

PUBLIC PERCEPTION OF BUREAUCRATIC PERFORMANCE IN UTTAR PRADESH (INDIA) AND ITS IMPACT ON SOCIAL CHANGE AND MODERNIZATION*

DHIRENDRA K. VAJPEYI

THE PROCESS OF NATION-BUILDING IN EMERGING NATIONS LIKE INDIA IS inconceivable today without massive and direct participation of government, and qualitative performance of the bureaucracy. The new conception of the state requires a new conception of a public service.¹ Researches have demonstrated how unreal and impractical it would be to think of any type of national development in which the bureaucracy, even if its role is limited, is excluded.² This is more pertinent in developing nations where the bureaucracy has to develop a potential capacity to sustain continuously changing, new types of political and social demands and organizations. In the Indian situation, as has been emphasized by the Indian planners, the success of five year plans and other nation-building projects depends on active citizen participation and interest. In Indian villages, as Dube notes, "the relations between the common village people and government officials are characterized by considerable distance, reserve and distrust."³ A long history of exploitation at the hands of outsiders has conditioned the villager to a hostile view. Bailey talking about Indian peasant attitudes and beliefs observes that:

One justifies cheating government agencies by saying that the officials concerned are cheating you. This perception is often so firm that even behavior which is interpreted as a hypocritical cover for some as yet undisclosed interest: by definition, all horses are Trojan.⁴

The Indian officials have to overcome the legacies of the freedom movement which discredited not only British rule, but also the administration

* I am thankful to Sally Conway for helping me on this manuscript. For their help in making the research for this article less burdensome for me, I would like also to acknowledge Professor Gordon Rhum and the Committee on Research and Curriculum Development of the University of Northern Iowa.

¹ Joseph La Palombara (ed.), *Bureaucracy and Political Development* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963), pp. 4-5.

² Morestein E. Marx, "The Higher Civil Service as an Action Group in Western Political Development," in La Palombara (ed), *ibid*, pp. 62-95.

³ V. T. Krishmanachari, *Towards a Welfare State* (New Delhi: Government of India, 1956), p. 105.

⁴ S. C. Dube, *India's Changing Villages: Human Factor in Community Development* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1958), p. 82.

and the steel-frame bureaucracy, and hence intensified the personal and social distance between citizens and official representatives of government.

The citizen's image of the government is shaped by the treatment he is accorded by the bureaucracy. Researches have indicated citizen involvement as a precondition for an effective process in the modern policy. Administrative contacts help move the public toward greater knowledge of the system, greater optimism about the public's role in the system, greater attitudinal support and greater cooperation with the goals of the system.⁵

The testable hypothesis in this paper is that greater citizen satisfaction tends to create greater support to governmental programs of transforming and modernizing the society. The fewer contacts with the government, the less chance there is that citizen's law abidance is put to the test. The research reported in this paper is based on the data collected in a north Indian state, Uttar Pradesh. The survey was conducted in June, 1972.

Sampling

Districts were used as primary sampling units as they, firstly, are the largest administrative units and have identical administrative structure. Secondly, they allowed us to take into account the geographical spread of a state. Thirdly, they provided a convenient unit for stratifying the state into socio-economically developed and underdeveloped regions. Lastly, they helped us to cluster the interviews. For the purpose of this study, I selected three districts on the basis of their socio-economic development — one most developed, second medium developed, and the third least developed.⁶

Within districts the community development blocks were used as sampling units because they automatically cluster the villages. As I was also interested in exposure to urbanization and the modern sectors of the community, these blocks were ranked with reference to the distance between block and district headquarters. In case of alternative routes the shortest route was taken into consideration. Then, using a median split the blocks were stratified into proximal and distal blocks. Then from each stratum one block was selected — making two blocks from each district. The quota of interviews for each district was distributed between the two blocks with reference to the latter's population size.

In selecting the villages within each block no standard procedure was adopted. Firstly, because any procedure that favored the selection of

⁵ F. G. Bailey, "The Peasant View of Bad Life," *Journal of British Association for the Advancement of Science*, Vol. 23 (1966), pp. 399-409.

