DLP

DEVELOPMENTAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

State of the Art **2**

The politics-bureaucracy interface: impact on development reform

Niheer Dasandi

October 2014

DEVELOPMENTAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

The Developmental Leadership Program (DLP)
is an international research initiative based at
the University of Birmingham, and working in
partnership with University College London (UCL) and La
Trobe University in Melbourne.

DLP aims to increase understanding of the political
processes that drive or constrain development. Its work
focuses on the crucial role of home-grown leaderships
and coalitions in forging legitimate institutions that
promote developmental outcomes.

DLP's independent program of research is supported by
the Australian aid program.

Contents

The 'State of the Art Paper' series

Our SOTA series aims to lay the groundwork for future DLP research by setting out what existing research evidence and development practice tells us about the politics of development in key areas.

These papers survey the literature, with three aims:

- to clarify what is already known about an issue and the policy implications of that research evidence;
- to suggest areas for further investigation by identifying knowledge gaps;
- to guide future DLP research, ensuring that it is problem-focused, useful and innovative.

To ensure the rigour, validity and utility of these papers, they are peer reviewed internally and externally by both academic and policy or programming experts.

We hope that the SOTA papers will also be useful to other researchers and commissioners of research, and to policymakers and practitioners.

Author and acknowledgements

Dr Niheer Dasandi is a DLP research fellow at University College London. As well as political-bureaucratic interaction, his research focuses on the politics of policy reform in developing countries, the political economy of aid, and the links between inequality and poverty. niheer.dasandi@ucl.ac.uk

Executive summary

There is a significant lack of research that focuses on how political and bureaucratic leaders in developing countries interact, and how their interaction affects institutional and policy reform. Yet this survey of the existing literature finds that political-bureaucratic relations are an important factor in reform success or failure. The findings suggest that political-bureaucratic relations that support successful reform often involve: a core group of political and bureaucratic leaders who work closely together and share development-centred values and aims; bureaucrats who have unusually high levels of influence in designing policy; and strong political leadership promoting the reform.

This paper offers an assessment of the current state of research on: the nature of the 'political-bureaucratic interface' in developing countries, and its impact on institutional and policy reform. It summarises the main findings of the literature, and identifies knowledge gaps.

Politicians and bureaucrats each have their own values, interests, ideas, attitudes and different sources, forms, and degrees of power. The 'political-bureaucratic interface' refers here to how political and bureaucratic *leaders* engage with each other, and to the structural or institutional constraints and opportunities that influence their engagement. It involves both the type of relationship – for example, how closely these leaders work together; whether they interact through informal or formal channels – and contextual factors that affect it.

Types of political-bureaucratic relations

Two aspects of the relationship between politicians and bureaucrats are particularly important: how distinct their roles are in the reform process (the distance and level of differentiation between the political and administrative spheres); and how much space, or autonomy, politicians give bureaucrats in designing policies.

Developing countries can be divided into three broad categories based on these key dimensions of political-bureaucratic relations (see table below).

- In 'developmental states' there is little separation of roles (so politicians and bureaucrats work closely together) and *significant* bureaucratic autonomy. 'Developmental states' are those where government involvement in the market has achieved high economic growth, such as Botswana and South Korea, Taiwan, and Singapore.
- In 'predatory' states there is little separation of roles and *little* bureaucratic autonomy. In these countries the ruling elite uses the state apparatus to extract personal wealth, such as in Zaire under Mobutu Sese Seko.
- In other developing countries there is greater separation of roles (more distant working relations) and lower bureaucratic autonomy. However, levels of both dimensions vary widely across these countries – and within them (between different ministries, for example). Most developing countries fall into this category, in which opposition between politicians and bureaucrats is more likely.

A typology of political-bureaucratic relations across states

		Autonomy of bureaucrats	
		Low	*High*
Separation of roles between politicians and bureaucrats	*High*	Other developing nations e.g. India	'Developed' nations
	Low	'Predatory' states e.g. Zaire	'Developmental' states e.g. Singapore

Loosely based on Svara's 'possible model of political-administrative relations' (2006: 956).

3

In developmental states

The relationship between political and bureaucratic leaders in developing countries has been discussed in greatest detail in the context of the successful 'developmental states'. The literature identifies seven key characteristics of the relationship in these states:

- A core group of 'developmental' senior politicians and bureaucrats who work closely together
- Shared developmental values and vision
- Shared social class or educational background
- Senior bureaucrats who were allowed to have significant influence in policy design
- Bureaucracies that were both meritocratic and 'coherent' – having corporate objectives, values and norms that are widely observed
- Significant movement between senior political and bureaucratic positions
- Bureaucracies that were often subsumed within the dominant political party.

In predatory states

Four features define political-bureaucratic relations in 'predatory states':

- A small group of individuals connected through personal loyalties controls the state apparatus (Evans 1989)
- Key political and administrative leaders have access to the major means of acquiring personal wealth.
- Government bureaucracy is used principally for rent-seeking
- Employment and promotion in the bureaucracy are based on political loyalty and clientelism.

In other developing countries

Factors that affect the more distant and varying political-bureaucratic relations in other developing countries include the following.

- **Colonial legacy** of bureaucracies established to maintain the status quo rather than to make change happen. The interests and attitudes of bureaucrats who seek to follow procedure can clash with those of politicians who seek political and economic transformation.
- **Democracy and political change**. Democratically elected politicians tend to be more concerned about the political costs of their decisions. Further, the more frequent political change is, the more difficult it is to create shared values and objectives between politicians and bureaucrats - who generally remain in post longer.
- **Political interference.** Despite formal separation of roles, politicians may seek to influence bureaucrats' recruitment and career progression.
- **Other actors** – such as elites, civil society, academics and donors – influence policymaking, and may support or block reforms. These dynamics can affect the level of impact that political-bureaucratic relations have on reform.

Resources, recruitment and representation

Three important structural factors shape the politics-bureaucracy interface in developing countries and its impact on reform. First, what **resources, or sources of power,** can politicians and bureaucrats draw on? There are three main types of resources:

- **Institutional.** These are the powers given to politicians and bureaucrats by the country's formal and informal political 'rules of the game'. Formal institutions usually give politicians a higher position in the decision-making hierarchy, but in many developing countries constitutions give bureaucrats some protection from dismissal by political leaders. Limited terms of political office can mean that in democratic nations bureaucrats' tenure is longer than that of politicians.
- **Technical**. Bureaucrats' main resource is knowledge and expertise about political and policy processes. Where bureaucrats have more knowledge of a policy than politicians, they are more likely to be granted greater autonomy in the policy process.
- **Financial**. Political leaders generally have greater control over a country's material resources, and this increases bureaucrats' responsiveness to their demands. However, specific ministries within a bureaucracy may have significant influence over the allocation of funds. Some ministries may also have more access to finance than others, for example as a recipient of external funding.

Second, to what extent are **recruitment and promotion in the bureaucracy** based on merit or on personal and political relationships? Some countries use civil service entrance exams to support meritocratic recruitment, but political leaders may still seek to exert influence by affecting bureaucrats' promotions and transfers.

A significant body of public policy and administration research considers a third factor: **representation**. For example, to what extent does the bureaucracy reflect the population's composition, values and views? This paper focuses on the representation of women and ethnic groups.

Studies indicate that a higher proportion of women in political and bureaucratic positions has had some broad positive impacts on agenda-setting (Goetz 1998); on women's political engagement (Barnes and Burchard 2013); and on gender relations through symbolic representation (Powley 2005). But greater numerical representation has had less impact on gender-related policy outcomes. Women's leadership in political and especially in bureaucratic office is, however, significantly under-researched.

Shared pro-development values and objectives

What fosters – or hinders – shared development-centred values and objectives among politicians and bureaucrats?

- **Shared backgrounds and informal networks** – for example, shared social class and networks based on having studied at the same secondary schools or universities, or those based on kin, ethnicity or region, which tend to have narrower interests.

- **Political and developmental factors**. Strong political leadership is particularly important in promoting a shared focus on development. Other factors include political continuity, framing policies to avoid emphasis on the left-right spectrum of political ideology, and the role of development successes in reinforcing a shared vision.
- **Organisational and individual factors**. For example, a specific ministry or agency can decisively shape the values and attitudes of its staff.

Impact of political-bureaucratic relations on reform

The literature on the failure of institutional reforms in developing countries highlights conflicting interests between politicians and bureaucrats as a key factor. Bureaucrats' unwillingness to implement reforms that clash with their interests can derail even reforms that have strong support from political leaders (Grindle 2004; Andrews 2013).

However, a small but significant literature examines how political leaders have managed to push through reforms despite resistance from bureaucrats and other actors. These leaders approached the bureaucracy either by: transforming it to remove sources of resistance (rare); establishing a new independent agency to address a specific issue or policy area; or working within the existing structure. Success factors in the second and third approaches included the following.

- **Political leaders' active commitment to reform**. Their strategies included timing reforms strategically, setting the terms of the debate, actively promoting reforms and weakening opponents.
- **A like-minded reform design team**, typically including influential bureaucrats and politicians. Success is more likely when teams: are strategically placed within the bureaucracy; plan before inviting wide discussion; create networks within government and with international funders; and leave executive leaders to manage pressure from public and bureaucratic opinion (Grindle 2004: 115).
- **Strategies at the design stage to increase the likelihood of implementation and sustainability**. These have included: offering choice in which reforms to implement or incentives for compliance; capacity development; delegation to sub-national governments; giving more attention to monitoring, for example by involving civil society groups (Grindle 2004; Goetz 2007; Robinson 2007).

Political-bureaucratic relations that support reforms

Comparing findings on the politics-bureaucracy interface in developmental states with more recent research on reforms that succeeded despite opposition, similarities emerge:

- Close working relationships between politicians and bureaucrats within an elite group
- Bureaucrats who have much greater influence in designing policy than is usually the case
- Shared pro-development values and goals within the core group of political and bureaucratic leaders, bolstered by informal ties
- A strong and committed political leadership and a strategy to deal with opposition.

Successful reforms were initiated and driven by domestic actors (see Hirschman 1981; Wallis 1999; Grindle 2004) who created links with international donors that were important for success. Three main considerations for external actors emerge from the literature:

- Identifying where there is political commitment to reforms
- Identifying and engaging with domestic actors already committed to reform
- Ensuring funding is available according to the timings set out by domestic reform teams.

Research gaps

While a significant body of literature looks at how political and bureaucratic leaders relate to one another in developing countries, most studies have only considered this issue implicitly. Future focused research could examine:

- **More specific types of political-bureaucratic relations**. Detailed analysis is needed to refine the broad categorisation offered by this paper.
- **Reform design teams**. How do these important teams made up of both politicians and bureaucrats come together? How do they coordinate their design work?
- **Commitment to reform**. What motivates politicians and bureaucrats to support reform – or not to? What values and attitudes, and their alignments or misalignments, are influential?
- **Higher education networks**. A more systematic analysis is needed of the role of networks among politicians and bureaucrats formed during higher education.

There are also methodological research gaps: most studies use single country qualitative case studies. Other methods that could prove fruitful include:

- **Comparative case study analysis,** for which Grindle (2004) and Goetz (2007) provide important theoretical frameworks
- **Interviews** to explore the values, motivations and behaviour of political and bureaucratic leaders in relation to one another
- **Social network analysis** of how the important formal or informal networks among politicians and bureaucrats emerge, persist or change
- **Participant observation and action research** to examine political-bureaucratic interaction behind closed doors.

1.0

Introduction

Current development thinking emphasises the importance of the quality of a nation's political institutions for successful development outcomes. However, efforts to implement institutional reforms in developing countries have frequently ended in failure. The role of the bureaucracy and, in particular, the relationship between political and bureaucratic leaders has in many cases been central to the failure to implement institutional reforms, particularly where the interests of politicians and bureaucrats have clashed (Cohen *et al*. 1985; Grindle and Thomas 1991; Andrews 2013). In other cases, this relationship has been seen as fundamental for strengthening institutions and achieving successful development outcomes. The close relationship between political and administrative leaders has been viewed as the key feature of the successful developmental states (Leftwich 1995; Johnson 1982). A better understanding of the factors that shape this relationship, and how differences in it impact reforms, is therefore central to understanding how institutional change happens. In particular, this would enable donors to better identify entry points and methods for supporting institutional reforms in developing countries.

This paper summarises the current state of knowledge on the nature of the 'politics-bureaucracy interface' in developing countries, and its impacts on institutional change and policy reform. Politicians and bureaucrats each have their own values, interests, ideas, attitudes and different sources, forms, and degrees of power. The politics-bureaucracy interface refers here to how political and bureaucratic leaders[1] engage with each other and the structural or institutional constraints and opportunities that influence their engagement. It involves both the type of relationship – for example, how closely these leaders work together; how distinct their roles are; whether they interact through informal or formal channels – and contextual factors that affect it.

This paper is structured as follows.

1. The remainder of this section broadly considers the context of research on the politics-bureaucracy interface, looking at the development literature and the public policy literature on the subject. This is followed by a brief discussion of the methodology used to undertake this review and the principal research questions that have guided the analysis.

2. The second section considers the nature of the relationship between politicians and bureaucrats in developing countries. It focuses on the extent to which their roles are separated into different spheres, and the level of autonomy and influence high-level bureaucrats have in the decision-making process.

3. The third section considers the structural factors that influence the relationship between politicians and bureaucrats, focusing on available resources, recruitment and career progression in the bureaucracy. It also considers the issue of representation, in particular women's representation in leadership positions in politics and the bureaucracy.

4. Fourthly, the paper looks at the factors that influence the behaviour of politicians and bureaucrats, specifically values, interests and incentives.

5. The fifth section focuses more on the agency of politicians and bureaucrats, and considers the impact of the politics-bureaucracy interface on policy reform. This section looks at the failure of reforms, and in more detail at cases in which reforms have succeeded despite significant opposition.

6. Finally, the paper highlights the main themes that emerge from the review and identifies the research gaps in the current literature.

1.1 Context

A wide body of literature considers the impact of bureaucracies in developing countries on development outcomes (see Knack and Keefer 1995; Mauro 1995; Evans and Raunch 1999; Raunch and Evans 2000). However, this literature has largely been informed by the notion of 'good governance', which takes 'a technical, managerial and administrative' approach to considering attributes of developing country bureaucracies (Hudson and Leftwich 2014: 9).[2] So while much has been written about bureaucracies in

---

1   See Lyne de Ver (2009) for a discussion of the concept of 'leadership'. While the focus here is at the leadership level, this necessarily involves some consideration of the relationship between senior bureaucrats and those in middle and lower level management positions. As I discuss in the final section of the paper, relations among bureaucrats at different levels is a key area for future research.

2   van de Walle (2006) highlights a number of flaws of measures that consider the quality of bureaucracies across the world.

developing countries, little of this literature has taken a political approach to understanding the role of the bureaucracy in the development world with an emphasis on power, agency, and ideas. Even less research has considered the interface between political and bureaucratic leaders, and the effect of this interface on institutional reform.

In contrast, the study of the relationship between politicians and bureaucrats in the (non-development) public policy literature has a long and venerable history (see Overeem 2012; Peters 2010; Peters and Pierre 2001). This tradition goes back to Woodrow Wilson's discussion of the importance of the separation of politics and administration in 1887, in which he argued bureaucrats should be politically neutral and professional technocrats (see Peters and Pierre 2001). Undoubtedly, the most influential work on the roles of, and relationship between, politicians and bureaucrats has been Max Weber's *Economy and Society*, first published in 1922. In this seminal work, Weber outlined the ideal relationship between political leaders and senior bureaucrats as one in which there is a clear distinction between the roles and responsibilities of each (see Weber 1968). From Weber's perspective, the ideal bureaucrat was a politically neutral, technical expert who was subordinate to political leaders. The primary responsibility of bureaucrats was to advise political leaders and efficiently implement the decisions made by these leaders.

The Weberian ideal bureaucracy is more generally used in the literature as a point of comparison for considering bureaucracies in both richer and poorer nations. This review draws considerably on the notion of a "Weberian bureaucracy" and the characteristics of such a bureaucracy. However, it is worth pointing out early on in the paper that few bureaucracies in the world meet the Weberian ideal – and given the messy reality of politics, particularly in many developing countries, it is unrealistic to expect states to meet it (see Brett 2009; Fukuyama 2013). Hence, it is used here for analytical purposes rather than presented as a standard against which bureaucracies can be judged.

