of both observational qualitative and quantitative data through surveys conducted by enumerators and qualitative interviews. WP2 will not just explore the “what” – what features of context covary with the formation of RSC – but also the “how” and “why”. Process tracing approaches and interviews will allow us not just to observe (if and where it is the case) that higher levels of RSC are associated with better outcomes, but whether that is because it is changing the behavior of citizens; the behavior of state agents within existing accountability & performance management routines; changing the accountability and performance management routines themselves; changing the relationship between political actors and state agents; etc. Where theoretically interesting variation exists, WP2 will develop case studies; qualitative accounts of how RSC emerged and how differences in RSC are related to differences in welfare outcomes, which will be publicly available at the close of the project.

WP2, then, will lead to three article manuscripts. One manuscript will use both qualitative and micro-founded quantitative data to explore the contexts in which RSC emerges. A second manuscript will again draw on mixed methods and address the relationship between RSC and welfare outcomes. A third manuscript will use meta-analytic techniques (Lipsey & Wilson 2001; Ringquist 2013) to establish the state of existing knowledge regarding attempts to build RSC. WP2 will also (via the publicly accessible database of existing attempts to build RSC and the separate library of case studies) build public goods which will facilitate the work of other scholars. The findings of WP2 will be discussed and interrogated as they develop at the annual RSC Forum, alongside work from other scholars which touch upon important RSC questions (a number of which will later be included in the edited volume on RSC).

Work Program 3: Building Relational State Capacity (PI; Post-Doc; India-Based Research Officer; Research Assistant Pool)

Work Program 3 (in collaboration with India’s CPR) will work to pilot attempts to actually build RSC in India. CPR has an existing “catalytic design support” engagement with a number of Indian states. Building on the strongest findings in WP2, the project will work with government to design attempts to improve RSC.

Both qualitative and quantitative approaches will evaluate these attempts to improve RSC. The specific interventions will be based on the foundation built in WP1 and WP2. If RSC between rural farmers and state agents is very strongly associated with better welfare outcomes in agricultural extension work, and an important predictor of RSC formation is extension agents’ frequent contact with farmers at times convenient to them (when they are not otherwise planting) and agents’ orientation towards farmers driving the agenda (rather than agents suggesting modes of improvement/attempting to diffuse best practice solutions). In WP3 the project team and CPR will work with Andhra Pradesh & Kerala state governments to pilot in some districts new rotation/visit schedules for agricultural agents and selection of new agents on the basis of their orientation towards farmers. We will then explore through comparison of pilot and non-pilot districts in a randomised controlled trial whether the pilot altered RSC and whether the pilot caused improvements in citizens’ welfare (e.g. agricultural income). Qualitative interviews and observations will complement the econometric experimental analysis to allow for process-tracing, shedding light on the mechanism of action.

WP1 and WP2’s findings will form a foundation on which WP3 will build. WP3 will focus not only on estimating the effects of RSC-promoting interventions in the contexts where they are studied, but also examine heterogeneity at two levels – in the effect of attempts to promote RSC on the level of RSC (Do attempts to catalyse RSC formation succeed?), and of RSC levels on welfare outcomes (Does ‘induced’ RSC improve outcomes?). Examining when – in both senses – attempts to promote RSC are more effective will allow us to build a broader evidence base regarding RSC. This will in turn serve as a base both for practitioners and for future scholarly explorations by a range of scholars.

Project Management : Project management will be led by me; I will manage a small team composed of the post-doc (Research Fellow) and India-based full time research assistant in Work Program 3. I have managed project fields teams in a number of countries (Bangladesh, Liberia, and Thailand), have previously managed large teams (e.g. serving as special assistant to the Finance Minister of Liberia), and have previous work experience in India. We will also discuss project management with RSC Forum participants on an annual basis, and seek input from Forum participants between annual meetings. India’s Centre for Policy Research has a long and distinguished track record of managing successful projects as well.

Dissemination & Impact: A primary goal of this project is to engage with academics from a variety of disciplines and geographies. This will be achieved through the publication of: at least five articles by the research team in the top political science and public management journals (a number of which the PI has

already published in); an edited volume emerging from the RSC Forum; an original monograph from the research team entitled *Relational State Capacity*, framing the central concept and drawing from all three work programs of the project; and a public database of attempts to build RSC; and a case study library.

This project will engage government officials in India as part of WP2 and WP3, building on my track record of working with policymakers in the developing world to achieve substantive impacts. The RSC Forum will also expand as the project reaches its later years, drawing in government officials interested in learning more about RSC or engaged in RSC activities. I plan for the RSC Forum to continue even after the end of ERC support and remain a focal point of a growing global RSC community of practitioners and scholars.

References

Ackerman, J. (2004). Co-governance for accountability: beyond “exit” and “voice”. *World Development*, 32(3), 447-463.

Aiyar, Y., Davis, V., Govindan, G. and Kapoor, T. (2021). *Rewriting the Grammar of the Education System: Delhi’s Education Reform (A Tale of Creative Resistance and Creative Disruption)*. *Research on Improving Systems of Education (RISE)*.

Ali, A. J., Fuenzalida, J., Gómez, M., & Williams, M. J. (2021). Four lenses on people management in the public sector: An evidence review and synthesis. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 37(2), 335-366.

Andrews, M., Pritchett, L., & Woolcock, M. (2017). *Building state capability: Evidence, analysis, action* (p. 288). Oxford University Press.

Androutsopoulou, A., Karacapilidis, N., Loukis, E., & Charalabidis, Y. (2019). Transforming the communication between citizens and government through AI-guided chatbots. *Government Information Quarterly*, 36(2), 358-367.