⁶ Samual J. Eldersveld, V. Iagnadham, and A. P. Barnabas, *The Citizen and the Administrator in a Developing Democracy* (Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1968), p. 13.

the larger villages would have deprived the study of the opportunity of studying small size communities on a regular basis from district to district. Secondly, the presence in the sample of villages of different sizes (varying in size from below 200 to above 10,000) would assure the availability of adequate data on larger villages which in terms of size verged on smaller towns. The villages were, therefore, ranked in terms of their size and once again the median split was used to stratify them into large and small villages. Selecting then one village from each of the strata, the block-quota of interviews was distributed between the two villages proportionate to their size.

For the urban sample the towns were classified in three categories:

1. those which would include industrial centers
2. those which were in intermediate or transitory stages of industrialization, and
3. those which overlapped the villages in terms of their traditional structure and low level of industrialization.

Thus, three towns, one from each category, were selected for the study. Total number of urban interviews were distributed with reference to the proportion of state population in all towns of that size within the state.

At each sampling point, respondents were selected from the available voters' list. In the absence of an actual voters' list a master list was made of lists of adult residents that were available with the village or town administration. The names of actual respondents were picked with the help of a random number total. Thus the following sampling framework emerged:

1. 3 districts
2. 2 blocks from each district (total blocks, 6)
3. 2 villages from each block (total villages, 12)
4. 3 towns

Total respondents = 456

The distribution of interviews in these selected three districts was as follows:

<i>District</i>	<i>Rural Interviews</i>	<i>Towns</i>	<i>Urban Interviews</i>	<i>Total</i>
Varanasi	92	Varanasi	56	148
Badaun	91	Lucknow	36	127
Gorakhpur	101	Ghaziabad	80	181
TOTAL	284		172	456

The original questionnaire which was in English was translated by me into Hindi, the language spoken in the state.

The central variables selected for the study were public expectation of treatment, public contacts with government, and public evaluation of governmental performance.

I. *Expectation of Treatment*

The government is identified in the eyes of citizens by the treatment they receive. Their attitudes of support or hostility toward the government are shaped by these impressions. In this study respondents were asked as to what kinds of treatment they expected from various government officials such as village level worker, Block Development officer, and other district officers, and the police. The question was asked for each office mentioned:

Do you expect (mention of the officer's position) to treat all citizens equally?

The data reported here indicate that those who expected equal treatment were 17% of the rural male respondents, and 2% rural females, 26% urban males, and 7% urban females in the sample. A high number of respondents reported that they do not expect equal treatment (51% rural males, 68% rural females; and 57% urban males, and 61% urban females) by bureaucracy and the police. 20% rural males, and 12% rural females, 15% of urban males and 26% of the females reported that treatment depends upon a variety of factors. Those respondents who have been categorized under the "other" category are those who had either no opinion or were quite confused about the situation. The data indicate that urban respondents, both males (57%) and females (61%) have low opinion of government officials on this question. Greater number of females were cynical and did not expect equal treatment (68% rural; 61% urban) (Table I). This may be due to very few contacts women have with government, and they accumulate their impressions by remembering what their menfolks and other neighbors have told them.

TABLE I

EXPECTATION OF TREATMENT BY BUREAUCRACY AND POLICE,
BY RESIDENCE AND SEX

N = 450

<i>Respondents Reporting</i>	<i>Rural</i>		<i>Urban</i>	
	<i>Male (%)</i>	<i>Female (%)</i>	<i>Male (%)</i>	<i>Female (%)</i>
1. They expect equal treatment	17	2	26	7
2. They do not expect equal treatment	51	68	57	61
3. Depends	20	12	15	26
4. Other (D.K., No opinion)	12	18	2	6
TOTAL PERCENT	100	100	100	100

A very general question followed asking those respondents who did not expect equal treatment or said that treatment depended on many factors. The question asked was:

In your opinion what are the reasons that some citizens get better treatment while others do not?