The focus of the public policy literature on the politics-bureaucracy interface has almost exclusively been on wealthy and industrialised democracies, ignoring developing country contexts.[3] This is partly a consequence of the significant difference between the institutional contexts of developed and developing countries. In developing countries the politics-bureaucracy interface occurs in the context of much weaker formal political institutions, and consequently the distinction between the roles of political leaders and bureaucrats is often blurred (Grindle 2004).[4] Furthermore, because of the development needs of these countries, bureaucracies have tended to play a much greater role in the policy process in an effort to transform the economies of these societies (Dwivedi 1999; Melo *et al.* 2012). While this paper draws on concepts and arguments made in the non-development public policy literature, it focuses on the development literature.

1.2 Methodological note and research questions

The existing literature on the politics-bureaucracy interface does not make up a coherent body of research. As is discussed in Section 6 of the paper, it is a highly under-researched area in development, and it is therefore not possible to undertake a detailed systematic review of the literature on this topic.

The methodology used to produce this paper draws on a number of different approaches and employs a relatively fluid method. The first step was to identify areas of the development literature that discuss the relationship between politicians and bureaucrats in some detail, which provided relevant search terms. These areas included, for example, the literature on *developmental states* and on the *success of reforms in developing countries*. This literature often referred to examples of the relationship between politicians and bureaucracies in other contexts, which made it possible to expand the review.

Furthermore, finding research areas that consider the politics-bureaucracy relationship made it possible to identify the key features of the relationship in these countries, and to use these to refine searches about the politics-bureaucracy interface; for instance, *meritocratic recruitment and appointment*, and *values and incentives*. These key terms were then used for standard Google and Google Scholar searches. Broader terms were also used, such as 'politics-bureaucracy', 'politics-administration' and 'development administration', which identified studies that directly address aspects of the politics-bureaucracy interface.

The 'non-development' public policy literature, which was often referenced in development texts looking at the politics-administration interface, was also used to identify key areas of the politics-bureaucracy interface. This was used as a reference point for the review, given it represents a clearer and more cohesive body of literature. This made it possible to identify clear search terms which were again used in standard Google and Google Scholar searches. Additional studies were identified through the citations in articles on the politics-bureaucracy relationship in development.

Three research questions guide this review:

- What is the shape of political dynamics between politicians and bureaucrats in developing countries?
- What factors influence the politics-bureaucracy interface?
- How does the politics-bureaucracy interface impact institutional and policy reform in developing countries?

It is important to note that the focus of this review is on the interaction between *leaders* in political office and the bureaucracy. While this entails some consideration of the relationship between politicians and bureaucrats more generally (and within the bureaucracy), the focus is on higher-level interaction.

---

3   For example in Georgiou's (2014) structural analysis of the politics-administration dichotomy literature, only two of the 165 papers included in the study focus on developing countries. Furthermore, not a single paper from *Public Administration and Development*, the principal journal publishing research on public administration in a development context, is included in the analysis.

4   See discussion in Section 2.

A related point is that the interface between political and bureaucratic leaders is inevitably shaped by characteristics of political leadership and the make-up and nature of the bureaucracy in a country. Consequently, this review gives significant attention to the separate characteristics of political and bureaucratic leaders that influence their interaction.

This paper focuses on the impact of the politics-bureaucracy interface on institutional and policy reform. A number of recent political economy analyses have demonstrated how the relationship between politicians and bureaucrats can influence public service delivery in developing countries (see Pedley and Taylor 2009; OPM 2010; The Asia Foundation 2012; Harris *et al*. 2013; Wild and Cammack 2013; Mcloughlin and Harris 2013). While these important studies are related to the literature analysed here, they tend to deal much more with mid- and lower-level bureaucrats. Reform processes and public service delivery are of course closely related, and it is important to note that a demarcation between the two areas is largely for analytical purposes rather than reflecting a clear divide in reality. This review considers more specifically the literature on how the politics-bureaucracy relationship impacts reforms, rather than the day-to-day provision of public services.

2.0

Separation and autonomy

This section considers the types of relationship between politicians and bureaucrats, focusing on two dimensions. The first is the *differentiation* or separation of roles between politicians and bureaucrats in a country. This can also be seen as the amount of distance between the political and administrative spheres. The second is the nature of the hierarchy between politicians and bureaucrats, specifically the *level of autonomy that bureaucrats have* in the policy process (see Huntington 2006; Fukuyama 2013). In analysing the types of relationship between politicians and bureaucrats, three broad categories of countries are considered. The characterisation and dimensions of how politicians and bureaucrats relate to each other is drawn from the substantial public policy and public administration literature on this subject.[5]

Countries can be placed into three broad categories, based on the type of relationships between politicians and bureaucrats discussed in the development literature.

- The first are developmental states, where the extant literature emphasises the close relationship between political leaders and high-level bureaucrats, with the latter given a great deal of autonomy in designing policies.

- The second category is predatory states, which are again marked by a close working relationship between politicians and bureaucrats. However, in this context bureaucrats are largely controlled by political leaders, and therefore have little in the way of autonomy or influence.

- Finally, the third category is states where there is – at least formally – a much greater degree of distance between politicians and bureaucrats. The level of bureaucratic autonomy varies considerably among these countries, but in general, bureaucrats tend to be more autonomous than in predatory states, but far less so than in developmental states.

2.1 Developmental states

The relationship between politicians and bureaucrats receives significant attention in the literature on *developmental states*, defined by Adrian Leftwich (1995: 401) as 'states whose politics have concentrated sufficient power, autonomy and capacity at the centre to shape, pursue and encourage the achievement of explicit developmental objectives.' The term has been applied to the late industrialisers of East Asia (e.g. Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and Singapore), and a handful of other countries (e.g. Botswana), who managed to achieve exceptionally high levels of economic growth through the active and strategic involvement of the state in the market (Johnson 1982; Evans 1992). Much of this literature focuses on state-business relations, particularly the use of industrial policy. However, studies of developmental states also emphasise the manner in which close political ties between politicians and bureaucrats based on shared values and agreed policy goals played a fundamental role in their development successes (see Johnson 1981, 1982; Evans 1985, 1992; Amsden 1989; Wade 1990; Charlton 1991; Leftwich 1995). Another important characteristic of such developmental states is the power and autonomy of their bureaucracies in the design and implementation of policies (Evans 1992; Leftwich 1995). As Chalmers Johnson (1981: 12) has remarked, in reference to Taiwan, 'the politicians reign and the state bureaucrats rule'. Box 1 sheds more light on the relationship between politicians and bureaucrats in Botswana's developmental state.[6]

---

5   See Svara (2006) for a review of the public administration literature on the relationship between politicians and administrators in the political process. In the majority of developing nations, this relationship tends to fit outside what Svara (2006: 55) considers the 'normal' range of variation into those seen to have 'more extreme characteristics'. As noted in the introduction, the vast majority of public administration studies tend to ignore the developing world context, and focus almost exclusively on developed democratic contexts.

6   It is worth noting that there have been recent efforts in Botswana to privatise some parts of the public sector and reduce the size of the bureaucracy to improve efficiency within public services. However, this is not seen as having significantly reduced the influence of the bureaucracy in policymaking in the country, or challenging the notion of Botswana as a developmental state (see Mothusi and Dipholo 2008).

Box 1. Politicians and bureaucrats in developmental Botswana

The relationship between politicians and bureaucrats played a key role in Botswana's democratic developmental success, as Roger Charlton (1991) has described. Significant features of this relationship include the following:

- Bureaucrats have a huge amount of influence in the policy-making process, in terms of the initiation, design and implementation of policies (Picard 1987; Charlton 1991).

- Politicians and bureaucrats represent a relatively unified socio-economic grouping, which is partly a consequence of being from a similar cattle-owning class (Gulhati 1990; Acemoglu et al. 2001a).

- Politicians and bureaucrats have a shared 'developmental ideology', which was reinforced by the country's high economic growth rates following independence (Charlton 1991: 274).

- A significant proportion of the country's high-level politicians are former civil servants; the ruling Botswana Democratic Party (BDP) actively encourages civil servants identified as being politically astute to enter politics at both the local and national level (Charlton 1991).

A number of factors have contributed to the closeness of this relationship between political leaders and high-level bureaucrats in Botswana. The first is that the ruling BDP party has been in power since the country's independence. This political continuity has enabled a close relationship to develop.

Secondly, the bureaucracy is able to attract the best graduates in the country, which contributes to strengthening the bureaucracy's technical expertise. Another key factor that influenced the development of the bureaucracy was the country's peaceful transition from colonial rule. Consequently, a number ex-colonial officers who chose to become citizens of the country dominated the top civil service posts immediately after independence (Picard 1987). This enabled high bureaucratic standards to be established. It was only as Batswana graduates were trained that a gradual policy of localisation was introduced.

A final factor that facilitated the close relationship between politicians and bureaucrats was the high quality of the country's political leadership, particularly the first two Presidents, Seretse Khama and Quett Masire (Harvey and Lewis 1990; Acemoglu et al. 2001a).

In reviewing the literature on developmental states, seven key characteristics of the relationship between political and bureaucratic leaders are identified as demonstrating and contributing to the closeness of this relationship, in which bureaucrats have significant autonomy and influence in the policy-making process.

- **Core developmental elite.** Developmental states are noted for the presence of a core developmental elite, centred on a small group of senior politicians and bureaucrats close to the head of the executive (Leftwich 1995). This core elite is noted for its intimate working relationship, which established the principles of the regime.

- **Influence of bureaucrats in policy design.** A defining characteristic of policy-making in developmental states is the significant influence that senior bureaucrats – part of the developmental elite – have on policy design, particularly in comparison to western democracies (Johnson 1981, 1982; Charlton 1991; Leftwich 1995). This influence is particularly important and prominent for key economic ministries and agencies, such as the Ministry of Trade and Industry (MITI) in Japan (Johnson 1982; Evans 1992).

- **Shared values and vision.** The close relationship between political leaders and senior bureaucrats is fostered by a set of shared values and objectives (Charlton 1991; Leftwich 1995). This notion of an *esprit de corps* among politicians and bureaucrats is identified in virtually all accounts of developmental states. This shared developmental vision is seen as key to the success of these countries. A consequence of these shared values and goals is that bureaucrats are far more politicised in developmental states than the politically neutral Weberian ideal. As Saxena (2011: 38) describes in the case of Singapore, the People's Action Party (PAP) government 'did not appreciate political neutrality; instead it expected the civil service to be aligned to its vision.'

- **Class and educational background**. Part of the explanation for the shared set of values and vision among politicians and bureaucrats in developmental states is that they often had similar class and/or higher education backgrounds. In the case of Botswana, significant attention has been given to senior politicians and bureaucrats coming from the same cattle-owning class (see Charlton 1991; Acemoglu *et al*. 2001a). Furthermore, in a number of different developmental contexts, political leaders and senior bureaucrats had formed close ties at elite universities before entering public service (see Evans 1989; Johnson 1992; Jones *et al*. 2014).

- **Coherent and meritocratic bureaucracies**. Bureaucracies in developmental states have tended to exhibit Weberian characteristics of being coherent and meritocratic (Evans 1992). These bureaucracies typically attracted the best graduates in the country who, upon entering public administration, were able to follow long-term career paths, and worked according to the objectives, rules and norms established within the bureaucracy.

- **Movement between political and bureaucratic positions**, A feature of a wide range of developmental contexts that demonstrates the closeness of the relationship between politicians and bureaucrats is the movement of high-level bureaucrats into political office, and vice-versa. This can be seen in the high number of important Cabinet Ministers that are former senior civil servants in many developmental governments (Leftwich 1995; Charlton 1991).

- **Bureaucracy subsumed within dominant party.** The majority of developmental states have been non-democratic, although there are examples of democratic developmental states. Differences between democratic and non-democratic systems in developmental contexts, however, are smaller, because both have typically featured a dominant political party. A key difference between non-democratic developmental states and predatory states is that the former have avoided the 'one-man "sultanism"' typically displayed in the latter (Leftwich 1995: 407). Instead these authoritarian states tend to be governed by a powerful political party.[7] This single party dominance can also be seen in democratic developmental states such as Botswana, where the BDP has been in power since the country's independence. Consequently, bureaucracies in developmental states tend to be subsumed within the dominant party system, which again highlights the politicised nature of bureaucracies in developmental states.

In considering the close relationship between politicians and senior bureaucrats in developmental states and, in particular, the influence of bureaucrats, it is important to note that the power of bureaucrats did not go unchallenged and nor was the nature of this relationship wholly fixed over time. For example, in the case of Botswana described in Box 1, Charlton (1991) cites a number of high level BDP party officials who saw the influence of bureaucrats as a big problem in the country. Furthermore, he notes that bureaucrats were often overruled when it came to policies that touched politically sensitive issues which could impact the BDP's electoral success, such as providing universal access to education. This highlights another important point about bureaucratic influence in developmental states: it is a result of political leaders willingly conceding power to bureaucrats on the basis of their knowledge about policy issues.

It is worth briefly noting that while developmental states are seen largely in a positive light within much of the existing literature, some studies have highlighted negative aspects of the developmental state (see Moon and Prasad 1994; Underhill and Zhang 2005; Fine *et al.* 2013). This includes highlighting rights violations and the suppression of political opposition, which has included members of the bureaucracy, opposition parties, and student and labour organisations in a number of developmental states (Leftwich 1995). It also includes a lack of public influence and voice in the policy process (see Underhill and Zhang 2005). Furthermore, some have highlighted high levels of corruption in part because of the close relationship between politicians and bureaucrats (see Evans 1989; Kang 2002). Indeed, as this paper discusses in section 2.3, developmental states have at times resembled predatory states. Finally, it is also worth noting that some have questioned the explanatory power of the developmental model by arguing that it overlooks substantial differences in the politics-bureaucracy interface between different developmental states, and fails to take into account the role of broader factors in the success of these states (see Moon and Prasad 1994).

2.2 Predatory states

While in developmental states, the close relationship between politicians and bureaucrats is seen to contribute to the development success of these countries, a significant body of literature focuses on how this close relationship is used to develop patronage networks in 'predatory' states (see Krueger 1974; Levine 1980; Cohen *et al.* 1985; Rowley *et al.* 1988; Evans 1992; van de Walle 2001; Acemoglu *et al.* 2001b; Lockwood 2006; Robinson 2007).[8] Much of this research has focused on Sub-Saharan Africa, where 'overgrown' bureaucracies incorporated into rent-seeking governments and the pervasive corruption that followed are widely seen as a central cause of post-independence economic stagnation across the continent (Bates 1994; Wunsch and Olowu 1990; Abernethy 1988).

Predatory or neopatrimonial[9] states are systems in which the state apparatus are directed towards extracting personal fortunes for the ruling elite (Evans 1989; Turner and Hulme 1997). As with developmental states, much of the literature on predatory states focuses on state-market relations, particularly on personal ties between politicians and business people (see Kelsall 2012). The relationship between politicians and bureaucrats, however, is again seen as being particularly important (Evans 1989; Tangri 1999; Smith 2009; Randall and Theobald 1998; Brett 2009). There are four defining features of the politics-bureaucracy relationship in predatory states that are emphasised in the literature:

- Within these systems, 'control of the state apparatus is vested in a small group of personalistically interconnected individuals' (Evans 1989: 570), often with an even smaller clique around the President, where power lies.
- Those in key political and administrative positions have access to the major means of acquiring personal wealth in the country.
- The government bureaucracy is used principally for clientelistic or rent-seeking purposes.
- Employment in the bureaucracy is based on political loyalty and clientelism, which means many of the bureaucrats hired are largely ineffective and unproductive.

As in developmental states, in predatory states there are very close ties between politicians and bureaucrats. Unlike developmental states, however, in predatory systems the bureaucracy has virtually no autonomy in the policy process. Evans (1992: 151) discusses archetypal predatory states, and notes that in contexts such as Zaire under Mobutu Sese Seko's rule, 'it is not the bureaucracy that impedes development so much as the *absence* of a coherent bureaucratic apparatus.' Instead, the basis for policy-making in such contexts is to create rents to be allocated among the political elite and its supporters, which includes civil servants. Rent-seeking can be found from the very top level of political office to the lowest levels of public administration (Booth and Golooba-Mutebi 2012).

It is important to note that with the wave of democratisation that occurred across Africa in the 1990s, there are now far fewer examples of the extreme levels of rent-seeking that match Evans' (1992) description of a predatory state, as Zaire did. However, in many recently democratic African states, this neopatrimonial system is still pervasive, as researchers associated with the *Africa Power and Politics Programme* (APPP) have discussed (see Booth 2011; Booth and Golooba-Mutebi 2012; Kelsall 2012).

---

7   Autocratic developmental states can be seen as examples of what Besley and Kudamatsu (2008) refer to as 'selectorates' – autocratic regimes where leaders are accountable to a small group of insiders.

8   Brett (2009) points out that the emphasis on a clear separation of roles and responsibilities between politicians and bureaucrats in the public policy literature was largely due to the concern that a closer relationship would lead to patronage.