Banerjee, S. (2016). Aadhaar: Digital inclusion and public services in India. *World Development Report*, 81-92.

Baker, G., Gibbons, R., & Murphy, K. J. (2002). Relational Contracts and the Theory of the Firm. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 117(1), 39-84.

Bardhan, P., & Mookherjee, D. (2006). Decentralisation and accountability in infrastructure delivery in developing countries. *The Economic Journal*, 116(508), 101-127.

Besley, T., & Persson, T. (2011). *Pillars of prosperity*. Princeton University Press.

Berwick, E., & Christia, F. (2018). State capacity redux: Integrating classical and experimental contributions to an enduring debate. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 21, 71-91.

Blair, R. A., Morse, B. S., & Tsai, L. L. (2017). Public health and public trust: Survey evidence from the Ebola Virus Disease epidemic in Liberia. *Social Science & Medicine*, 172, 89-97.

Bovaird, T. (2007). Beyond engagement and participation: User and community coproduction of public services. *Public administration review*, 67(5), 846-860.

Brown, J. D., Earle, J. S., & Gehlbach, S. (2009). Helping hand or grabbing hand? State bureaucracy and privatization effectiveness. *American Political Science Review*, 103(2), 264-283.

Cabannes, Y. (2004). Participatory budgeting: a significant contribution to participatory democracy. *Environment and urbanization*, 16(1), 27-46.

Carpenter, D. (2014). *Reputation and Power*. Princeton University Press.

Eyben, R., Guijt, I., Roche, C., & Shutt, C. (Eds.). (2015). *The politics of evidence and results in international development: Playing the game to change the rules?*. Rugby: Practical Action Publishing.

- Evans, P. (1995) *Embedded Autonomy: States and Industrial Transformation*. Princeton University Press.
- Fox, Jonathan A. "Social accountability: what does the evidence really say?." *World Development* 72 (2015): 346-361.
- Gibbons, R., & Henderson, R. (2012). Relational contracts and organizational capabilities. *Organization science*, 23(5), 1350-1364.
- Global Health Security Index (2019). Available at <https://www.ghsindex.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/2019-Global-Health-Security-Index.pdf>
- Hendrix, C. S. (2010). Measuring state capacity: Theoretical and empirical implications for the study of civil conflict. *Journal of peace research*, 47(3), 273-285.
- Hickey, S. (2019). The politics of state capacity and development in Africa: Reframing and researching 'pockets of effectiveness'.
- Honig, D. (2018). *Navigation by Judgment: Why and When Top-Down Control of Foreign Aid Won't Work*. Oxford University Press.
- Honig, D. (2021). Supportive management practice and intrinsic motivation go together in the public service. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(13).
- Honig, D. (under contract/forthcoming). *Mission Driven Bureaucrats*. Oxford University Press.
- Krishnamurthy, M., Sanan, D., Sharma, K. R., & Unnikrishnan, A. (2021). *The Pandemic and Public Administration: A survey of Indian Administrative Service (IAS) officers*. Centre for Policy Research. New Delhi.
- Levy, B. (2014). *Working with the grain: Integrating governance and growth in development strategies*. Oxford University Press.
- Lipsey, M. W., & Wilson, D. B. (2001). *Practical meta-analysis*. SAGE publications.
- Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public service*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Luttmer, E. F., & Singhal, M. (2014). Tax morale. *Journal of economic perspectives*, 28(4), 149-68.
- Mann, M. (1984). The autonomous power of the state: its origins, mechanisms and results. *European Journal of Sociology/Archives européennes de sociologie*, 25(2), 185-213.
- Mansbridge, J. (2018). Recursive representation. In *Creating political presence* (pp. 298-338). University of Chicago Press.
- McDonnell, E. M. (2020). *Patchwork Leviathan*. Princeton University Press.
- Migdal, J. S. (1988). *Strong societies and weak states*. Princeton University Press.
- Pradhan, S. (2021). *Tackling the Crisis of Citizen Trust in Governance: The World Bank Imperative*. Keynote remarks at the World Bank Governance Forum, March 17, 2021. Online at <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/stories/tackling-the-crisis-of-citizen-trust-in-governance-the-world-bank-imperative/>
- Pritchett, L., & Woolcock, M. (2004). Solutions when the solution is the problem: Arraying the disarray in development. *World Development*, 32(2), 191-212.

Rasul, I., Rogger, D., & Williams, M. J. (2021). Management, Organizational Performance, and Task Clarity: Evidence From Ghana's Civil Service. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 31(2), 259-277.

Ringquist, E. (2013). *Meta-analysis for public management and policy*. John Wiley & Sons.

Roll, M. (2014). The State That Works: A 'Pockets of Effectiveness' Perspective on Nigeria and Beyond. In *States at Work* (pp. 365-397). Brill.

Schmitt, M. & Gilman, H.R. (2021). *Building the Relationships for Collaborative Governance: Case Studies from Across America*. New America Foundation.

Schwartz, A. (1992). Relational contracts in the courts: An analysis of incomplete agreements and judicial strategies. *The Journal of Legal Studies*, 21(2), 271-318.

Warren, M. E., & Pearse, H. (2008). Designing deliberative democracy: The British Columbia citizens' assembly.

Whitaker, G. P. (1980). Coproduction: Citizen participation in service delivery. *Public Administration Review*, 240-246.

Williams, M. J. (2021). Beyond state capacity: bureaucratic performance, policy implementation and reform. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 17(2), 339-357.

World Bank. (2021). *Worldwide Governance Indicators*. <http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/>.