A wide variety of factors were reported by the respondents. If the citizen is rich, powerful, influential, and related to some local or state politician or government official then his chances of getting better treatment are far more than a person with no such connections. The caste was not considered to be a very important factor. The percentage of respondents reporting that the bureaucracy gives preferential treatment to some citizens is high, both in rural (71% males, and 80% females) and urban (72% males, and 87% females) samples. Only 3% rural males, 10% rural females and 2% urban males and 6% urban females felt that caste has any relation to the type of treatment they receive. (Table II) In a situation like India where caste has been considered as one of the most important behavior influencing factor, the low percentage of respondents under this category is an interesting indication as to how new factors are taking place in their social interaction. The data reported here indicate that the great majority of Indians do not feel that the ordinary citizen can get fair and equal treatment. This is much more evident in the case of urban areas. This raises serious questions about the political system's capability to create a sense of legitimacy among citizens.

TABLE II
EQUALITARIANISM IN ADMINISTRATION AS PERCEIVED
BY THE PUBLIC, BY RESIDENCE AND SEX

N = 450

<i>Those reporting</i>	<i>Rural</i>		<i>Urban</i>	
	<i>Male (%)</i>	<i>Female (%)</i>	<i>Male (%)</i>	<i>Female (%)</i>
All are treated equally	17	2	26	7
Preferential treatment is given	71	80	72	87
1. Wealthy	47	51	31	39
2. With relatives	21	19	39	42
3. High caste	3	10	2	6
Other	12	18	2	6
(Don't know; No opinion)				
TOTAL PERCENT	100	100	100	100

In the same series respondents were asked about the amount of consideration they expect for their opinions and point of views from the bureaucracy and the police. The percentage of respondents who expect serious consideration was not high. Only 11% males and 4% females in the rural sample, and 24% and 7% in the urban sample expected serious consideration. (Table III)

TABLE III

AMOUNT OF CONSIDERATION EXPECTED FOR POINT OF VIEW/OPINIONS
FROM BUREAUCRACY AND THE POLICE, BY RESIDENCE AND SEX

N = 450

Percent who expect:	Rural		Urban	
	Male (%)	Female (%)	Male (%)	Female (%)
Serious consideration	11	4	24	7
A little attention	19	9	21	15
To be ignored	44	47	41	44
Depends	22	29	13	27
Other (D.K., no opinion)	4	11	1	7
TOTAL PERCENT	100	100	100	100

Studies have shown that high education, greater mass media exposure, and serious consideration of opinions and expectations of equal treatment by government officials are positively correlated. The data reported here (Table IV) points out that 21% males and 7% females in the rural sample, and 36% urban males and 21% urban females who were highly exposed to the mass media channels also expected equal treatment. With less media exposure the expectation also go down (Table IV). The data indicates that the lower the mass media exposure and education, both in the urban and the rural samples, the lower is the expectation of being treated equally and getting any serious consideration. The high percentage of female respondents both rural and urban, is under 'to be ignored' and 'not treated equally' category. They report to be more suspicious and cynical than their menfolks, possibly due to fewer contacts, and knowledge about administration.

If we combine two indices of 'equal treatment', and 'high consideration' the following pattern emerges.

II. *Public Contact with Government and its support to Government Programs*

As noted earlier, public beliefs and attitudes towards government are formed by treatment given by the agents of administration. In

⁷ D. L. Sheth, *Socio-Economic Profiles of Districts of Four States in India* (New Delhi: Center for the Study of Developing Societies, 1966) (mimeographed).

TABLE IV

EXPOSURE TO MASS MEDIA, LEVEL OF EDUCATION, EXPECTATION OF EQUAL TREATMENT AND SERIOUS CONSIDERATION TO OPINIONS, BY RESIDENCE AND SEX