9   However, see section 2.3 for discussion of findings from the Africa Power and Politics Programme on 'developmental patrimonialism'.

2.3 Differences between developmental and predatory states

Developmental and predatory states are often placed at opposite ends of the development spectrum in the extant literature. The former are viewed positively as states that have brought about extraordinary levels of development within relatively short periods of time. Predatory states, on the other hand, are widely considered to be the worst-case situations. The political system is seen as the underlying cause of the failure of development in these countries. There are, however, important similarities between developmental and neo-patrimonial states, particularly in the close relationship between politicians and bureaucrats, as has been discussed above. This similarity has meant that in certain periods, developmental regimes 'have appeared more predatory than developmental', particularly as these states are not immune to corruption in the face of rapid wealth generation (Evans 1989: 572; see also Leftwich 1995; Good 1994; Kang 2002). In some cases, countries have moved between developmental and neo-patrimonial, as Cammack and Kelsall (2011) describe in Malawi.

The similarities between developmental and predatory states has been a key area of focus for researchers associated with the *Africa Power and Politics Programme*, who have highlighted cases of 'developmental patrimonialism', such as that in Rwanda since 1994 (see Booth and Golooba-Mutebi 2012). Countries exhibit developmental patrimonialism 'when the ruling elite acquires an interest in, and a capability for, managing economic rents in a centralized way with a view to enhancing their own and others' incomes in the long run rather than maximizing them in the short run' (Booth and Golooba-Mutebi 2012: 381; see also Khan 2005).

Given the similarities between developmental and predatory states, based on the close relationship between politicians and bureaucrats, it is important to note the key differences between the two. This is the subject of Peter Evans' (1989, 1992) work and, more recently, of APPP research. The key differences are:

- Recruitment and promotion in developmental bureaucracies are based on meritocratic principles, unlike in predatory states where they largely depend on personal ties.
- Developmental states tend to have bureaucracies with more 'internal coherence', whereby officials working in these bureaucracies adhere to established aims, rules and norms, and their career progression is based on performance against these standards (Evans 1989; Kelsall 2012).
- In developmental states politicians and bureaucrats have shared values and goals based on promoting longer-term economic success – or at least in generating long-term rents that benefit others in society as well as themselves. In more predatory states the focus of politicians and bureaucrats tends to be on extracting short-term rents to accumulate personal wealth.

2.4 Distant and differentiated roles

So far, this section has considered contexts where there is a particularly close relationship between politicians and bureaucrats. Yet a relatively small number of countries fall into the 'developmental' or 'predatory' categories. In the much larger number of developing nations fall that outside these categories there is significant variation in the relationship between political leaders and senior bureaucrats. However, an important way in which these other countries differ from developmental and predatory states is the nature of their formal political institutions. whereby politicians and bureaucrats tend to have a more distant relationship and more clearly differentiated roles.

The degree of distance in the relationship between politicians and bureaucrats in these countries varies substantially. Furthermore, there are significant differences within these states too, and the relationship between politicians and bureaucrats may be much closer for specific ministries or individual politicians. However, formally at least, there is a clearer overall distinction between politicians and bureaucrats in these countries than in the developmental and predatory cases considered previously.

Perhaps the most important upshot of this is that, in this larger group of countries, the likelihood of conflicting interests and opposition between politicians and bureaucrats is much greater than in developmental or predatory states. This section outlines some broader features of states that have more distant and delineated political-bureaucratic relations, and also some of the differences between them. These features have a significant impact in shaping the politics-bureaucracy interface in these countries.

Colonial legacy

An important feature of many of these countries is that their political institutions are often closely related to their former colonial systems, particularly in the structure and responsibilities of the bureaucracy. The colonial powers frequently developed bureaucracies at the expense of other political institutions, and as a result post-independence bureaucracies often enjoyed higher levels of power than other political institutions (Smith 2009; Turner and Hulme 1997; Wallis 1989; Riggs 1963; Alavi 1972). Under colonial rule, the bureaucracy had the important role of ensuring law and order prevailed, and that the status quo was not altered. Arguably the clearest example of this is the case of India, where the bureaucracy is generally viewed as having retained its colonial emphasis on the rule of law and on adhering to established procedure (Dwivedi 1999).

The colonial focus on maintaining the status quo, particularly in former British colonies such as India, meant that bureaucracies were seen as unable to address the huge development requirements of these countries. Development requires change. A number of studies highlight the conflicting interests and attitudes of political leaders who seek political and economic transformation of the state, and bureaucrats largely concerned with following procedure and maintaining the status quo in society (Dwivedi 1999; Wood 1977; Smith 2009; Brett 2009).

Transforming this colonial bureaucracy into a more development-centred public administration was a key focus area of the *development administration* literature that emerged in the 1960s.[10]

---

10   Dwivedi (1999) provides an overview of the development administration literature.

Democracy and political change

States that fall into this broad category of having more distant and differentiated roles between politicians and bureaucrats tend, in general, to have formally democratically elected governments. This is less often the case in developmental and predatory states. There are a number of important consequences for the politics-bureaucracy interface of political leaders in these countries being democratically elected.

It means that political leaders who wish to remain in power are more likely to be concerned by the political costs of their policies, something that bureaucrats generally have to worry less about (see Charlton 1991). Consequently, politicians are often less likely to follow bureaucratic advice if there are perceived political costs associated with certain policies.

A related point is that while politicians in these countries tend to come and go, bureaucrats often remain in post (Grindle and Thomas 1991; Grindle 2004; Smith 2009).[11] As a number of studies point out, this means that bureaucrats may be more resistant to implementing changes promoted by politicians, on the basis that the same political leaders may not be in power after the next election (see Smith 2009).

More frequent political change makes it much more difficult to create the shared values and objectives among politicians and bureaucrats that are a hallmark of political-administrative relations in developmental states - because different political leaders have different objectives. In countries where a dominant party has been in power for a number of years, new political leaders may not trust a bureaucracy associated with the previous regime (see Everest-Phillips 2013). Finally, the politician-bureaucrat relationship in a democracy is more likely to be influenced by additional actors in society such as other elites, unions, and civil society organisations, as discussed below.

Political interference

In this broad group of developing nations relations between politicians and bureaucrats are more distant, but political involvement in the bureaucracy is extensive. This tends to be viewed in a negative light, since their bureaucrats tend to have far less autonomy from politicians than the Weberian model suggests is ideal, or than in the developmental model.

The most common way in which politicians are seen to adversely interfere in the work of the bureaucracy is by influencing the recruitment and career progression of bureaucrats (see Evans 1992). In some cases, such as Mexico, until relatively recently there was no formal exam to enter the bureaucracy. This meant that recruitment of bureaucrats was often done on the basis of personal connection to politicians or political loyalty (Grindle 1977).[12] In India, there is a formal examination to enter the civil service and constitutional protection for bureaucrats from dismissal, and political interference is largely manifested by the influence of political leaders over promotions and transfers (see Dwivedi *et al*. 1989; Iyer and Mani 2012). So while there is a greater distinction between the roles of bureaucrats and politicians in these countries, bureaucrats are, in general, not granted the autonomy or the influence in the policy-making process that has been highlighted in the case of developmental states.

Other actors

Another important factor that shapes the politics-bureaucracy interface in this third category of countries is the role played by other important actors – for instance, elite classes, trade unions, civil society, academics, and donors. These actors can have both positive and negative influences on policy reform. An important difference between Latin and Central American states and the East Asian developmental states is highlighted by numerous studies; in the former, the powerful rural elite classes had a significant impact on government and state policy, while in East Asia the developmental elite had relative autonomy in policymaking (Evans 1987; Leftwich 1995; O'Donnell 1973; Hamilton 1981). These elite classes in Latin and Central American states have frequently acted to prevent progressive reforms (see de Ferranti *et al*. 2003).

Other actors in these societies also significantly impact government policy. Non-developmental states face pressure from other classes, mass media, labour organisations, civil society organisations, academics and research institutes, and donors. However, as Leftwich (1995) points out, developmental states have managed to avoid pressures from these groups for a number of reasons: because such groups were relatively weak; or because developmental regimes had been able to weaken them or gain their support through careful political manoeuvring; or as a result of these governments ruthlessly suppressing these other actors (for examples, see Robison 1987; Sundhaussen 1989; Van Dijk 1990; Amsden 1989).

It is worth noting, however, that an important criticism of the literature on developmental states is the manner in which developmental approaches overemphasise the independence of the state or political and bureaucratic leaders from societal forces. This is seen as an inaccurate reflection of the East Asian developmental states (Underhill and Zhang 2005).

In addition, recent studies have highlighted the importance of actors outside political and bureaucratic offices in bringing about institutional and policy reform. Indeed, drawing on evidence from a range of reform processes, Andrews (2013) emphasises the importance of there being 'multiple leaders' involved in successful reform processes, which includes those from outside political and bureaucratic office, such as members of local NGOs and other civil society groups. Furthermore, Andrews (2013) highlights the importance of engaging with a broad set of actors to reflect on problems and develop an iterative approach to reforms. This suggests that a key area of further research would be to consider in more depth the opportunities and constraints that other actors in society place on politicians and bureaucrats in the reform process.

---

11   It is important to note that this is not always the case, particularly when considering the leadership level, where senior bureaucrats have been appointed by political leaders, we may also see a change in the bureaucratic leadership occurring with political change (see Lewis 2008).

12   Since the 1990s, Mexico has been implementing various civil service reforms. Currently, some ministries hire civil servants using an examination, however, other ministries recruit directly often without examinations (see Grindle 2010; Parrado and Salvador 2011; OECD 2012).

2.5 Summary

This section has analysed the literature that broadly considers the types of relationships between political and bureaucratic leaders. Broadly speaking there are three: states which have close relations between political leaders and senior bureaucrats and where the latter are given significant autonomy (developmental states); those with close ties between the two, and where bureaucrats have no autonomy from political leaders (predatory/neo-patrimonial states); and those with much more distant ties, in which the level of bureaucratic autonomy and influence vary significantly on a case-by-case basis. Figure 1, below, presents a broad typology of states based on the relationships between politicians and bureaucrats.

The two dimensions considered in this section are used to classify states. The first dimension is the degree of separation in the roles of politicians and bureaucrats in a country. In other words, the first dimension is the level of distance and differentiation between politicians and bureaucrats. The second dimension is the level of autonomy that bureaucrats have. As this section has discussed, developmental states and neopatrimonial states have a low level of formal separation in the roles of politicians and bureaucrats, and so they are located in the lower two cells in Figure 1.[13]

Figure 1. A typology of political-bureaucratic relations across states

		Autonomy of bureaucrats	
		Low	*High*
Separation of roles between politicians and bureaucrats	*High*	other developing nations e.g. India	developed nations
	Low	predatory/neopatrimonial states e.g. Zaire	developmental states e.g. Singapore

In most other developing nations, there tends to be a much greater formal separation of roles between politicians and bureaucrats, as tends to be the case in developed nations. This means that 'other developing nations' and 'developed nations' are located in the upper two cells. An important difference between politicians and bureaucrats in developmental states and neopatrimonial systems is that in the former, bureaucrats have a much greater degree of autonomy than in the latter. In most other (non-developmental) developing nations a key issue that emerges from the literature is the relative lack of autonomy that bureaucrats have.[14]

The autonomy of bureaucrats has been highlighted as a key feature of how institutionalised a country is (Huntington 2006). This is therefore an important distinction between political systems in developed countries and those in most developing nations, as Figure 1 indicates, which has meant that the autonomy of bureaucrats has been proposed as a principal measure of the quality of governance (see Fukuyama 2013). However, it is worth pointing out, as Fukuyama (2013: 357) explains, that an emphasis on bureaucratic autonomy 'does not mean that bureaucrats should be isolated from their societies or make decisions at odds with citizen demands'. So, while significant bureaucratic autonomy is seen as positive; complete bureaucratic autonomy is seen as highly negative.[15] It should be noted that the typology presented is based on very broad categorisations.[16] The distinction between the types of relations between politicians and bureaucrats tends to be more blurred, often varying across specific ministries.

Having established a broad typology of political-bureaucratic relations across states, this review considers the factors that impact this relationship. The next section considers, in greater depth, how resources and recruitment affect the politics-bureaucracy interface and its impact on policy. Linked to the issue of recruitment, it also considers the issue of representation in the bureaucracy and political office, focusing on women's representation. Section 4 then examines how values, incentives, and interests shape the politics-bureaucracy interface and development outcomes. These different factors help determine where individual states appear on the continuum of political-bureaucratic relations, and the impact of the politics-bureaucracy interface on reform.

---

13   This typology is loosely based on Svara's (2006: 956) 'possible model of political-administrative relations'.

14   The difference in levels of bureaucratic autonomy may, in part, also be a function of developmental states generally being less democratic than many of these other developing nations. Brett (2009: 125) argues that 'the relationship between democratic accountability and bureaucratic autonomy is an inherently contradictory one.'

15   Fukuyama (2013), drawing on Peter Evans' work, argues that the relationship between bureaucratic autonomy and 'quality of government' looks like an inverted U, whereby bureaucratic subordination and complete bureaucratic autonomy produce a low quality of government, while greater autonomy (but not complete autonomy) of the bureaucracy produces a high quality of government.

16   For example, Svara (2006) makes distinctions between developed countries based on the dimensions presented here. However, most developed nations fit into what he considers to be a more 'normal' range of relations between politicians and bureaucrats, and hence in comparison to developing countries can be seen to have a higher level of separation in the roles of politicians and bureaucrats, where bureaucrats have significant autonomy from politicians. Hence, developed nations are placed in the upper right cell in Figure 1.

3.0

Resources, recruitment and representation

The previous section identified the types of relationship between politicians and bureaucrats, and some of the factors that influence this relationship. This section considers in more detail structural factors that shape both the politics-bureaucracy interface and its effects on policy reforms. The section begins with a discussion of the main resources that politicians and bureaucrats are able to draw on in influencing their relationship with each other, and the policy process. These are divided into three broad areas: institutional resources, technical and informational resources, and financial resources. The second part of the section considers the issue of recruitment and career progression, which has widely been seen as highly influential in shaping the politics-bureaucracy relationship. Finally, the section deals with the issue of representation in the politics-bureaucracy interface, focusing specifically on women's leadership and its impact on promoting gender equality in developing nations.

3.1 Resources

The interaction between politicians and bureaucrats in the political process is strongly influenced by the resources that each can draw on. Resources, here, refers to the sources of power that are available to politicians and bureaucrats in influencing policy. These are broadly divided into three areas. The first is institutional resources, which refers to the powers that politicians and bureaucrats have been provided with by a country's political system. This includes both formal and more informal institutional resources. The second is technical and informational resources - the specific knowledge that politicians and bureaucrats have about political processes that provides them with influence. The third is financial resources, namely the control over material resources within government. While these three broad categories of resources provide politicians and bureaucrats with their principal sources of power, depending on the local context other sources may be available that influence the politics-bureaucracy interface.

Institutional resources

The existing literature suggests that a country's political institutions have a significant impact on shaping the interaction between politicians and bureaucrats. Political institutions are effectively the 'rules of the game'. They allocate position and power resources to political and bureaucratic leaders, provide the framework for political interaction, and determine the representation of interests in the decision-making process (Grindle 1996, 2004; Goetz 2007).

Broadly speaking, political institutions across the world establish a hierarchy between political leaders and bureaucrats, with the political leaders holding decision-making power. They have the power to appoint and remove bureaucrats, and to ignore the advice of bureaucratic leaders. As noted in the Botswana example, even when bureaucrats have significant influence in decision-making processes, this is only because political leaders allow it. Even in this context, when politically-sensitive issues arose that political leaders felt could have repercussions in elections, they were quick to overrule bureaucrats. This hierarchy also means that political leaders have the ability to restructure existing political institutions to their advantage (Grindle 2004).

Beyond this broad hierarchy, however, differences in the nature of countries' political institutions will lead to differences in the relative influence and autonomy of bureaucrats in relation to political leaders. For example, there has been some debate in the more general political science literature on whether parliamentary systems or presidential systems provide bureaucrats with greater autonomy (see Moe 1993; Moe and Caldwell 1994; Tsebelis 1995; Eaton 2000). Eaton (2000: 370) points out that some studies find that 'in parliamentary systems legislators retain ultimate authority over the cabinet and over bureaucrats', which means these bureaucrats are provided with more autonomy than in presidential systems. Legislators in presidential systems are said by some to be more concerned with the possibility of a president using the bureaucracy in ways that go against legislators' interests (see also Cowhey and McCubbins 1995). However, it is important to note that the autonomy of bureaucrats may not be uniform across different parliamentary and presidential systems (Eaton 2000).

Different ministries or agencies are also likely to have different levels of power and autonomy according to their position within the public sector. While the structure of public sectors varies from country to country, a broad characterisation is made in the literature between 'upstream bodies' (also referred to as 'central agencies') and 'downstream delivery bodies' (see Holt and Manning 2014). The former include the core ministries and agencies that lie at the centre of government, such as the Ministry of Finance and the offices that support the head of the executive. The latter is made up of sector ministries and agencies 'that deliver, commission, or fund services

under the policy direction of government' (Holt and Manning 2014: 3). It also includes more autonomous agencies, such as regulators and/or state-owned enterprises. This distinction impacts control of resources and attitudes of bureaucrats, as is discussed below.

While politicians are provided with much of the power from countries' institutions, bureaucrats are also able to draw on institutional resources. In a large number of developing countries, constitutions offer bureaucrats protection from excessive political interference. Most commonly this is through protecting bureaucrats against dismissal by political leaders. Limited terms of office for political leaders again limit political overreach. An important consequence is that while in democratic developing nations political leaders may be in power for a short period of time, bureaucrats tend to have much longer careers (see Smith 2009).

In addition to *formal* institutions shaping the interaction between politicians and bureaucrats, in many contexts *informal* institutions also play an important role. Informal institutions refer to the 'rules of the game' structuring political life 'created, communicated, and enforced outside of officially sanctioned channels' (Helmke and Levitsky 2004: 725). These can include 'associations built on ascriptive attachments', such as kin, ethnicity or religion, which often significantly shape attitudes among politicians and bureaucrats, as discussed in Section 4 (Goetz 2007). Informal institutions can also include norms within political life. Examples include the unwritten rule that for decades allowed Mexican presidents to select successors (known as the '*dedazo*'), or the unwritten code in Japan – the '*Amakudari*' – which meant retiring state bureaucrats were awarded high-level positions in private corporations (Helmke and Levitsky 2004). Such informal institutions significantly influence the politics-bureaucracy interface.

Knowledge and informational resources

Another important source of power for both politicians and bureaucrats is the knowledge they have of various aspects of the policy process. The key resource that bureaucrats can draw on is technical or informational resources, these being knowledge and expertise about different aspects of the political and policy process. As Weber noted, expertise represents the principal source of political power for bureaucracies; this is particularly so in developing nations where they are 'often said to monopolize the knowledge and expertise relevant to government' (Smith 2009: 135). Bureaucrats typically have greater substantive expertise on a specific policy issue and/or knowledge about government procedures than do politicians.

This can spark conflict between politicians and bureaucrats, effectively between hierarchy and expertise, as noted by Weber (1968). This is seen as central to the politics-bureaucracy interface. A large body of literature has considered the information asymmetry between politicians and bureaucrats that arises from bureaucratic expertise (see Moe 2006). This expertise is, in part, reinforced by the bureaucrats' security of job tenure in contrast to politicians' fixed term of office.[17] As noted previously, a principal reason for the influence of bureaucrats in the policymaking process in developmental states was their technical expertise. Some have considered how digital technology may alter this information asymmetry by increasing public sector transparency (see West 2005).

This form of what might be considered 'more scientific knowledge' tends to be seen as the most important in the policy process. However, as Schmidt (1993) explains, there are other equally important forms of knowledge which are typically ignored in the literature. These include the ability to make informed decisions in uncertain circumstances based on practical experience; understanding who to speak to get a more holistic view of an issue; and more critical knowledge about issues that provide checks against standard procedures in specific settings (Schmidt 1993).

Political leaders also have knowledge and expertise that influences the politics-bureaucracy interface. This is often knowledge about the broader political context of specific policy issues. In other words, politicians may have a more holistic knowledge of specific policy issues than bureaucrats, which in turn will affect the politics-bureaucracy interface. For example, Chung's (1989) analysis of the influence of presidents and bureaucrats in South Korea's decision-making process depended in large part on the knowledge presidents had about a specific issue area and about the broader political context. More generally, the literature on developmental states highlights how bureaucrats' technical knowledge about economic transformation was key to shaping the politics-bureaucracy relationship in these states (see Johnson 1982; Evans 1982).

The knowledge and information resources available to politicians and bureaucrats in a specific policy context is influenced by both the level of differentiation in their roles and of bureaucrats' autonomy from politicians. Where bureaucrats have greater knowledge of a policy than politicians, they are more likely to be granted greater autonomy. The willingness of politicians to include bureaucrats in the design phase of the policy process is also dependent on relative levels of knowledge. However, there is a significant lack of empirical analysis of the role of knowledge and informational resources on the politics-bureaucracy interface in developing countries. Given this gap in the existing literature, a large question mark remains over the extent to which academic arguments about the role of knowledge in shaping the politics-bureaucracy relationship apply to developing country contexts.

Financial resources

Finally, the politics-bureaucracy interface is also impacted by financial resources - the level of control over material resources that political leaders and bureaucrats have. In general, political leaders' greater control over a country's resources ensures greater responsiveness by bureaucrats to their demands (Costello 1996). This is a point well established in the public policy literature (see Peters 2010).

---

17   While this review does not go into the internal structure of bureaucracies, it is worth noting that level of knowledge about a specific policy issue will vary across the different levels of hierarchy within a bureaucracy. Often lower level bureaucrats have greater knowledge about specific policy issues than senior bureaucrats, who typically may have a better understanding of the broader contexts. This suggests that the communication system within a bureaucracy is particularly important, so that bureaucrats at all levels can draw on all available information (see Downs 1967).

However, specific ministries - particularly the 'upstream bodies' or 'central agencies' within a bureaucracy - have significant influence over the allocation of financial resources (see Holt and Manning 2014). So ministries' access to financial resources shapes their differing levels of influence. For example, in Tanzania, the National Development Corporation and the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Development had different levels of autonomy from the country's political leaders. The former had external funding, unlike the latter which was dependent on central government for its budget (Costello 1996).

The example demonstrates that while, in general, politicians control financial resources in a country, aid may serve to redress a power imbalance in developing country contexts between politicians and bureaucrats, providing an alternative source of funding to specific ministries or agencies. There are, however, significant limitations to such external funding, particularly as there is a danger of donor-funded ministries and agencies becoming more accountable to external donors than to citizens and domestic political leaders (see Hirschmann 1999).

3.2 Recruitment, appointment and career progression

Meritocratic recruitment and career progression is one of the key features of Weber's ideal type bureaucracy. This has also been identified in the development literature as a key factor distinguishing more developmental states (meritocratic) from more neo-patrimonial ones (personalised recruitment) (see Evans 1989, 1992; Leftwich 1995; Randall and Theobald 1998). The absence of meritocratic recruitment in the bureaucracy is generally seen as producing public administrations which are inflated, inefficient, dishonest, and lacking in autonomy from political leaders (Smith 2009; Fritzen 2007; Adamolekun 2002).

A principal means of ensuring meritocratic recruitment in the bureaucracy is through a civil service entrance examination. This entrance exam enabled developmental regimes to recruit the countries' best graduates (see Evans 1992). However, in a number of states, particularly in Latin America, typically there have been no formalised civil service entrance exams (Evans 1992; Grindle 1977; Parrado and Salvador 2011). Instead most positions in the bureaucracy 'are assigned on the basis of political affiliation, social class, ethnic group, nepotism or family connections' (Meacham 1999: 282). This has also been noted in some more neo-patrimonial African states, where bureaucratic recruitment is on the basis of personal, ethnic, or political ties with leaders (see Kelsall 2012).

It is, however, important to note that simply having civil service exams does not ensure a meritocratic bureaucracy. As Evans and Raunch (2000: 53) note, 'exams and other credentials may not select for relevant skills but instead may function mainly as barriers to entry that shield incumbent officials from competition from qualified outsiders.' Furthermore, there may be some conflict between achieving more representative bureaucracy and seeking to achieve meritocracy through civil service exams, and this is discussed below.

In addition to recruitment being meritocratic, the extant literature also points to the importance of career progression in the bureaucracy being based more on performance than political loyalty. This is another key area in which political interference can impact the autonomy of the bureaucracy. In many countries both political loyalty and meritocratic performance can influence promotions. However, evidence suggests that in some countries, career progression is one area in which politicians seek to influence the bureaucracy. This is particularly relevant in the case of India. While there is an entrance exam for the civil service, and bureaucrats are protected against politicians being able to dismiss them, political leaders instead seek to influence the bureaucracy through promotions and transfers, as discussed in Box 2.

Box 2. India's travelling bureaucrats

India's civil servants are offered protection against unfair dismissal by Article 311 of the Constitution. Consequently, the main tool that Indian political leaders use to control the bureaucracy is the frequent transfer of civil servants around the country. Dan Banik (2001) refers to this as the 'transfer raj'.

Anil Bhatt's (1979: 159) 'portrait of an old-fashioned Indian bureaucrat' describes the case of an experienced Indian bureaucrat unwilling to yield to political pressure and corrupt practices:

> He was known to be a strong and independent officer who would not submit to any unreasonable pressures from politicians or superiors. And I knew that because of this he had suffered particularly at the hands of the politicians. In some cases he was transferred, described as 'dropped down', to less prestigious positions and places.

More recently, Lakshmi Iyer and Anandi Mani (2012) have developed a formal model of the relationship between politicians and bureaucrats, which they have tested empirically using a unique dataset of the career histories of 2,800 officers in the Indian Administrative Service between 1980 and 2004. They find that politicians use frequent transfers across posts of varying importance to control bureaucrats.

A significant indicator of the level of bureaucrats' autonomy and influence in the policymaking process is the extent to which they are appointed by political leaders. While in Japan prime ministers typically only appoint dozens of officials, in Brazil presidents appoint thousands (Schneider 1992; Evans 1992; Grindle 2010). However, political appointments are not necessarily made on the basis of political loyalty. A Commonwealth Secretariat study of 12 countries finds that 'the principle of non-partisanship does not always result in an apolitical process for senior appointments', and likewise, 'political involvement in senior appointments and dismissals does not necessarily make the decision politically partisan' (Everest-Phillips 2013: 10). Studies looking at the cases of successful reforms in developing countries, which are discussed in more detail in Section 6, highlight the importance of political appointments for reform success where there is resistance to change (see Grindle 2004; Melo *et al.* 2012). These appointments, however, have tended to be made on the basis of expertise, commitment to reforms, and trust based on various informal ties, not personal connections alone.

3.3 Representation and women's leadership

Within the public policy and public administration literature, a significant body of research considers the issue of *representative bureaucracy*. The main theme of this research is that bureaucracies should broadly reflect the interests, views, needs, goals and values of the general public in the policy process (Pitkin 1967; Subramaniam 1967; Selden 1997; Keiser *et al.* 2002). A particularly important aspect of the representative bureaucracy literature is the distinction between *passive* or *descriptive* representation and *active* or *substantive* representation (see Pitkin 1967; Keiser *et al.* 2002; Barnes and Burchard 2012). The former refers to the bureaucracy's demographic representativeness of the general population, and the latter refers to whether the decision-making process benefits specific groups in the population, by removing discriminatory barriers (Mosher 1982). The focus in this section is on ethnic and women's representation. However, the arguments can be applied to other group-based representation, such as caste and wealth.

The issue of representative bureaucracy has been considered in the context of ethnicity in developing countries. In a study in newly independent Zambia, Dresang (1974) found that ensuring ethnic representation in the bureaucracy had little impact on policies towards different ethnic groups.[18] This was because Zambian bureaucrats were more motivated by individual career progression than social background. However, Dresang argues that ensuring the representation of different ethnic groups in the bureaucracy was of great political importance, as it had symbolic value which was important for avoiding ethnic divisions in Zambian politics.

The political importance of ethnic representation in the bureaucracy is also demonstrated by Brown's (1999) study of how political divisions based on ethnicity in Trinidad and Guyana meant employment in the public sector was closely linked to the ethnic group in power. This was found to negatively impact public sector performance.

There has been some debate over whether representative bureaucracy on the basis of ethnicity can undermine the development of a meritocratic and autonomous bureaucracy. However, studies have found that ethnic representation in the bureaucracy has been an important part of state-building in newly independent nations (see Enloe 1978). Indeed, the development success of countries such as Botswana and Mauritius is seen in part as being due to developing a 'politically independent state bureaucracy with personnel policies based largely on merit, but with a composition that is reasonably representative of their societies' (Carroll and Carroll 1997: 470).

The issue of representation is particularly pertinent for considering women in political and bureaucratic leadership positions and their impact on policy reform, particularly on reforms that promote gender equality. There is no research that directly considers the role of women in the politics-bureaucracy interface in development, and what the effects are on policy outcomes. There is, however, a growing literature that considers how greater descriptive (demographic) representation of women in positions of political leadership affects policy (see Goetz 1998; Tamale 2000; Devlin and Elgie 2008; Yoon 2011). There are also some studies on women in bureaucracies in developing countries (see Goetz 1992; Staudt 1997; Kabir 2013). However, this is a much smaller body of research in comparison to that on women in political leadership. This is a significant issue, given 'public administration is in itself a gendered and gendering process, such that its outcomes, internal organisation, and culture reflect and promote the interests of men' (Goetz 1992: 6). As gender relations both shape and are influenced by bureaucratic processes and outcomes, the lack of analysis on this issue makes it an important area for future research.

Much of the recent focus on women in government decision-making positions in developing countries has focused on Sub-Saharan Africa, because it is the region that has witnessed the largest and quickest rate of change in women's political representation (Tripp *et al.* 2009; Barnes and Burchard 2013). These changes have largely been the result of institutional changes, such as quotas for the number of women in political office. Box 3 discusses the representation of women in politics in the case of Rwanda.

Box 3. Women's representation in Rwandan politics

In October 2003, women won just under half of the seats in Rwanda's lower house of Parliament, which means the country is ranked first in the world in terms of the number of women elected to parliament (Powley 2005; Burnet 2008; Delvin and Elgie 2008). These gains for women in parliament are the result of specific mechanisms to ensure greater representation of women in Rwandan politics, including a constitutional guarantee, a quota system, and innovative electoral structures (see Powley 2005). The country's Ministry of Gender and Women in Development was also established to promote gender equality.

The greater representation of women in politics and the bureaucracy led in 1999 to the revoking of laws that prohibited women from inheriting land. However, as Burnet (2008) notes, the increased participation in political positions in Rwanda led, in the short term, to a general decrease in women's ability to influence policy in the country. This is because it weakened women's civil society groups, which had been very influential in pushing for greater gender equality. Many of the leaders of these organisations entered politics and were less able to bring about change from the inside than they had been from the outside.

However, in the longer term, the greater representation of women in Rwanda's political system has led to a change in public perceptions about the role of women in society. Consequently, 'increased female representation in government could prepare the path for their meaningful participation in a genuine democracy because of a transformation in political subjectivity' (Burnet 2008: 386).

---

18   The absence of a clear link between ethnic representation in the bureaucracy with bureaucratic performance and policy outcome is highlighted by Subramaniam's (1967) in his critique of the notion of representative bureaucracy.

In general, recent studies indicate that the greater representation of women in political and bureaucratic positions in Sub-Saharan Africa has had positive impacts on agenda-setting (Goetz 1998); on women's political engagement more generally in these countries (Barnes and Burchard 2013); and generally on gender relations through symbolic representation (Powley 2005). However, greater descriptive representation has had less impact on substantive policy outcomes that address gender inequalities (Goetz 1998). As Goetz (1998: 241) explains, 'there is a difference between a numerical increase in women representatives, and the representation of women's interests in government decision-making'.

This is a finding that can be seen in non-developmental contexts too. A key issue, highlighted by Keiser *et al.* (2002), is that the literature on gender representation in bureaucracies more generally has failed to systematically consider under what circumstances passive representation will lead to policy outcomes that promote active representation.

4.0

Values, incentives and interests

This section considers the literature on the values, incentives and interests of bureaucrats and politicians. These are important factors that shape the politics-bureaucracy interface and its impact on policy, and are the drivers of attitudes and behaviours. Much of the existing economics literature is based on research that draws on the economic-centred rational choice approach. It tends to focus almost exclusively on the incentives facing bureaucrats and political leaders and to ignore the role of values (see Tabellini 2008; Hudson and Leftwich 2014). However, as Hudson and Leftwich (2014) have highlighted, incentives that are provided by institutional structures cannot on their own explain how political actors behave; a range of factors linked to context and individual agency matter. The importance of the role of values has also been demonstrated in the previous sections of this paper that discuss the differences between developmental and other states. This section considers values, incentives and interests together.[19]

What fosters the creation of an *esprit de corps* among politicians and bureaucrats that focuses on promoting development within a country? What prevents the creation of such a shared set of values and objectives? The different factors that feature in the existing literature are placed into three broad categories: antecedent factors, political and developmental factors; and organisational and individual factors.