<i>Media Exposure/Level of Education</i>	<i>Urban</i>				<i>Rural</i>			
	<i>High Expectation of equal treatment</i>		<i>High serious Consideration</i>		<i>High Expectation of equal treatment</i>		<i>High serious Consideration</i>	
	<i>M (%)</i>	<i>F (%)</i>	<i>M (%)</i>	<i>F (%)</i>	<i>M (%)</i>	<i>F (%)</i>	<i>M (%)</i>	<i>F (%)</i>
High exposure	21	7	13	10	36	21	32	26
Medium exposure	17	5	8	7	27	16	27	15
Low exposure	11	3	2	—	14	9	8	2
High education	23	19	21	13	41	33	39	23
Medium education	19	13	11	6	23	19	19	10
Low education	9	4	3	1	12	8	8	2

the absence of any meaningful communication and contacts between the public and the bureaucracy there are greater chances of misunderstanding, distrust, and suspicion about each other. Frequent contacts, theoretically, help in changing these attitudes and create a 'good will', and feeling of mutual cooperation.

The respondents were asked a series of questions about their contacts with bureaucracy which helped us in developing an administrative contact index for each respondent. In rural areas these officers about whom contact questions were asked included Block Development officers, district officers (Zila Vikas Adhikari Tehsildar, Police Superintendent), and village level workers, for urban respondents they were municipal officials and district officials. Both urban and rural respondents were also asked about their contacts with state officers, and frequency and nature of such contacts.

The same questions were asked from urban and rural respondents about the state and district officials.

Those respondents who had very high contact score were also the ones who believed that various government officials at different levels were doing a good/very good job. The data also indicated, comparatively,

⁸ Alex Inkeles, "Participant Citizenship in Six Developing Countries", *American Political Science Review* LXIII, No. 4, 1969.

TABLE V
THE ROLE OF ADMINISTRATIVE CONTACT IN DEVELOPING BELIEF IN
AND SUPPORT FOR GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAMS, BY RESIDENCE AND SEX

N = 450

<i>Believe government officials are doing good job/very good job</i>	<i>Administrative Contact Score*</i>											
	<i>Very High</i>		<i>High*</i>		<i>Average*</i>		<i>Occasional</i>		<i>Rare</i>		<i>Never</i>	
	<i>M (%)</i>	<i>F (%)</i>	<i>M (%)</i>	<i>F (%)</i>	<i>M (%)</i>	<i>F (%)</i>	<i>M (%)</i>	<i>F (%)</i>	<i>M (%)</i>	<i>F (%)</i>	<i>M (%)</i>	<i>F (%)</i>
<i>Rural Sample</i>												
(1) Village officials	77	61	68	73	59	41	47	49	41	36	33	45
(2) Block officials	88	43	51	38	67	45	41	37	43	45	39	49
(3) District officials	63	31	47	29	41	37	35	22	37	28	31	29
(4) State officials	55	21	43	17	39	19	43	26	48	18	47	26
<i>Urban Sample</i>												
(1) Municipal officials	88	68	73	61	65	53	59	41	51	33	41	36
(2) District officials	62	53	51	49	43	47	57	49	49	38	43	37
(3) State officials	51	46	43	37	39	31	49	36	42	41	61	52

* Very High — More than three times
 High — Three times
 Average — Two times
 Occasional — Once
 Rare — Less than once
 Never —

that a high percentage of respondents were satisfied by the performance of their local officials than district and state officials. This may be due to few contacts made by an average citizen with state officials. The decrease in the contact score was found to be positively correlated with respondents' decreased beliefs about job performance by government officials. Both urban and rural respondents who scored very high on administrative contact score were also the ones who had greater faith in government officials as doing a good job. Those respondents who never had any contacts with the bureaucracy were also the ones who thought that the government officers were not doing a good job (Table V).

Researches have shown that if the perception of the possibility of self-help is low, dependence upon government is high, and the chances of frustrations are greater. This is partly due to the lack of self-confidence in doing things which may prove to be detrimental to citizen initiative.