4.1 Antecedent factors

The previous discussion on developmental states highlights the importance of factors that shape the creation of an esprit de corps that occur prior to politicians and bureaucrats entering public service. An important factor for these states has been that political leaders and senior bureaucrats have tended to come from the *same class background*. This has been described in the case of Botswana, and applies to a number of other developmental states, such as Singapore, where politicians and bureaucrats tended to be 'English-educated middle class men' (Saxena 2011: 40). The importance of this shared class background is also highlighted in the case of India. In the decade after India's independence, bureaucrats and politicians came from the same elite class. However, over time, the democratic system meant that politicians often came to more closely represent poorer, rural constituents. This had significant negative consequences for levels of trust between politicians and bureaucrats (Wilcox 1965; Hirschmann 1981; Turner and Hulme 1997).

An arguably more important antecedent factor in shaping the shared values and objectives of politicians and bureaucrats in developmental states has been the formation of *informal networks*, particularly those linked to attending the *same elite universities*. In the case of Japan, Johnson (1982: 57-59) emphasises the important role of the *gakubatsu*, the ties among classmates from elite university – particularly, the alumni of Tokyo University Law School (see also Evans 1989, 1992). This was also the case with South Korea, where the majority of those who passed the civil service entrance examination were from Seoul National University, and 40% had come from two prestigious secondary schools in Seoul (Kim 1987; Evans 1992). A more recent study by Jones *et al.* (2014) demonstrates how the key reform coalitions in Ghana in the 1980s and 1990s emerged from student organisations and study groups at the University of Ghana in the 1970s and early 1980s. The elite school link is also described in discussing Digvijay Singh's implementation of pro-poor reforms in Madhya Pradesh; while playing sports at school he got to know others who would go on to be prominent politicians and senior civil servants (Melo *et al.* 2012: 72).

The literature also points to examples of informal networks that have prevented the formation of a shared development-oriented ethos among politicians and bureaucrats. Typically, these are networks based on kin, ethnicity, or region, which tend to promote the use of public office for the advantage of group members, rather than for broader national development goals. This can be seen in the case of the Solomon Islands, described by Turnbull (2002), where politicians and senior bureaucrats face intense pressure to give priority to the demands of those in their kin group (see Box 4).

---

19   It is worth noting that there is an absence of research on the motivations of senior politicians and bureaucrats in the public policy literature as well as the development literature (van der Wal 2013).

> **Box 4. Personalised ties in the Solomon Islands**
>
> While the Solomon Islands has formally adopted a Westminster-style parliamentary system, political alliances are still largely based on traditional kinship and regional ties, known as *wantokism* (see Turnbull 2002; Cox 2009). This has led to unstable politics in the country, with fluid alliances, rapid turnover of those in political office, and a reliance on shifting personal allegiances. It also affects the bureaucracy because, after elections, permanent secretaries are routinely replaced by people who have close personal ties to the new government.
>
> This has also meant that political and bureaucratic leadership in the Solomon Islands tend to be highly personalised. This has a negative impact on political stability, and Melanesian traditions of reciprocity mean that political and bureaucratic leaders are expected to reward kin members with redistribution from the spoils of political office (Cox 2009). They are also expected to accumulate material goods and wealth, which kin members assume they have access to. For example, they are expected to pay school fees, contribute to the costs of cultural events, and pay for transportation when people are sick (Turnbull 2002).
>
> Finally, a further impact of *wantokism* on leadership in the bureaucracy is that 'a public servant may not be able to direct subordinate officers effectively because of kinship relationships or because they have a higher village status than him – being older, for instance' (Turnbull 2002: 194; Coyne 1992).

4.2 Political and developmental factors

Factors linked to political processes and development success also impact the values and incentives of politicians and bureaucrats. The role of *political leadership* is important in the formation of a development-centred ethos among politicians and bureaucrats. This has been highlighted in a number of studies that consider widespread bureaucratic corruption. These studies note that if corruption is prevalent among political leaders, it is almost inevitable that the bureaucracy will be afflicted by systematic corruption (Dwivedi *et al.* 1989; Hyden *et al.* 2003; Evans 1989). As Hyden *et al.* (2003: 21) point out:

> It is clear that behaviour in the civil service is very much dependent on how the political leadership behaves. If the elected politicians are not corrupt, they tend to set an example that is emulated in the bureaucracy. If, on the other hand, they are corrupt, this tends to spread to the civil service too.

The role of political leadership in preventing corruption is highlighted by Booth and Golooba-Mutebi (2012) in the case of Rwanda. Paul Kagame's zero-tolerance stance towards corruption, even when his own supporters have been implicated, is posited as a key factor in the low levels of corruption in the country.[20] It is worth noting that bureaucrats do not seem to have the same influence with politicians; while studies have identified cases of bureaucrats who try to maintain high standards despite widespread political corruption, these people are seen as largely idiosyncratic and have no real impact on the broader political context (see Kelsall 2012; Bhatt 1979).

The importance of political leadership in fostering an esprit de corps, however, goes beyond the issue of corruption. A key theme in the literature on developmental states is that political leaders actively sought to promote values based on public service, nation-building and development. In newly independent Singapore, for example, the government encouraged bureaucrats to participate in mass civic projects at the weekend, such as cleaning the waterfront, to familiarise them with political leadership and to 'prepare them, psychologically, to get their hands dirty in the difficult work of nation building' (Saxena 2011: 39). Furthermore, the Singaporean government set up a Public Study Centre for civil servants to reorientate them towards the values of the developmental regime and away from the 'irrelevant' values inherited from the colonial bureaucracy (Saxena 2011; Seah 1971).

Political continuity is viewed as an important factor in promoting an esprit de corps among politicians and bureaucrats in developmental states (Leftwich 1995). In Singapore, the continued rule of the People's Action Party helped promote the shared values and goals of politicians and bureaucrats (Saxena 2011). Likewise in Botswana, as noted previously, the BDP party's long rule was important.

The *development success* of a country has also been highlighted as a key factor in reinforcing the shared ethos between politicians and bureaucrats. In the case of Botswana, for example, rapid economic growth following independence was a key factor in reinforcing the 'ideology of developmentalism' that permeated the political leadership and bureaucracy (Charlton 1991: 274).

In certain cases, such as in Tanzania under Julius Nyerere, tensions can develop between political leaders and the bureaucracy on the basis of *political ideology* (see Costello 1996). Some studies suggest that unlikely reforms are most likely to happen when political leaders can avoid framing reforms on the basis of the left-right political spectrum, and instead emphasise pragmatism and development. For example, Melo, Ng'Ethe and Manor (2012: 14) offer a detailed analysis of how Ugandan leader Yoweri Museveni, Madhya Pradesh Chief Minister Digvijay Singh, and Brazilian President Fernando Cardoso managed to implement poverty reduction reforms despite significant resistance, in part from bureaucrats. They describe how the three leaders positioned themselves as centrist reformers 'between left and right'. In fact, the authors argue that more generally, 'politicians who seek to pursue anti-poverty policies must proceed so carefully and incrementally that they almost always end up operating as centrists on the left/right political spectrum' (Melo *et al.* 2012: 13).

---

20   It is worth noting that in their analysis of corruption-control measures in New York, Anechiarico and Jacobs (1996) argue that the proliferation of anti-corruption measures undermines the ability of politicians and bureaucrats to govern effectively by constraining decision-makers' discretion, shaping priorities, and causing delays. This is an issue that has received little attention in a development context.

4.3 Organisational and individual factors

A number of studies in the public policy literature have emphasised that a key determinant of bureaucratic values and attitudes is the specific ministry or agency a bureaucrat works for (Meier and Nigro 1976; Mosher 1982; Dunleavy 1991; Keiser *et al.* 2002). In particular, the distinction between central agencies (or upstream bodies) and downstream delivery bodies is important here (Holt and Manning 2014). There is little research on this issue in the development literature. However, the case of differing attitudes among bureaucrats in two different Tanzanian bureaucratic organisations demonstrates how organisational factors can impact the behaviour of bureaucrats (Box 5).

Box 5. Differing attitudes in Tanzania's bureaucracy

Costello's (1996) study examines the differences between the attitudes of staff in two bureaucratic organisations in Tanzania: the National Development Corporation (NDC) and the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Development (Kilimo). The NDC's objective was to create and operate an industrial sector in the country, while Kilimo's work focused on improving agricultural productivity, which included supporting agricultural producers. The NDC's role of leading Tanzania's industrial development gave it a high level of prestige, and bureaucrats in the NDC saw themselves as superior to other bureaucrats. They were also paid more and provided with numerous other benefits.

The NDC viewed themselves as the technical vanguard trying to transform the structure of the Tanzanian economy. The focus on technical information also meant that the NDC saw its role as non-political. They viewed themselves as 'experts involved in performing objectively desirable tasks' (Costello 1996: 129). This produced a strong aversion to political intrusion into their work.

Bureaucrats within the NDC were generally more elitist, more likely to follow established procedures, and less accepting of interference from political leaders than those within Kilimo. Costello (1996: 130) argues, 'the role-definition of Kilimo as supplying support services to farmers produces a degree of responsiveness to their clientele that is absent in NDC; the belief that they must serve producers tempers their elitism.' Kilimo's greater interaction with the public also meant that its staff viewed 'political interference as part of the normal working arrangement' (Costello 1996: 131).

Finance also played an important role in the different attitudes in the two organisations. NDC was far less dependent on revenue from the central government than Kilimo, because it could both generate its own income domestically and attract foreign financing. This again promoted a greater emphasis on autonomy from political interference among NDC bureaucrats than there was among Kilimo bureaucrats.

Values and attitudes are likely to vary according to the type of individual exercising power and the individual-level incentives that politicians and bureaucrats are offered. This, again, has been widely discussed in the public policy literature (see Downs 1967; van der Wal 2013).[21] At a general level, the behaviour of political leaders in democratic societies is significantly influenced by their desire to remain in power. Bureaucrats, however, may be more influenced by a wider range of factors, such as career progression, influence, and wage levels. The issue of how wages impact bureaucratic behaviour and performance has received significant attention in the development literature, although very few of these studies consider policymaking bureaucrats or senior bureaucrats.[22]

---

21 Downs (1967) categorises bureaucrats into five types according to their main motivations: climbers, conservers, zealots, advocates, and statesmen.

22 See Carr *et al.* (2011) and Hasnain *et al.* (2012) for overviews of this research.

5.0

Policy reform

This section considers more directly how the politics-bureaucracy interface impacts policy and institutional reform. While Section 3 largely focused on structural factors that shape the politics-bureaucracy interface, this section looks more at the agency of political and bureaucratic leaders.

In doing so, it brings together much of the previous discussion in this paper. Specifically, it considers: the types of relations between politicians and bureaucrats; how politicians and bureaucrats draw on different types of resources in shaping the success or failure of a reform; how the make-up of the bureaucracy matters for reform; and how the values, incentives and interests of bureaucrats play a role in the reform process. It more broadly considers the strategies used to alter political-bureaucratic interaction, and how this affects the likelihood of a reform initiative's failure or success.

The section is divided into two parts. The first looks at how the politics-bureaucracy interface can lead to the failure of reforms. The second focuses on the limited number of studies that examine how political leaders managed to strategically push through reforms, despite resistance from bureaucrats and other influential actors in society. The most important study here is Grindle's (2004) *Despite the Odds*, in which she examines how political leaders in a number of Latin American countries managed to introduce education reforms in the face of bureaucratic and union resistance.

5.1 The failure of policy reform

The extensive efforts to introduce institutional reforms in developing countries since the 1980s are, in general, seen to have produced disappointing results (Polidano 2001; Rodrik 2006; Andrews 2013; Robinson 2007; Goetz 2007; Unsworth 2010; Evans 2008). These institutional reforms include those linked to the widely discussed Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) implemented by the IMF and the World Bank in this period (Andrews 2013). The failure of such reforms is linked more generally to the failure of SAPs. The failure of these institutional reforms has led to the emergence of a body of literature that seeks to understand why and how these reforms failed, with the interaction between politicians and bureaucrats receiving significant attention (see Cohen *et al.* 1985; Thomas and Grindle 1990; Krueger 1993; Grindle 2004; Robinson 2007; Wilder 2009; World Bank 2008; Andrews 2013).

The literature on the failure of governance reforms in developing countries, suggests the principal problems have been:

- A failure to pay adequate attention to politics in the design and implementation of reforms
- A lack of strong domestic leadership
- Inappropriate efforts to transfer governance models from one context (developed country setting) to another (developing country settings).[23]

Studies have in particular highlighted how reforms can fail, despite having strong support from political leaders, because bureaucrats are unwilling to implement reforms that clash with their interests (Grindle 2004; Andrews 2013). For example, in Bolivia civil service reform initiatives in 1993 and in 1999 had high level political support but failed largely because bureaucrats resisted change to existing norms (Montes 2003). Competing and conflicting interests between politicians and bureaucrats are a key factor in the failure of reforms.

5.2 Policy reform against the odds

This section considers how institutional and policy reforms are successfully implemented despite opposition. Specifically, it considers reforms that are supported by political leaders but face bureaucratic opposition, and the part played by the politics-bureaucracy interface in the manoeuvring of a reform past its opponents. It discusses:

- The broad approaches taken by political reformers towards the bureaucracy in promoting reforms
- The factors that contributed to the success of political leaders' reforms despite opposition from different societal actors

---

23   Reviews of the literature on the failure of governance and civil service reforms, which highlight these problems, are provided by Rao (2013) and Scott (2011).

- The strategies used by reform design teams made up of bureaucrats and politicians
- Reform implementation.

Finally, a brief summary includes a note on cases where bureaucratic support for reforms is not matched by the necessary support from political leaders.

Approaching the bureaucratic context

In the cases of bureaucracies perceived to be resistant to reforms, the literature highlights three broad approaches taken by political leaders and other pro-reform actors to the bureaucracy to enable reforms to take place.

- The first is a comprehensive transformation of the bureaucracy to remove sources of resistance
- The second can be described as an 'enclave approach', whereby a new and independent agency is established within the bureaucracy to address a specific issue or policy area
- The third approach involves no significant change in the bureaucratic context; instead leaders are able to implement reforms through political manoeuvring within the existing structures.

The first approach, the transformation of the bureaucracy, is highly unusual because it relies either on the presence of a strong autocratic political system, as in the case of China, or on a large exogenous shock, as occurred in some cases through the debt crisis of the 1980s and the consequent Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs). Box 6 describes the transformation of China's bureaucracy initiated by Deng Xiaoping in 1980, which made the country's subsequent extensive economic reforms possible.

The transformation of the Chinese bureaucracy by the country's political leadership demonstrates important points about the politics-bureaucracy interface and its impact on reform. A key issue is that a prerequisite of reforms was the commitment of political leaders.

Box 6. 'From revolutionary cadres to party technocrats' in China

The politics-bureaucracy interface played a key role in China's extensive economic reforms in the early 1980s. In order for these reforms to be implemented, Chinese leader Deng Xiaoping implemented a series of administrative reforms, which transformed the bureaucracy 'from revolutionary cadres to party technocrats' (Lee 1991; Li 1998). Revolutionary veterans, who were the biggest opponents of economic reform, held senior bureaucratic positions in the country.

The first major reform was to abolish the de facto lifetime tenure of government officials by introducing a set of retirement ages for bureaucrats as part of a mandatory retirement programme. An education requirement was also set for each bureaucratic level (Lee 1991; Lieberthal 1995).

As part of the retirement process, known as the lixiu, retired officials continued to enjoy special political privileges, such as still being able to read confidential government documents (Li 1998: 394). Some also served as special counsellors to their successors. They were also offered economic compensation and additional housing, which their children and grandchildren could continue to use after their death. Finally, for the most senior staff, informal arrangements enabled their children to enter politics at senior levels.

The two main consequences of the first reform were that the older revolutionary veterans in the bureaucracy were replaced by younger and more educated bureaucrats who were more supportive of economic reforms. Furthermore, as the average duration of a bureaucrat's tenure was reduced, there were more vacancies in the bureaucracy at any one time. This provided young and more educated bureaucrats with opportunities for upward mobility (Li 1998).

Deng Xiaoping's second key reform was extensive administrative and fiscal decentralisation, which gave provincial governments a share of taxes collected. An important consequence of this was the growth of new businesses partially owned or supported by provincial governments who benefited from increasing tax returns. From the mid-1980s, bureaucrats were allowed to leave their jobs and join the business community, a process known as xiahai. These bureaucrats benefited from higher incomes, while businesses benefited from their technical experience of government procedure. The result was a bureaucracy far more supportive of economic reform (Li 1998).

The Chinese case demonstrates the importance of political manoeuvring in the politics-bureaucracy interface. It shows that changing incentives alone was not enough for bureaucrats to become pro-reform; a much deeper transformation of the bureaucracy was needed to shift entrenched views. Only after this transformation did incentives play a role. The benefits conceded to the revolutionary veterans also highlight the importance of reaching political settlements, even in more autocratic contexts.

A second approach taken by political leaders is the 'enclave approach' (Dia 1996), whereby new and autonomous executive agencies are set up within the bureaucracy to circumvent entrenched problems and resistance from existing ministries and agencies (see Roll 2014). This approach is strongly influenced by the *New Public Management* (NPM) paradigm, promoted by the World Bank and the IMF in the 1980s.[24] These new and autonomous agencies tend to recruit highly skilled staff who are provided with alternative incentive structures and working methods. Such an approach has been successful in the case of tax reform in Ghana, as described in Box 7, and also in the case of Indonesia's Corruption Eradication Commission (see Andrews 2013; Schutte 2012).

---

24   See Manning (2001), Batley (1999), and Polidano (1999) for overviews of the New Public Management approach in developing countries.

While there are examples of success linked to the enclave approach (see Roll 2014), studies also highlight limitations. As Robinson (2007: 524) notes, such an approach 'weakens the capacity and commitment of existing government bureaucracies'. In both the Ghanaian tax collection example (see Dia 1996), and in the case of education reform in Ecuador (see Grindle 2004: 104-110), the special status of the new agencies created substantial resentment and opposition from existing bureaucracies. In Ecuador, this eventually contributed to the failure of the reform.

The third approach political leaders take to promoting reform while dealing with a resistant bureaucracy is to work within the existing bureaucratic structure. This involves the use of strategic political manoeuvring.

Political leadership

Studies that consider how reforms were successfully implemented in unlikely circumstances all tend to highlight the central role played by political leaders. Where reforms are successful, they are generally supported by political leaders – who may be presidents, prime ministers, other ministers, or governors – with a deep commitment to the reforms (see Grindle 2004; Goetz 2007; Robinson 2007; Melo *et al.* 2012; Andrews 2013). This commitment can come from a number of sources. For example, Mexican President Carlos Salinas explained that he was committed to education reform because: he believed it would address concerns about the power of the education union; he was convinced that better education would improve the plight of the poor; and he had sympathy for the claims of teachers because his mother had been a public school teacher. His motivation 'emerged from political, economic, and personal concerns' (Grindle 2004: 63).

While the presence of a political leader committed to reform is a prerequisite for success, it is not a guarantee of success. Studies of successful reforms in the face of adversity highlight the importance of reforming leaders' strategies (see Grindle 2004; Melo *et al.* 2012). In her study of the education reforms in Latin America, Grindle (2004: 88) identifies five key leadership characteristics and strategies that shaped the likelihood of reform success:

- The ability to affect the timing of the new reforms
- Using powers of appointment to bring others committed to change into key leadership positions
- Taking action to weaken or marginalise opponents
- Setting the terms of debate for the reform
- Actively campaigning on issues.

These are observable in a number of successful reforms. The ability to affect the timing of new reform is important because it allows leaders to select the opportune moments to push ahead, thereby increasing the likelihood of success. In the case of the education reforms in Mexico, it took President Carlos Salinas three years to increase his presidential power, and to bring about change in the powerful education workers' union, the *SNTE*, and the Ministry of Education. He pushed ahead with reforms once he had achieved a constitutional majority in the midterm elections in 1991 (Grindle 2004).

Using powers of appointment to bring politicians and bureaucrats committed to change into key leadership positions has been highlighted as an important factor in a number of examples of successful reform. These proponents of reform are trusted by the political leaders and generally have high levels of technical expertise. For example, in considering Brazilian President Fernando Cardoso's implementation of social reforms, Melo *et al.* (2012: 134) emphasise the importance of Cardoso's appointment of Vilmar Faria in various senior bureaucratic positions. Faria led the design of the reforms, and was a leading professor of sociology who had worked closely with Cardoso previously.[25]

---

25 Melo *et al.* (2012: 136) also highlight another important appointment by Cardoso, explaining 'along with Faria, a key figure in the design of the strategies was the President's wife, Ruth Cardoso, who, like her husband was an academic: a former Professor of Sociology'. They argue that her social science background enabled her to make a significant contribution to the reforms.

The appointment of 'special advisers' or outsiders by political leaders is often contentious and can foster resentment among other senior bureaucrats (Everest-Phillips 2013; Shastri 1997). However, where there is entrenched resistance to change within ministries or where bureaucrats have insufficient knowledge of an issue, special advisers offer political leaders a means of drafting in key actors who have both the expertise and commitment to promote reform.

Grindle (2004: 90) uses the Latin American education reforms to illustrate the importance of leaders setting out to weaken or marginalise opponents. This was done in various ways. Powerful union opponents were removed and replaced with those more willing to negotiate; union resistance was reduced by increasing teachers' salaries; supporters of reform were systematically mobilised; reforms were introduced school by school to circumvent opposition; and opponents were played off against each other in debates by 'identifying distinct interests of those who were hostile to all or part of the reform'.

The executive leaders also set the terms of debates about education reform, particularly in the way they were framed for the public. This strategy can also be seen in the case of Madhya Pradesh's poverty-reduction reforms. Chief Minister Digvijay Singh framed these reforms in the public arena as being about 'development' and not 'poverty' because he felt focusing on the latter would antagonise the state's non-poor citizens (Melo *et al.* 2012: 87). This strategy included commissioning the first state-level *Human Development Report* in India.

The final important leadership strategy for reform success that Grindle (2004) describes is that executive leaders actively promote reforms. This, again, is observable in different cases of reform success. In discussing Rwanda's successful decentralisation reforms, Matt Andrews (2013: 167) points out that 'President Kagame engaged personally with district mayors' to bolster the reforms (see also Scher 2010). Melo et al.'s (2012) case studies of Museveni, Singh, and Cardoso also highlight how all three leaders sought to actively promote reforms. Hence, a central issue emerging from the literature on reform success is that political leaders work to promote these reforms, and to support the core 'reform team', as discussed below.

Reform team and design

The majority of studies looking at successful reforms also emphasise the importance of core groups of reformists, typically made up of influential bureaucrats and political leaders, who are responsible for the design of the reform and the strategies used to promote it (see Waterbury 1990; Grindle and Thomas 1991; Haggard 1990; Grindle 2004; Williams 2001; Shastri 1997; Melo et al. 2012). This is particularly evident in Shastri's (1997) analysis of the politics of India's economic reforms of the 1980s and early 1990s, and the key role played by 'the change team', a group of senior bureaucrats and politicians committed to economic reform.[26] These reform teams were also fundamental to successful education reform in Latin America. Grindle's (2004: 115) analysis, again, offers the clearest framework for understanding the six characteristics and strategies of reform design teams that increase the likelihood of success. It is important to:

- Create a single and like-minded design team that develops a common understanding of the problem and how to solve it
- Take care over the composition of the team and its placement within the bureaucracy
- Limit access to discussions of the reform until the design team works out their own detailed plan
- Rely on executive leaders to manage the public politics of reform
- Create networks within government
- Create networks with international funders.

The presence of a single and like-minded design team is a central feature of almost all reform successes, and yet much of the political economy literature on reforms has tended to ignore or downplay their importance (Grindle 2004; Waterbury 1990). In designing the reforms, however, it is this core group that has the ability to decide 'who wins and who loses and how much they win or lose' (Grindle 2004: 114). This is fundamental for the success or failure of a reform.

The similarity in the team members' perspectives and objectives is important. In the Indian case, the design team consisted of senior bureaucrats who had developed similar ideas about economic reform from having spent time abroad and having been exposed to new economic ideas (Shastri 1997). As Grindle (2004: 115) points out in the Latin American cases, while members of the design teams were selected on the basis of having a shared view, 'each of the teams also went through a process of problem diagnosis that helped engineer a common vision of what needed to be done.'

In addition to the make-up of the team, its placement within the bureaucracy is also important. This is best demonstrated in the case of education reforms in Bolivia. The design team was initially placed in the Ministry of Planning, which was headed by a pro-reform Minister, because the Ministry of Education strongly opposed the proposed reforms. This, however, led to greater resistance from the Ministry of Education; it was only once the team was placed within the Ministry of Education that the team was able to move forward with reforms (Grindle 2004).

Another feature of these designs teams in successful reform cases is their insulation from bureaucratic and societal pressure on reform design; this also means that the public politics of reform are left to executive leaders (Williams 2001; Shastri 1997; Grindle 2004; Robinson 2007a). This, in the case of the Indian reforms, went as far as Prime Minister Chandrashekhar publicly taking a more critical stance towards proposed economic liberalisation to appease voters, while privately encouraging the reform team to be bolder with their proposals (Shastri 1997: 43-4).

---

26   The term 'change team' was coined by John Waterbury (1990) to describe the small and cohesive group consisting of bureaucrats, technocrats and political leaders that initiates, designs and implements the reform agenda.

Grindle (2004) also emphasises that it is important for the design team to create networks across government to build support for reforms. Shastri (1997) details how the design team in India went about trying to broaden support for the reforms within various bureaucracies. In Bolivia, the inclusion of politicians from different parties, particularly indigenous parties, ensured that the team in charge of designing education reforms was able to create networks within government (Grindle 2004).

International elements influenced the ideas of individual members of the reform design teams in India, for example, but the success of reforms is also often aided by the team's creation of networks with international funders. This draws in both technical advice and, often, sufficient funds to implement the reforms. In Rwanda's decentralisation reforms, the involvement of international donors early in the process increased local knowledge about the reforms, and this encouraged acceptance of the Rwandan Government's proposals (Andrews 2013).

Implementation

This paper has focused on the interaction between political and bureaucratic leaders. This interaction is arguably most important in the design phase of policy reform. In moving from this phase to implementing and sustaining reforms, power often shifts to much lower levels of governance and public service (Grindle 2004). The importance of mid-level and 'street level' bureaucrats who deal with individual citizens has received significant attention in the public policy literature (see Lipsky 1980; Peters and Pierre 2007). A focus on lower levels of bureaucracy and their politics-bureaucracy interface is beyond the scope of this paper.

However, despite the distance between the 'high politics' of reform and the lower levels of implementation, there are a number of strategies that politicians and high-level bureaucrats involved in designing reforms can use to increase the likelihood of the reforms being implemented and sustained (Grindle 2004; Goetz 2007; Robinson 2007):

- Sequencing, timing and pace of reforms
- Degree of choice offered in implementation
- Use of individual incentives
- Technical capacity development
- Devolution to sub-national governments
- Monitoring of reforms.

The way in which the implementation of reforms is sequenced and timed can have a significant impact on reform success. The issue of timing has been discussed above. An additional issue is whether reforms should be implemented gradually or rapidly. In comparing the success and failure of the implementation of reforms in India and Uganda, Robinson (2007: 540) notes that:

> Incremental approaches work well when there is potential opposition to reform and pacts need to be negotiated to ensure successful implementation. Conversely, rapid implementation is possible where vested interests are not threatened or where a top-down process will not be challenged politically.

Another issue is the degree of choice offered in the implementation of reforms. Grindle (2004: 168) discusses how in a number of the Latin American countries considered, local government authorities and schools were given some choice over which of the reforms they would implement. In other cases, however, political leaders and senior bureaucrats seek to make reforms mandatory. For example, in seeking to ensure health reforms were implemented by local governments and bureaucrats in Brazil, President Cardoso introduced constitutional reforms so that the federal government could intervene where sub-national governments did not comply (Melo *et al.* 2012: 143-4). However, while implementing education reforms, Cardoso offered additional resources to municipalities, an incentive which encouraged them to expand education coverage in their districts (Melo *et al.* 2012: 152).

In some cases, implementation failure may not be because lower-level governments are unwilling to carry out reforms, but because they are unable to (Grindle 2004; Goetz 2007). Developing capabilities may therefore be an important in ensuring that reforms are implemented. As already noted, Rwanda's decentralisation reforms included donor-supported initiatives to develop local capacities. Related to this example, a further strategy to improve the likelihood of successful implementation is to devolve responsibility for some reforms to lower levels of government (Goetz 2007; Robinson 2007).

A final strategy to ensure reforms are implemented is to improve their 'monitorability' (Goetz 2007; Robinson 2007). This can include engaging with other actors, such as civil society organisations and the media, who may be in a better position to monitor implementation (Robinson 2007). As Goetz (2007: 413) notes, 'the more open to public scrutiny and measurement, the more likely governments will stick to reform promises'.

5.3 Summary

This section has considered the existing research on how the politics-bureaucracy interface can impact the success or failure of policy reform in developing countries. The recent literature analysing the failure of institutional reforms has highlighted how the interaction of political leaders and bureaucrats can explain reform failures. The section has also highlighted the importance of the politics-bureaucracy interface in reform success against the odds. In doing so, the studies considered emphasise the effect of the values of politicians and bureaucrats and the incentives they are offered, the different resources (institutional, technical and financial) that these actors draw on, and the political strategies used to bring about reform.

6.0

Conclusions, cross-cutting issues, and research gaps

This paper has considered the existing literature on the politics-bureaucracy interface in developing countries, and its impact on policy reform. This concluding section highlights some of the key cross-cutting issues that have emerged from this literature, and considers the directions for future research on this important issue. The first part examines the similarities in the politics-bureaucracy interface between developmental states discussed early in the paper and the cases of successful reforms. The second part considers how external factors have influenced the politics-bureaucracy interface, providing insights for donors and other development organisations. Finally, the paper concludes by considering the gaps in the existing literature which future research should seek to address.

6.1 Developmentalism vs. successful reforms

In looking at the research on the politics-bureaucracy interface in developmental states and the more recent research on successful policy reform against the odds, a number of similarities emerge. In fact, one might go as far as to claim that recent studies suggest politicians and bureaucrats who initiate successful reform adopt a number of characteristics of the developmental politics-bureaucracy interface around a specific issue/policy area. Such features include:

- The close working relationship of politicians and bureaucrats within an elite group.
- The much greater influence of bureaucrats in designing policy than is usually the case.
- A set of shared values and goals within the core group of political leaders and high-level bureaucrats.
- Informal ties between political leaders and high-level bureaucrats in the core group.
- The presence of strong and committed political leadership and a willingness to weaken opposition.

A comparison between the politics-bureaucracy interface in successful developmental states and in cases of successful policy reform requires further research. That said, there is significant support for Goetz's (2007) development of a framework to analyse successful reforms based on the experiences of developmental states, to be more specifically applied to the politics-bureaucracy interface (see also Robinson 2007).

6.2 External influences and interventions

Given the importance of the politics-bureaucracy interface for the failure or success of policy reform in developing countries, a key question is how donors and other external development organisations can help promote a politics-bureaucracy interface that supports pro-development reforms. The literature on the failure of institutional reforms emphasises the way in which donors have often tried to bring about reform in developing countries through the use of conditionalities. These efforts are largely seen as having failed because of the attempt to transfer governance models from one context to another without understanding the politics of specific developing nations.

However, the research on successful reforms demonstrates that donors have influenced the politics-bureaucracy interface outside of Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs). The creation of international networks has been an important part of a number of reform strategies used by politicians and bureaucrats. A key difference between SAP-based reforms, which have often produced disappointing results, and successful reform cases is that successful reform was domestically driven by various reform 'mongers' or 'champions' (see Hirschman 1981; Wallis 1999; Grindle 2004). These actors created ties with international donors that were important for the success of the reforms. The reforms were not imposed or even initiated by outside actors. This meant that reforms had a greater chance of success because there was a strong domestic commitment to them, and because political leaders and design teams better understood how to promote them in their specific political context to increase the likelihood of success.

An important question, then, is what does this mean for donors trying to promote reform? Three clear issues emerge from the literature:

- Identifying contexts where there is political commitment to reforms
- Identifying and engaging with domestic actors already committed to the reform process
- Ensuring the funding is available according to the reform timings set out by domestic reform teams.

That donors need to be more responsive to local contexts and local actors is a message that has increasingly been emphasised in recent years, most notably by Andrews (2013). The research on how the politics-bureaucracy interface can impact the success or failure of a reform demonstrates why this focus on adapting to local contexts and actors is so important.

The emphasis on donors being more responsive to local contexts comes largely from the literature that focuses on the use of aid. However, an interesting and important issue that emerges from studies of successful reforms is how politicians and bureaucrats have been influenced by *ideas* and *policies* in other countries and how this has fostered a strong commitment to reform in their own countries. This suggests that an additional area in which external actors influence reforms is through policy transfers to domestic politicians and bureaucrats. Again, it is worth emphasising that when looking at examples of idea and policy transfers, these have been driven by domestic actors in successful examples; they have not been initiated or even promoted by external actors.