Keeping these theoretical concerns in mind respondents were asked a series of questions to measure the concept of self-confidence.¹⁰ An adjective list was provided to each respondent as to how he perceived himself. The respondent indicated, in terms of eighteen adjectives or phrases, whether he was usually or not very often this kind of person. The nine positive and negative words and phrases were as follows:

<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>
1. Strong	1. Not smart
2. Popular	2. Afraid
3. Can handle problems himself	3. Cannot handle problems himself
4. Friendly	4. Not popular
5. Dependable	5. Easy going
6. Honest	6. Selfish
7. Takes initiative	7. Lacks initiative
8. Knowledgeable	8. Lacks knowledge
9. Resourceful	9. Not resourceful

The respondents were also asked as to how much support they give to the bureaucracy, their dealings with officials, whether they felt they could act if there was a problem, and how much influence they had on government officials. Their answers to whether the public officials really cared about people like them, and respect their opinions and point of views were also taken into consideration in developing the self-confidence index. The percentage of rural respondents was higher on high

⁹ Peter M. Hall, 'Identification with the Delinquent Sub-Culture and Level of Self-Evaluation,' *Sociometry*, Vol. 29, No. 2 (June, 1966).

¹⁰ Alex Inkeles, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

support scale (Table VI). It is interesting if we compare these figures with rural respondents' expectation of being treated equally and serious consideration of their opinions. Low confidence was found to be positively correlated with low support of government (53% rural; 58% urban) (Table VII). It seems that the urban respondents are more cynical, anomic and hostile. Alex Inkeles in his study of Indian citizens found the similar general pattern.¹¹ If we combine the two indices of high support and high self-confidence, the following pattern emerges:

		<i>Urban</i>	<i>Rural</i>
High self-confidence	— high support	41%	57%
Moderate self-confidence	— moderate support	19%	23%
Low self-confidence	— low support	58%	65%

The self-confidence series of questions continued, and respondents were asked that if something went wrong, or if the respondents were faced with negligent behavior of subordinate officers, could they complain to some higher officers in the administration or could they take their grievances to some political leader. A high percent of the respondents (56% rural males, and 78% of the rural females; 51% urban males, and 75% urban females) did not feel that they could do much (Table VII).

TABLE VI

PATTERNS OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTITUDES TOWARD
GOVERNMENTAL OFFICIALS, AND ATTITUDES OF SELF-CONFIDENCE IN
CITIZEN RELATIONSHIPS TOWARD GOVERNMENTAL OFFICERS,
BY RESIDENCE

N = 450

Levels of Support for Government

<i>Levels of Self-confidence</i>	<i>Rural</i>			<i>Urban</i>		
	<i>High Support (%)</i>	<i>Moderate Support (%)</i>	<i>Low Support (%)</i>	<i>High Support (%)</i>	<i>Moderate Support (%)</i>	<i>Low Support (%)</i>
1. High Self-confidence	57	39	21	41	28	17
2. Moderate Self-confidence	33	23	13	26	19	13
3. Low Self-confidence	10	31	65	19	16	58
4. Not Ascertained	—	7	1	14	37	12
5. Total PERCENT	100	100	100	100	100	100

¹¹ Fred W. Riggs, "Bureaucrats and Political Development: A Paradoxical Viet", in La Palombara (ed.), *op. cit.*

TABLE VII

SENSE OF PERSONAL CONFIDENCE OR EFFICACY IN CONTACTING
GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

N = 450

<i>Respondents who report that they</i>	<i>Rural</i>		<i>Urban</i>	
	<i>Male (%)</i>	<i>Female (%)</i>	<i>Male (%)</i>	<i>Female (%)</i>
Could complain to higher officials or other leaders	43	21	49	25
Don't know if could complain or to whom	34	54	26	47
Nothing could be done	21	24	25	28
Not Ascertained	2	1	—	—
TOTAL PERCENT	100	100	100	100

The impact of administrative contact on confidence is quite noticeable in Table IX. The data show that those respondents who have very high contact scores are the ones who report that officials treat all citizens fairly, citizens can act if officials are not doing their jobs properly and would act by themselves if confronted by a problem. This confidence in the bureaucracy and in themselves decreases as the administrative contact score goes down. A high percentage of respondents reported that they will be treated fairly, can take initiative individually and collectively the percentage reporting that political contacts and pulls are quite important. Our data are not completely consistent on this matter. But in general, the administrative contact is functional to the achievement of greater realism about administrative behavior and greater self-confidence.

III. *General Evaluation of Governmental Performance*

Modern democratic systems are very sensitive to the public opinion and the public evaluations of governmental performance. Public support and evaluation of administration is favorable and positive if the public is satisfied in terms of material rewards, and there exist adequate psychopolitical channels for the citizen to ventilate his grievances and participate in policy formulation. The data reported here indicate that a high percentage of respondents thought that the government officials were doing a poor job. The same pattern of responses were given about the state officials. It is to be noted here that the higher the level of officials, the higher is the percentage of respondents who felt that those officers were not doing a good job (Table IX).

The data reported in Table IX do not speak very highly about the general performance of the administration in India at different

TABLE VIII
THE RELEVANCE OF ADMINISTRATIVE CONTACT FOR CITIZEN CONFIDENCE
IN THE POLITICAL SYSTEM, BY RESIDENCE AND SEX

N = 450

	<i>Administrative Contact Scores</i>											
	<i>Very High</i>		<i>High</i>		<i>Average</i>		<i>Occasional</i>		<i>Rare</i>		<i>Never</i>	
	<i>M (%)</i>	<i>F (%)</i>	<i>M (%)</i>	<i>F (%)</i>	<i>M (%)</i>	<i>F (%)</i>	<i>M (%)</i>	<i>F (%)</i>	<i>M (%)</i>	<i>F (%)</i>	<i>M (%)</i>	<i>F (%)</i>
<i>A. Rural</i>												
1. Officials treat all citizens fairly	61	52	54	49	46	41	41	39	59	51	48	41
2. Citizens can act if officials are not doing their job properly	63	59	57	51	43	39	37	36	51	44	46	39
3. Would act by himself if has a problem with the government	42	39	29	22	21	22	46	42	45	38	49	37
4. Political pull is important	71	66	74	64	69	61	69	64	59	57	56	51
<i>B. Urban</i>												
1. Officials treat all citizens fairly	54	49	59	56	55	51	41	33	33	27	31	27
2. Citizens can act if officials are not doing their job properly	67	61	36	38	33	29	61	57	59	48	56	47
3. Would act by himself if has a problem with the government	30	27	42	47	45	41	27	21	21	24	27	18
4. Political pull is important	64	61	66	58	69	67	45	41	47	49	39	36

TABLE IX
GENERAL EVALUATION OF GOVERNMENTAL PERFORMANCE, BY
RESIDENCE AND SEX

N = 450

	RURAL								URBAN					
	Village Officials		Block Officials		District Officials		State Officials		Municipal Officials		District Officials		State Officials	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Very good job	8	2	3	2	4	—	6	—	17	6	17	4	11	5
Good job	13	12	15	7	13	5	23	5	14	8	20	8	12	8
Fair job	14	17	22	12	26	9	28	8	18	9	14	17	19	15
Poor job	46	21	49	37	51	55	38	46	49	52	44	61	45	66
No opinion	19	48	11	42	6	31	5	41	2	25	5	10	13	6
TOTAL PERCENT	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

levels. The possible explanation for this low evaluation is that villagers tend to regard most village improvements as the job of the government rather than their own. This over-reliance on government and a frustrated wait for the arrival of such help affects the general evaluative opinion of the public.

It scarcely requires any exhaustive documentation to observe that corruption and graft are rampant among the officials of developing societies. This not only hampers the development and transformation of the society but also produces a very negative, not too flattering image of the bureaucracy in the public mind which in turn becomes less supportive, and more cynical and hostile toward government as such. It has both long-range and short-range implications for the political system.

An opposite view has been taken by Professor Fred W. Riggs in his 'Sala' model of bureaucracy where he maintains that graft and corruption may be quite functional in the development of stable political institutions in the beginning stages of nation and state building.

The respondents were asked about their perception of corruption in bureaucracy. Corruption, somehow, was considered quite natural. The work used for bribe in India is 'Haq' (the right). A large number of respondents while reporting rampant corruption also maintained that it was quite natural and that they were ready to go with it. Even the percentage of respondents who felt that only a few are corrupt is high. Again the data show that urban respondents were more cynical. Females, both rural and urban, were also more cynical than their male counterparts (Table X).

TABLE X
PERCEPTIONS OF CORRUPTION IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE

<i>Those reporting</i>	N = 450			
	<i>Rural</i>		<i>Urban</i>	
	<i>Male (%)</i>	<i>Female (%)</i>	<i>Male (%)</i>	<i>Female (%)</i>
Majority are corrupt	37	41	48	43
About a half are corrupt	13	8	30	21
Just a few are corrupt	26	19	8	17
None are corrupt	8	5	2	4
No opinion/D.K.	16	27	12	15
TOTAL PERCENT	100	100	100	100

In the same series respondents were asked to report as to how confident they feel about their own status and relationships with govern-

TABLE XI
SUMMARY INDICES OF ATTITUDES TOWARD GOVERNMENT AND
ADMINISTRATION, BY RESIDENCE AND SEX

N = 450

	<i>Rural</i>		<i>Urban</i>	
	<i>Male (%)</i>	<i>Female (%)</i>	<i>Male (%)</i>	<i>Female (%)</i>
A. Index of attitudinal support for officials and programs				
1. Very supportive	18	30	6	17
2. Moderately supportive	48	45	37	47
3. Moderately critical	27	21	46	28
4. Very critical	7	4	11	8
TOTAL PERCENT	100	100	100	100
B. Index of self-confidence about own status and relationships with government officials				
1. High self-confidence	22	18	3	2
2. Moderate self-confidence	57	41	62	71
3. Limited self-confidence	18	31	29	19
4. No self-confidence	3	10	6	8
TOTAL PERCENT	100	100	100	100

mental officials and their attitudinal support for officials and programs. It is to be noted that rural respondents were more self-confident (22% males, 10% females) than the urban respondents (3% males and 2% females). Both urban males and females (11% and 8%, respectively) are very critical of the programs and officials in comparison to 7% rural male sample and 4% rural females (Table XI). Village India seems to be more satisfied and less critical. Urban respondents, probably, have higher expectations and live in greater tensions than rural folks and therefore are more hostile and less supportive of government. No condition is as unstable as a transitional one when it is improving.

Summary

In summary, the data reported here indicate that the Indian citizens do not expect equal treatment, and serious consideration for their opinions. They feel that wealthy and influential persons with connections and pulls stand better chances with the bureaucracy (Table II). The frequency of administrative contact did affect their attitudes toward the administration. Those respondents who came into frequent contacts believed that governmental officials in general were doing a good job (Table V), officials treat all citizens fairly, and citizens could take their grievances to higher officials for redress if they were not satisfied (Table VIII). Those respondents who were very high on administrative contact score also reported that political pull is quite important to get things done. The data reveal paradoxical patterns of support and hostility, of consensus and criticism. Those respondents who were highly self-confident were also high supportive. On the balance, our respondents tend to be more supportive of the administration, despite being quite critical of the bureaucracy (Table XI). The findings also indicate a positive correlation between attitudes of citizens towards administration and other variables of modernization such as mass media, education, initiative and self-confidence. Those respondents who were highly educated and exposed to mass media were the ones who possessed egalitarian values and expected equal treatment and serious consideration from the administration. Highly self-confident respondents provided greater support to the administration (Table IV). Highly self-confident respondents provided greater support to the administration (Table VI), and were willing to take initiative to solve their problems (Table VII and VIII). High confidence and greater frequency of administrative contacts were also found to be related. Our data also indicate that hostility reactions can increase, particularly in the urban areas, as a result of bureaucratic contact and probably of the not very cordial treatment received by urban citizens. But, despite this, citizens who associate with bureaucrats at different levels reveal attitudes and orientations

which are supportive and not rejective of the political system. One could be both optimistic and alarmed at these findings, but with greater mass media exposure, more education, greater number of highly self-confident and initiative-talking citizens this relationship between elite-citizen may be improved. Unless these basic conflicts are resolved to the satisfaction of the public and the administration, no efforts can be successful in bringing about political and social change in India.