While this transfer of policy ideas has been particularly pronounced between developed and developing countries, it has occurred across a range of contexts. In the case of the Rwandan government's emphasis on women's representation in politics, Powley (2005) notes that senior members of the *Rwandan Patriotic Front* (RPF) were inspired by the efforts of Yoweri Museveni to promote gender equality in Uganda, which they observed while in exile. Shastri (1997) describes how a number of the pro-reform high-level bureaucrats in India had previously been posted in the East Asian NICs, and were inspired by the success of economic policies in those countries. Similarly, Brautigam and Diolle (2009) explain how the idea for setting up export processing zones (EPZs) in Mauritius by the country's business, political, and bureaucratic elite came from their personal connections in Taiwan and observation of the success of EPZs there.

How ideas and policy transfers have impacted reforms in developing countries is certainly an area that requires more research – currently many of the examples tend to be largely anecdotal. There is an important body of research on policy transfers from abroad in the public policy literature (see Dolowitz and Marsh 1996, 2000).[27] A key limitation of the existing research, however, is that while the process of policy transfers from abroad are frequently described, there is little in depth analysis of those processes (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000).

6.3 Research gaps and future directions

This section considers directions for future research based on the review of the existing literature undertaken in this paper. In general, there is a dearth of research that directly addresses the politics-bureaucracy interface in a development context. This can be seen by considering the journal *Public Administration and Development*. In the past ten years, only five of the 436 articles make any mention of political-administrative interaction. There are very few studies, in general, that directly consider the politics-bureaucracy interface in development. As noted previously, despite the significant number of studies that consider the politics-administration relationship in the public policy literature, few consider this relationship in a developing country context.

There are a number of issues that emerge from this review, which provide the basis for future research:

- The nature of the politics-bureaucracy relationship varies a great deal across the developing world. This paper offers a broad categorisation of the different types of relations (see Section 2). However, a more detailed analysis of how this relationship varies across countries is required. A further avenue of research would be to consider when and how countries move from one category to another. In particular, research is needed on the concept of bureaucratic autonomy - its measurement, determinants, and effects.

- This study has focused on the politics-bureaucracy interface at the leadership level. Yet recent research has highlighted the importance of considering bureaucrats at middle and lower level positions in looking at the success of development reforms (see Andrews 2013). It is therefore necessary to consider the politics-bureaucracy interface at these levels more carefully, particularly its impact on donor support. An entry point into such research would be considering the 'internal coherence' of bureaucracies that Evans (1992: 573) considers fundamental in differentiating developmental and predatory states, as has been discussed in this paper. This would involve considering the relationship between bureaucratic leaders and those in other positions within the bureaucracy, and the effect this has on development reforms.

- A number of studies highlight the importance of a core reform design team made up of political leaders and senior bureaucrats. However, more research is required on whether such design teams can be observed in different reform contexts. More research is also needed on how these groups come together, and how they coordinate their reform design work. In other words, more in-depth analysis is needed to unpack the workings of reform design teams.

- Discussions of successful reforms that highlight the role of the design team generally emphasise the commitment of political leaders and bureaucrats. An important area of future research is to examine what factors shape this commitment to reform, and why in other cases this commitment does not exist. Far more research is required on the values, motivations, and attitudes of politicians and bureaucrats, particularly in relation to one another.

---

27   A recent issue of the journal, *International Review of Administrative Sciences,* critically examines the issue of policy transfer in the context of the World Bank's approach to public sector management (see Manning and McCourt 2013).

- Much of the literature has highlighted the importance of higher education on the politics-bureaucracy interface. Higher education is important because it contributes to the expertise of political and bureaucratic leaders. However, it is especially important for the formation of informal networks between political leaders and senior bureaucrats and for shared values. A more systematic analysis of the role of higher education networks on the politics-bureaucracy interface is needed.

In addition to a general lack of research on the politics-bureaucracy interface in development, there are also important methodological gaps in the existing research. The overwhelming majority of studies in this area have tended to be single country qualitative case studies. Given the findings of this review, there are a number of alternative methodological approaches that would be fruitful for further investigating the politics-bureaucracy interface:

- **Comparative case study analyses.** There is a significant lack of comparative analyses that consider the politics-bureaucracy interface. Notable exceptions include Grindle (2004), Robinson (2007a), and Melo et al. (2012). However, the majority of studies largely draw on single cases, with little attention given to how different aspects of the relationship between politicians and bureaucrats may be relevant in other contexts. Grindle (2004) and Goetz (2007) provide theoretical frameworks for undertaking comparative analyses of the politics-bureaucracy interface and its impact on the reform process.

- **Interviews.** While many of the case studies draw on data collected through interviews with political leaders and high-level bureaucrats, there is scope for much more interview-based research, particularly to understand the values, motivations, and behaviour of political leaders and bureaucrats in relation to one another. This would lead to more direct analysis of the different aspects of the politics-bureaucracy interface in different contexts.

- **Network analysis.** This paper has also shown the importance of informal and more formal networks between political leaders and high-level bureaucrats. However, little is known about how these networks are formed, how they persist, and how they change. Furthermore, very little is known about how the structure of these networks impacts outcomes, or who the key actors are within them. Network analysis, with its focus on relations between actors and the structure of these relations, offers a clear approach for considering these questions (see Wasserman and Faust 1994; Scott 2000).

- **Participant observation and action research.** A significant issue in understanding the politics-bureaucracy interface is that much of it occurs behind closed doors. Consequently the specific dynamics are often difficult to understand from the outside. This is an area in which participant observation and action research could potentially be used effectively. Understanding how politicians and bureaucrats come together around specific policy issues and work towards specific reforms is an important area of future research. Action research would be particularly fruitful given the existing role of academics and experts in reform design teams; such participation could potentially be used to produce research on the politics-bureaucracy interface (see Brydon-Miller *et al.* 2003; Rhodes 2013; O'Keefe et al. 2014).

The importance of the politics-bureaucracy interface for development outcomes is becoming increasingly apparent. While a significant body of literature looks at how political and bureaucratic leaders relate to one another in developing countries, most studies have considered this issue implicitly rather than explicitly. The review of the existing research highlights a number of areas to consider for more direct research on the politics-bureaucracy interface in development.

References

Abernethy, D. (1988) 'Bureaucratic Growth and Economic Stagnation in Sub-Saharan Africa' in Cummins, S. (ed.) *Africa's Development Challenges and the World Bank.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Reinner.

Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S., and Robinson, J. A. (2001a) 'An African Success Story: Botswana', MIT Working Paper 01-37. Cambridge, MA: MIT.

Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S. and Robinson, J. A. (2001b) 'The Colonial Origins of Comparative Development: An Empirical Investigation', *American Economic Review,* 91 (5): 1369-1401.

Adamolekun, L. (2002) 'Africa's Evoving Career Civil Service Systems: Three Challenges – State Continuity, Efficient Service Delivery and Accountability', *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 68(3): 373-387.

Alavi, H. (1972) 'The State in Post-Colonial Societies: Pakistan and Bangladesh', *New Left Review* 74(1): 59-81.

Amsden, A. (1989) *Asia's Next Giant: South Korea and Late Industrialisation* New York: Oxford University Press.

Andrews, M. (2013) *The Limits of Institutional Reform in Development* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anechiarico, F. and Jacobs, J. B. (1996) *The Pursuit of Absolute Integrity: How Corruption Control Makes Government Ineffective* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Banik, D. (2001) 'The Transfer Raj: Indian Civil Servants on the Move', *European Journal of Development Research*, 13(1): 106-134.

Barnes, T. D. and Burchard, S. M. (2013) '"Engendering" Politics: The Impact of

Descriptive Representation on Women's Political Engagement in Sub-Saharan Africa', *Comparative Political Studies,* 46(7): 767-790.

Bates, R. H. (1994) 'The Impulse to Reform in Africa', in J. Widner (ed.), *Economic Changes and Political Liberalization in Sub-Saharan Africa* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Batley, R. (1999) 'The New Public Management in Developing Countries: Implications for Policy and Organizational Reforms', *Journal of International Development,* 11(5): 761-765.

Besley, T. and Kudamatsu, M. (2008) 'Making Autocracies Work', in E. Helpman (ed.), *Institutions and Economic Performance* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bhatt, A. (1979) 'Colonial Bureaucratic Culture and Development Administration: Portrait of an Old-Fashioned Indian Bureaucrat', *Journal of Commonwealth and Comparative Politics,* 17(2): 159-175.

Booth, D. (2011) 'Introduction: Working with the Grain? The Africa Power and Politics Programme', *IDS Bulletin*, 42(2): 1-8.

Booth, D. and Golooba-Mutebi, F. (2012) 'Developmental Patrimonialism? The Case of Rwanda', *African Affairs,* 111(444): 379-403.

Brautigam, D. and Diolle, T. (2009) 'Coalitions, Capitalists and Credibility: Overcoming the Crisis of Confidence at Independence in Mauritius', DLP Research Paper 04, Developmental Leadership Program.

Brett, E. A. (2009) *Reconstructing Development Theory* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Brown, D. R. (1999) 'Ethnic Politics and Public Sector Management in Trinidad and Guyana', *Public Administration and Development,* 19(4): 367-379.

Brydon-Millier, M., Greenwood, D. and Maguire P. (2003) 'Why Action Research', *Action Research*, 1(1): 9-28.

Burnet, J. E. (2008) 'Gender Balance and the Meanings of Women in Governance in Post-Genocide Rwanda', *African Affairs*, 107(428): 361-386.

Cammack, D. and Kelsall, T. (2011) 'Neo-Patrimonialism, Institutions and Economic Growth: The Case of Malawi 1964-2009', *IDS Bulletin*, 42(2): 88-96.

Carr, S., Leggatt-Cook, C., Clarke, M., MacLachlan, M., Papola, T. S., Pais, J., Thomas, S., McAuliffe, E., Normand, C. (2011), 'What is the Evidence on the Impact of Increasing Salaries on Improving the Performance of Public Servants, including Teachers, Nurses and Mid-Level Occupations, in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: Is it Time to Give Pay a Chance? Systematic Review'. London: EPPI Centre, Institute of Education, University of London.

Carroll, B. W. and Carroll, T. (1997) 'State and Ethnicity in Botswana and Mauritius: A Democratic Route to Development?', *Journal of Development Studies*, 33(4): 464-486.

Charlton, R. (1991) 'Bureaucrats and Politicians in Botswana's Policy-Making Process: A Re-interpretation', *Journal of Commonwealth and Comparative Politics,* 29(3): 265-282.

Chung, C-K. (1989) 'Presidential Decisionmaking and Bureaucratic Expertise in Korea', Governance: *An International Journal of Policy and Administration*, 2(2): 267-292.

Cohen, J. M., Grindle, M. S., and Walker, S. T. (1985) 'Foreign Aid and Conditions Precedent: Political and Bureaucratic Dimensions', *World Development*, 13(12): 1211-1230.

Costello, M. J. (1996) 'Administration Triumphs over Politics: The Transformation of the Tanzanian State', *African Studies Review,* 39(1): 123-148.

Cowhey, P. F. and McCubbins, M. D., eds. (1995) *Structure and Policy in Japan and the United States* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cox, J. (2009) 'Active Citizenship or Passive Clientelism? Accountability and Development in Solomon Islands', *Development in Practice*, 19(8): 964-980.

Coyne, G. (1992) 'The Impact of Culture on Small-State Administration: the Case of the Solomon Islands', in Baker, R. (ed.) *Public Administration in Small Island* States West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press pp.71-83.

de Ferranti, D., Perry, G.E., Ferreira, F.H.G., Walton, M. (2003) *Inequality in Latin America: Breaking with History?* Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Devlin, C. and Elgie, R. (2008) 'The Effect of Increased Women's Representation in Parliament: The Case of Rwanda', *Parliamentary Affairs,* 61(2): 237-254.

Dia, M. (1996) *Africa's Management in the 1990s and Beyond* (Washington, D.C.: World Bank).

Dolowitz, D. and Marsh, D. (1996) 'Who Learns What from Whom: A Review of the Policy Transfer Literature', *Political Studies*, XLIV: 343-357.

Dolowitz, D. P. and Marsh, D. (2000) 'Learning from Abroad: The Role of Policy Transfer in Contemporary Policy-Making', *Governance: An International Journal of Policy and Administration*, 13(1): 5-24.

Downs, A. (1967) *Inside Bureaucracy* Boston, MA: Little Brown.

Dresang, D. L. (1974) 'Ethnic Politics, Representative Bureaucracy and Development Administration: The Zambian Case', *American Political Science Review*, 68(4): 1605-1617.

Dunleavy, P. (1991) *Democracy, Bureaucracy and Public Choice* Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf

Dwivedi, O. P. (1999) 'Development Administration: An Overview' in K. M. Henderson and O. P. Dwivedi (eds.) *Bureaucracy and the Alternatives in World Perspectives* Basingstoke: Palgrave, pp. 3-24.

Dwivedi, O. P., Jain, R. B. and Dua, B. D. (1989) 'Imperial Legacy, Bureaucracy and Administrative Changes: India 1947-1987', *Public Administration and Development*, 9: 253-269.

Eaton, K. (2000) 'Parliamentarism versus Presidentialism in the Policy Arena', *Comparative Politics*, 32(3): 355-376.

Enloe, C. H. (1978) 'Ethnicity, Bureaucracy and State-Building in Africa and Latin America', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 1(3): 336-351.

Evans, A. (2008) 'Civil Service and Administrative Reform: Thematic Paper', Background Paper to *Public Sector Reform: What Works and Why? An IEG Evaluation of World Bank Support*, Washington, D.C: World Bank.

Evans, P. B. (1985) 'Transnational Linkages and the Economic Role of the State: An Analysis of Developing and Industrialised Nations in the Post-World War II Period', in Evans, P. B., Rueschemeyer, D. and Skocpol, T. (eds.) *Bringing the State Back In* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Evans, P. B. (1989) 'Predatory, Developmental and Other Apparatuses: A Comparative Political Economy Perspective on the Third World State', *Sociological Forum,* 4(4): 561-587.

Evans, P. B. (1992) 'The State as Problem and Solution: Embedded Autonomy and Structural Change', in Haggard, S. and Kaufman, R. R. (eds.) *The Politics of Economic Adjustment* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Evans, P. B. and Raunch, J. E. (1999) 'Bureaucracy and Growth: A Cross-National Analysis of the Effects of 'Weberian' State Structures on Economic Growth, *American Sociological Review*, 64(5): 748-765.

Everest-Phillips, M. (ed.) 'Making Development Possible: Improving the Political-Administrative Interface', Report for the Commonwealth Secretariat.

Fine, B., Saraswati, J. and Tavasci, D., eds. (2013) *Beyond the Developmental State: Industrial Policy in the Twenty-First Century* London: Pluto Press.

Fritzen, S. (2007) 'Discipline and Democratize: Patterns of Bureaucratic Accountability in Southeast Asia', *International Journal of Public Administration* 30(12-14): 1435-1457.

Fukuyama, F. (2013) 'What is Governance?', *Governance*, 26(3): 347-368.

Georgiou, I. (2014) 'Seeing the Forest for the Trees: An Atlas of the Politics-Administration Dichotomy', *Public Administration Review*, 74(2): 156-175.

Goetz, A. M. (1992) 'Gender and Administration', *IDS Bulletin*, 23 (4): 6-17.

Goetz, A. M. (1998) Women in Politics and Gender Equity in Policy: South Africa and Uganda, *Review of African Political Economy*, 25(76): 241-262.

Goetz, A. M. (2007) Manoeuvring Past Clientelism: Institutions and Incentives to Generate Constituencies in Support of Governance Reform', *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, 45(4): 403-424.

Goldsmith, A. A. (1999) 'Africa's Overgrown State Reconsidered: Bureaucracy and Economic Growth', *World Politics,* 51(4): 520-546.

Good, K. (1994) 'Corruption and Mismanagement in Botswana: A Best-Case Example?', *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 32(3): 499-521.

Grindle, M. S. (1977) *Bureaucrats, Politicians and Peasants in Mexico* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Grindle, M. S. (1996) *Challenging the State: Crisis and Innovation in Latin America and Africa Cambridge*: Cambridge University Press.

Grindle, M. S. (2004) *Despite the Odds: The Contentious Politics of Education Reform* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Grindle, M. S. (2010) 'Constructing, Deconstructing and Reconstructing Career Civil Service Systems in Latin America', Faculty Research Working Paper 10-025, Cambridge, MA: John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Grindle, M. S. and Thomas, J. W. (1991) *Public Choices and Policy Change: The Political Economy of Reform in Developing Countries* Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Haggard, S. (1990) *Pathways from the Periphery: The Politics of Growth in the Newly Industrialized Countries*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hamilton, N. (1981) 'State Autonomy and Dependent Capitalism in Latin America', *British Journal of Sociology* 32(3): 305-329.

Harris, D., Wales, J., Jones, H., Rana, T., Chitrakar, R. L., (2013) 'Human Resources for Health in Nepal – The Politics of Access in Remote Area', London: ODI.

Hasnain, Z., Manning, N. and Pierskalla, J. H. (2012) 'Performance-Related Pay in the Public Sector: A Review of Theory and Evidence, Policy Research Working Paper 6043, Washington, D. C.: World Bank.

Helmke, G. and Levitsky, S. (2004) 'Informal Institutions and Comparative Politics: a Research Agenda', *Perspectives on Politics,* 2(4): 725-740.

Hirschmann, D. (1999) 'Development Management versus Third World Bureaucracies: A Brief History of Conflicting Interests', *Development and Change,* 30(2): 287-305.

Holt, J. and Manning, N. (2014) 'Fukuyama is Right About Measuring State Quality: Now What?', *Governance*, 27(4): 717-728

Hudson, D. and Leftwich, A. (2014) 'From Political Economy to Political Analysis', DLP Research Paper 25, Birmingham: Developmental Leadership Program, University of Birmingham.

Huntington, S. P. (2006) *Political Order in Changing Societies* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Hyden, G., Court, J. and Mease, K. (2003) 'The Bureaucracy and Governance in 16 Developing Countries', World Governance Survey Discussion Paper 7, London: ODI.

Iyer, L. and Mani, A. (2012) 'Traveling Agents: Political Change and Bureaucratic Turnover in India', *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 94(3): 723-739.

Jain, R. B. (2001) 'Towards Good Governance: A Half Century of India's Administrative Development', *International Journal of Public Administration*, 24(12): 1299-1334.

Johnson, C. (1981) 'Introduction: The Taiwan Model', in Hsiung, J. S. (ed.) *Contemporary Republic of China. The Taiwan Experience, 1950-1980* New York: Praeger.

Johnson, C. (1982) *MITI and the Japanese Miracle* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Jones, A., Jones, C. and Ndaruhutse, S. (2014) 'Higher Education and Developmental Leadership: The Case of Ghana', Research Paper 26. Birmingham: Developmental Leadership Program, University of Birmingham.

Kabir, S. L. (2013) 'Key Issues in Women's Representation in Bureaucracy: Lessons from South Asia', *Public Organization Review*, 13(4): 427-442.

Kang, D. C. (2002) 'Bad Loans to Good Friends: Money Politics and the Developmental State in South Korea', *International Organization*, 56(1): 177-207.

Keiser, L. R., Wilkins, V. M., Meier, K. J. and Holland, C. A. (2002) 'Lipstick and Logarithms: Gender, Institutional Context and Representative Bureaucracy', *American Political Science Review*, 96(3): 553-564.

Kelsall, T. (2012) 'Neo-Patrimonialism, Rent-Seeking and Development: Going with the Grain?', *New Political Economy,* 17(5): 677-682.

Khan, M. H. (2005) 'Markets, States and Democracy: Patron-Client Networks and the Case for Democracy in Developing Countries', *Democratization*, 12(5): 704-724.

Kim, B. K. (1987) 'Bringing and Managing Socioeconomic Change: The State in Korea and Mexico', PhD Dissertation, Department of Government, Harvard University.

Knack, S. and Keefer, P. (1995) 'Institutions and Economic Performance: Cross-Country Tests Using Alternative Institutional Measures', *Economic and Politics,* 7(3): 207-227.

Krueger, A. O. (1974) 'The Political Economy of the Rent-Seeking Society', *American Economic Review,* 64 (3): 291-303.

Krueger, A. O. (1993) *Political Economy of Policy Reform in Developing Countries* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Lee H. Y. (1991) *From Revolutionary Cadres to Party Technocrats in Socialist China* Berkeley: University of California Press

Leftwich, A. (1995) 'Bringing Politics Back In: Towards a Model of the Developmental State', *Journal of Development Studies*, 31(3): 400-427.

Levine, V. T. (1980) 'African Patrimonial Regimes in Comparative Perspective', *Journal of Modern African Studies* 18 (4): 657-73.

Lewis, D. E. (2008) *The Politics of Presidential Appointments: Political Control and Bureaucratic Performance* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Li, D. D. (1998) 'Changing Incentives of the Chinese Bureaucracy', *American Economic Review,* 88(2): 393-397.

Lieberthal, K. (1995) *Governing China: From Revolution through Reform* New York: Norton

Lipsky, M. (1980) *Street Level Bureaucrats: The Dilemmas of Individuals in Public Service* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Lockwood, M. (2006) *The State They're In: An Agenda for International Action on Poverty in Africa,* 2nd ed. Rugby: Practical Action Publishing.

Lyne de Ver, H. (2009) 'Conceptions of Leadership'. DLP Background Paper 4, Developmental Leadership Program.

Manning, N. (2001) 'The Legacy of New Public Management in Developing Countries', *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 67(2): 297-312.

Manning, N. and McCourt, W. (2013) 'Introduction: The World Bank's Approach to Public Sector Management', *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 79(3): 391-397.

Mauro, P. (1995) 'Corruption and Economic Growth', *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* 110(3): 681-712.

Mcloughlin, C. and Harris, D. (2013) 'The Politics of Progress on Water and Sanitation in Colombo, Sri Lanka', London: ODI.

Meacham, C. E. (1999) 'Development Administration and its Alternatives in Latin America and the Caribbean: Reforms and Redirection' in K. M. Henderson and O. P. Dwivedi (eds.) *Bureaucracy and The Alternatives in World Perspectives* Basingstoke: Palgrave pp. 269-294.

Meier, K. J. and Nigro, L. G. (1976) 'Representative Bureaucracy and Policy Preferences: A Study In the Attitudes of Federal Executives', *Public Administration Review* 36: 458–69.

Melo, M. A., Ng'Ethe, N. and Manor, J. (2012) *Against the Odds: Politicians, Institutions and the Struggle Against Poverty* London: Hurst and Company.

Moe, T. M. (1993) 'Political Institutions: The Neglected Side of the Story', *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization*, 6: 213-253.

Moe, T. M. (2006) 'Political Control and the Power of the Agent', *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization* 22(1): 1-29.

Moe, T. M. and Caldwell, M. (1994) 'The Institutional Foundations of Democratic Government: A Comparison of Presidential and Parliamentary Systems', *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics,* 150: 171-195.

Montes, C. (2003) 'Results-Based Public Management in Bolivia', London: ODI.

Moon, C-I. and Prasad, R. (1994) 'Beyond the Developmental State: Networks, Politics and Institutions', *Governance*, 7(4): 360-384.

Mothusi, B. and Dipholo, B. (2008) 'Privatisation in Botswana: The Demise of a Developmental State?', *Public Administration and Development*, 28(3): 239-249.

Mosher, F. (1982) *Democracy and the Public Service* New York: Oxford University Press.

O'Donnell, G. (1973) *Modernization and Bureaucratic-Authoritarianism: Studies in South American Politics* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

OECD (2012) 'Human Resources Management Country Profiles: Mexico', available at: http://www.oecd.org/gov/pem/OECD%20HRM%20Profile%20-%20Mexico.pdf [accessed 22 November 2013].

O'Keefe, M., Sidel, J. T., Marquette, H., Roche, C., Hudson, D. and Dasandi, N. (2014) 'Using Action Research and Learning for Politically Informed Programming', DLP Research Paper29, Birmingham: Developmental Leadership Program, University of Birmingham.

Overeem, P. (2012) *The Politics-Administration Dichotomy: Towards a Constitutional Perspective* Boca Raton, FL: Taylor and Francis.

OPM (2010) 'Institutional and Political Economy Analysis of the Health Sector in Nepal', Oxford: Oxford Policy Management.

Parrado, S. and Salvador, M. (2011) 'The Institutionalization of Meritocracy in Latin American Regulatory Agencies', *International Review of Administrative Sciences,* 77(4): 687-712.

Pedley, D. and Taylor, D. (2009) 'Politics and Policy in Education in Ghana', London: DFID.

Peters, B. G. (2010) *The Politics of Bureaucracy: An Introduction to Comparative Public Administration*, 6th ed. London: Routledge.

Peters, B. G. and Pierre, J. (eds.) (2001) *Politicians, Bureaucrats and Administrative Reform* London: Routledge.

Pitkin, H. (1967) *The Concept of Representation* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Polidano, C. (1999) 'The New Public Management in Developing Countries', IDPM Public Policy and Management Working Paper No. 13, Manchester: Institute for Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester.

Powley, E. (2005) 'Rwanda: Women Hold Up Half the Parliament' in J. Ballington and A. Karram *Women in Parliament: Beyond Numbers*, Revised ed. Stockholm: International IDEA

Randall, V. and Theobald, R. (1998) *Political Change and Underdevelopment*, 2nd ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Rao, S. (2013) 'Civil Service Reform: Topic Guide', Birmingham: GSDRC, University of Birmingham.

Raunch, J. E. and Evans, P. B., (2000) 'Bureaucratic Structure and Bureaucratic Performance in Less Developed Countries', *Journal of Public Economics*, 75(1): 49-71.

Rhodes, R. A. W. (2013) 'Political Anthropology and Civil Service Reforms: Prospects and Limits', *Policy and Politics,* 41(4): 481-496.

Riggs, F. W. (1963) 'Bureaucrats and Political Development', in J. LaPalombara (ed.) *Bureaucracy and Political Development* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Robinson, M. (2007) 'The Politics of Successful Governance Reforms: Lessons of Design and Implementation', *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, 45 (4): 521-548.

Robison, R. (1987) 'After the Gold Rush: The Politics of Economic Restructuring in Indonesia in the 1980s', in R. Robison *et al.* (eds.) *South East Asia in the 1980s: The Politics of Economic Crisis* Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Rodrik, D. (2006) 'Goodbye Washington Consensus, Hello Washington Confusion?', *Journal of Economic Literature*, XLIV: 973-87.

Roll, M. (ed.) (2014) *The Politics of Public Sector Performance: Pockets of Effectiveness in Developing Countries* Abingdon: Routledge.

Rowley, C. K., Tollison, R. D. and Tullock, G., eds. (1988) *The Political Economy of Rent-Seeking* Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Sandbrook, R. (1985) *the Politics of Africa's Economic Stagnation* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Saxena, N. C. (2011) *Virtuous Cycles: The Singapore Public Service and National Development* Singapore: United Nations Development Programme.

Scher, D. (2010) The Promise of Imihigo: Decentralized Service Delivery in Rwanda, 2006-2-10, Princeton, NJ: Innovations for Successful Societies, Princeton University.

Schmidt, M. S. (1993) 'Grout: Alternative Kinds of Knowledge and Why They Are Ignored', *Public Administration Review* 53(6): 525-530.

Schneider, B. R. (1992) *Politics Within the State: Elite Bureaucrats and Industrial Policy in Authoritarian* Brazil Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Schutte, S. A. (2012) 'Against the Odds: Anti-Corruption Reform in Indonesia', *Public Administration and Development*, 32: 38-48.

Scott, J. (2000) *Social Network Analysis: A Handbook* 2nd ed. London: SAGE.

Scott, Z. (2011) 'Evaluation of Public Sector Governance Reforms 2001-2011: Literature Review', Oxford: Oxford Policy Management.

Seah, C. M. (1971) *Singapore Politics, 1945-1963: The Myth of the "Leftward Drift"* Singapore: South Seas Society.

Selden, S. C. (1997) *The Promise of Representative Bureaucracy: Diversity and Responsiveness in a Government Agency* Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe.

Shastri, V. (1997) 'The Politics of Economic Liberalization in India', *Contemporary South Asia,* 6(1): 27-56.

Smith, B. C. (2009) *Understanding Third World Politics: Theories of Political Change and Development,* 3rd ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Staudt, K., ed. (1997) *Women, International Development and Politics: The Bureaucratic Mire,* 2nd ed. Philadelphia, PE: Temple University Press.

Subramaniam, V. (1967) 'Representative Bureaucracy: A Reassessment', *American Political Science Review*, 61(4): 1010-1019.

Sundhaussen, U. (1989) 'Indonesia: Past and Present Encounters with Democracy', in L. Diamond *et al*. (eds.) *Democracy in Developing Countries*, Vol.3, Asia. Boulder, CO: Lynne Reinner.

Svara, J. H. (2006) 'Introduction: Politicians and Administrators in the Political Process – A Review of Themes and Issues in the Literature', *International Journal of Public Administration,* 29(12): 953-976.

Tabellini, G. (2008) 'The Scope of Cooperation: Values and Incentives', *The Quarterly Journal of Economics,* 123(3): 905-950.

Tamale, S. (2000) *When Hens Begin to Crow: Gender and Parliamentary Politics in Uganda* New York: Perseus.

Tangri, R. (1999) *The Politics of Patronage in Africa: Parastatals, Privatization and Private Enterprise* Oxford: James Currey.

Taylor, I. (2003) 'As Good as It Gets? Botswana's ''Democratic Development''', *Journal of Contemporary African Studies,* 21(2): 215-231.

The Asia Foundation (2012) 'Political Economy Analysis of Local Government in Nepal: With Special Reference to Education and Health', Kathmandu: The Asia Foundation.

Thomas, J. W. and Grindle, M. S. (1990) 'After the Decision: Implementing Policy Reforms in Developing Countries' *World Development* 18(8): 1163-1181

Tripp, A. M., Casimiro, I., Kwesiga, J. and Mungwa, A. (2009) *African Women's Movements* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tsebelis, G. 'Decision Making in Political Systems: Veto Players in Presidentialism,

Parliamentarism, Multicameralism and Multipartyism', *British Journal of Political Science,* 25(3): 289-325.

Turnbull, J. (2002) 'Solomon Islands: Blending Traditional Power and Modern Structures in the State', *Public Administration and Development* 22(2): 191-201.

Turner, M. and Hulme, D. (1997) *Governance, Administration and Development: Making the State Work* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Underhill, G. R. D. and Zhang, X. (2005) 'The Changing State-Market Condominium in East Asia: Rethinking the Political Underpinnings of Development', *New Political Economy,* 10(1): 1-24.

Unsworth, S. (2010) 'An Upside Down View of Governance', Brighton: Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex.

van der Wal, Z. (2013) 'Mandarins or Machiavellians? On Differences between Work Motivations of Administrative and Political Elites', *Public Administration Review*, 73(5): 749-759.

van de Walle, N. (2001) *African Economies and the Politics of Permanent Crisis, 1979-1999* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

van de Walle, S. (2006) 'The State of the World's Bureaucracies', *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice,* 8(4): 437-448.

Van Dijk, K. (1990) 'The Indonesian State: Unity in Diversity', in S. Mitra (ed.) *The Post Colonial State in Asia* London: Wheatsheaf.

Wade, R. (1990) *Governing the Market: Economic Theory and the Role of Government in East Asian Industralization* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Wallis, M. (1989) *Bureaucracy: Its Role in Third World Development* London: Macmillan.

Wasserman, S. and Faust, K. (1994) *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Waterbury, J. (1990) 'The Heart of the Matter? Public Enterprise and the Adjustment Process', in S. Haggard and R. Kaufmann (eds), *The Politics of Economic Adjustment: International Constraints,*

Distributive Politics and the State Princeton: Princeton University Press

Weber, M. (1922/1968) *Economy and Society* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

West, D. M. (2005) *Digital Government: Technology and Public Sector Performance* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Wilcox, W. (1965) 'Politicians, Bureaucrats and Development in India', *Annals of the American Academic of Political and Social Science,* 358: 114-122.

Wild, L. and Cammack, D. (2013) 'The Supply and Distribution of Essential Services in Malawi: Summary Findings', London: ODI.

Wilder, A. (2009) 'The Politics of Civil Service Reform in Pakistan', *Journal of International Affairs*, 63(10): 19-37.

Williams, M. E. (2001) *Market Reforms in Mexico: Coalitions, Institutions and the Politics of Policy Change* Lanham, ML: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Wood, G. D. (1977) 'Rural Development and the Post-Colonial State: Administration and Peasantry in the Kosi Region of North-East Bihar, India', *Development and Change,* 8(3): 307-323.

World Bank (2008) 'The Political Economy of Policy Reform: Issues and Implications for Policy Dialogue and Development Operations', Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Wunsch, J. and Olowu, D., eds., (1990) *The Failure of the Centralized State* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Yoon, M. Y. (2011) 'More Women in the Tanzanian Legislature: Do Numbers Matter?', *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 29(1): 83-98.

DLP

DEVELOPMENTAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM