

# **Public Perception of Governance, Corruption, and Their Impact on Sustainable Development: Evidence from Butwal, Nepal**

*Received on 14 June, 2025; Accepted on 31 August, 2025; Published on November, 2025*

**Sanjoy Kumar Karna, PhD**

Assistant Professor

Butwal Multiple Campus, Butwal

devakinandan28@yahoo.com

<https://orcid.org/00000-0002-8550-2688>

Mobile: 9847027058

## **Abstract**

*This study examines public perceptions of governance quality, corruption, and sustainable development in Butwal and surrounding areas of Nepal. Despite transitioning to a democratic system in 1990, Nepal continues to face persistent governance challenges, including systemic corruption, weak institutional accountability, and political instability. Using a structured questionnaire administered to 90 participants, the study employed descriptive analysis, chi-square tests, t-tests, and logistic regression to analyze public opinion. While more than half (55.5%) of respondents expressed dissatisfaction with government employees, a slight majority (51.1%) acknowledged timely service delivery. This suggests that factors beyond timeliness—such as transparency, fairness, and staff conduct—significantly influence public satisfaction. Perceptions of infrastructure showed notable improvement: positive assessments of roads and streets increased by 30 percentage points, and hospitals by 25 points, all statistically significant ( $p < 0.001$ ). Key drivers of corruption included fast service, low public sector salaries, and inadequate reporting mechanisms, with the most severe perceived impacts*

*being stalled development, weakened governance, and increased inequality. Regression analysis indicated that political instability, corruption, and complex legal frameworks significantly increase the likelihood of individuals facing barriers to business or employment. Respondents identified proper investigations, prompt service delivery, and strict legal enforcement as the most effective anti-corruption measures. The study concludes that administrative reforms focusing on transparency, simplified legal procedures, and improved staff conduct, coupled with efforts to stabilize politics and combat corruption, are essential for enhancing institutional trust and advancing sustainable development in Nepal.*

**Keywords:** Governance, sustainable development, perception, corruption, barriers

### **Introduction**

Democracy and good governance (Smith, 2019) are integral to sustainable development, often viewed as interdependent concepts. Scholars frequently use these terms interchangeably without emphasizing their fundamental conditions (Johnson & Ahmed, 2020). Key principles of good governance include legitimacy, accountability, transparency, and inclusiveness (United Nations, 2018). Development remains a primary goal in modern societies, with nations at various stages of progress across these dimensions (World Bank, 2021). The complexity of capturing these stages makes understanding the development process challenging (Jones, 2017), particularly through a sustainable development lens (UNDP, 2019). Developing nations continually strive to achieve advanced levels of development across various facets (Kumar, 2016). In Nepal, the fall of the authoritarian Panchayat regime in 1990 marked a shift toward democracy. However, the country continues to face significant economic, social, and political challenges, with corruption being particularly detrimental (Sharma & Basnet, 2017). Corruption is so pervasive that it affects virtually every sector, leading to a deficit in democratic governance (Transparency International, 2019). Governance encompasses variables such as pluralism, accountability, political stability, absence of violence, and governmental effectiveness (World Bank, 2021). This research seeks to explore public perceptions of corruption, governance, and the sustainability of development in Nepal.

Nepal faces significant governance challenges, especially following a decade-long violent conflict from 1996 to 2006 (Sharma, 2017). The political climate is characterized by instability, impunity, weak rule of law, and limited local accountability (Karki & Sijapati, 2019). According to multiple sources, Nepal is

currently experiencing considerable political instability and exhibits traits of a fragile state (World Bank, 2021). Fragile states often lack a secure political and security environment, preventing governments from delivering essential services to their populations, including the most vulnerable (OECD, 2020). Nepal's instability stems from several major political transitions, including the shift from monarchy to a democratic republic, from a unitary to a federal structure, and from a Hindu state to a secular one (Gellner, 2019). Additionally, the country has transitioned from a majoritarian electoral system to a mixed system incorporating majoritarian, proportional representation, and quota elements (Bista & Gurung, 2020).

The analysis proceeded in several steps: Descriptive Statistics: Used to summarize demographic characteristics and the distribution of perceptions across variables. Cross-tabulation Analysis: Conducted to examine bivariate relationships, particularly between service timeliness and satisfaction levels. Chi-Square Tests: Employed to determine whether associations between categorical variables (e.g., service timeliness and satisfaction) were statistically significant. Paired Sample t-Tests: Applied to compare perceptions of development infrastructure (before vs. now) to evaluate perceived improvements. Binary Logistic Regression: Used to identify the determinants of perceived difficulty in adopting a business or profession. The dependent variable was coded as 1 for "great difficulty" and 0 for "other." Independent variables included political instability, corruption, complex legal frameworks, high taxes, loan access, and frequent government changes. Marginal Effects: Calculated from the logistic regression model to interpret how much each independent variable changed the probability of experiencing significant business difficulty.

## **Literature Review**

Corruption is fundamentally a form of crime (Lederman et al., 2001). However, discussions of corruption vary greatly between countries due to unique historical and cultural contexts (Gupta, 1995). In Nepal, key political affairs remain dominated by a small group of elites, similar to the Panchayat era. These elites continue to control and manipulate both the political and economic landscapes (Subedi, 2001). They maintain formal and informal networks within their circles, practices deeply rooted in social interactions that are unlikely to change soon (Levitt, 1999). Current academic approaches to corruption often bypass moral considerations, focusing instead on technical aspects (Bukovansky, 2002).

Myrdal (1974) argued that underdeveloped nations are economically, infrastructural, and socially weak, struggling to use their resources for national benefit. In the public sector, governance involves wielding power through the creation of effective public policies, procedures, and laws that are legitimate and accountable to citizens. These actions directly influence human interactions, institutional dynamics, and socio-economic development (Rose-Ackerman, 2016). As a field of study, governance often focuses on the design and execution of modern welfare programs and public benefit systems like pensions and healthcare, aiming to promote efficient service delivery in line with democratic principles and resource constraints (Rose-Ackerman, 2016). While this adaptability allows for contextual application, the ambiguity can create operational challenges. In some instances, good governance has become a "catch-all buzzword" lacking clear meaning or substance (Johnston, 2002, p. 7). North (1990) described economic history as a series of economies that failed to establish effective rules and enforcement mechanisms necessary for long-term sustainable growth. Bradhan (1997) explored how corruption negatively impacts economic development, noting that it can manifest differently across societies and hinder growth. He cited Singapore as a success story, where economic development surged following significant reductions in corruption.

### **Methodology**

This study employed a quantitative research design to investigate public perceptions of governance, corruption, and development in Butwal, Nepal. The study was conducted in Butwal Municipality and its surrounding areas in the Rupandehi District of Nepal. Butwal was selected as the study area for several strategic reasons: Butwal is a major sub-metropolitan city and a vital economic, administrative, and transportation hub for the entire Lumbini Province. Its significance means that governance issues here have a wide ripple effect, making it a critical case study. The city exhibits a blend of urban and peri-urban characteristics and is experiencing rapid urbanization and infrastructure development. This makes it a typical and representative case of the governance and development challenges faced by many growing secondary cities in Nepal. Butwal is home to a diverse demographic mix in terms of ethnicity, class, and occupation, providing a wide range of perspectives on governance and service delivery. The researchers' proximity to the study area facilitated easier data collection, logistics, and a deeper contextual understanding of the local governance environment. Therefore, findings from Butwal offer valuable insights that are likely indicative of trends in other similar urban centers across Nepal."

A structured questionnaire was administered to 90 respondents selected from Butwal and nearby areas. The questionnaire captured data on various dimensions, including demographic characteristics (age, gender, education, and occupation), satisfaction with government services, personal experiences with corruption, and perceptions of the causes and consequences of corruption. The survey instrument included the following components: Satisfaction metrics: Measures of satisfaction with government staff and service timeliness. Corruption-related variables: Frequency and severity ratings of ten causes and ten consequences of corruption (using Likert-type scales from 1 to 10). Development perception: Ratings of public infrastructure before and after a specified time frame in terms of roads, streets, and hospitals. Barriers to economic participation: Respondents rated the difficulty level (great, moderate, not difficult) for entering professions or businesses, focusing on factors like political instability, corruption, complex laws, and tax burdens.

The study collected data from a sample of 90 respondents. While this may appear as a limited sample for a quantitative study, the sample size was justified for the following reasons: This study was conducted under constraints of time, financial resources, and manpower. A sample size of 90 was logistically feasible while still allowing for robust statistical analysis. The primary aim was to obtain in-depth perceptual data on complex issues like governance and corruption. A moderately sized sample allowed for a more manageable and detailed analysis of these perceptions without becoming overly superficial. The statistical techniques employed (e.g., descriptive statistics, Chi-square tests, paired t-tests, and logistic regression) can yield valid and significant results with a sample of this size, especially when effect sizes are moderate to large, as some were found in this study (e.g.,  $p < 0.001$  for infrastructure improvements). For an exploratory study aiming to identify key trends and relationships rather than provide nationally representative prevalence estimates, a sample of 90 is considered adequate to generate meaningful hypotheses and highlight areas for further large-scale research. In perceptual studies, after a certain point, new responses often become repetitive. The sample size of 90 was sufficient to reach a point of thematic saturation for the key issues investigated. It is acknowledged that the findings are not automatically generalizable to the entire Nepali population. However, they provide a critical snapshot and a strong foundation for understanding the perceptions of citizens in a key urban area and for designing larger follow-up studies."

The analysis proceeded in several steps: Descriptive Statistics: Used to summarize demographic characteristics and the distribution of perceptions across variables. Cross-tabulation Analysis: Conducted to examine bivariate relationships, particularly between service timeliness and satisfaction levels. Chi-Square Tests: Employed to determine whether associations between categorical variables (e.g., service timeliness and satisfaction) were statistically significant. Paired Sample t-Tests: Applied to compare perceptions of development infrastructure (before vs. now) to evaluate perceived improvements. Binary Logistic Regression: Used to identify the determinants of perceived difficulty in adopting a business or profession. The dependent variable was coded as 1 for "great difficulty" and 0 for "other." Independent variables included political instability, corruption, complex legal frameworks, high taxes, loan access, and frequent government changes. Marginal Effects: Calculated from the logistic regression model to interpret how much each independent variable changed the probability of experiencing significant business difficulty.

## Results and Discussion

### Perception of Governance

This section examines how public satisfaction with government staff is influenced by the timeliness of services. Two variables were examined:

**Satisfaction with Government Staff (SGS):** categorized as unsatisfied (0), satisfied (1), and highly satisfied (2).

**Table 1: Satisfaction with Government Staff**

Satisfaction level	Frequency	Percentage
Unsatisfied (0)	50	55.5%
Satisfied (1)	35	38.8%
Highly Satisfied (2)	5	5.7%
Total	90	100%

*Source: Author's Calculation*

More than half (55.5%) of respondents were unsatisfied with the service provided by government staff. Only a small proportion (5.7%) reported being highly satisfied, while 38.8% were moderately satisfied. The high level of dissatisfaction indicates significant public discontent with government employees' interactions and service delivery. The very low proportion of highly satisfied respondents suggests that excellent service quality is rare and not reflective of the general system.

**Government Service Timeliness (GSS):** categorized as in time (0), genuine delay (1), and unnecessary delay (2).

**Table 2: Government Staffs' Service Delivery**

Punctuality level	Frequency	Percentage
In Time (0)	46	51.1%
Genuine Delay (1)	36	40.0%
Unnecessary Delay (2)	8	8.9%
Total	90	100%

*Source: Author's Calculation*

The analysis reveals that while a slight majority (51.1%) receive services on time, a significant portion (40%) experience genuine delays, often due to administrative or resource constraints. However, unnecessary delays (8.9%) signal inefficiency, weak accountability, or potential rent-seeking behavior. These delays, though affecting a smaller group, have a disproportionate negative impact on public trust and satisfaction.

**Table 3: Cross-analysis between Satisfaction and Service Delivery**

Satisfaction level	In time (0)	Genuine Delay (1)	Unnecessary Delay (2)	Total
Unsatisfied (0)	32	14	4	50
Satisfied (1)	13	18	4	35
Highly Satisfied (2)	1	4	0	5
Total	46	36	8	90

*Source: Author's Calculation*

- i. **On-time services (46 cases):** A majority (69.6%) remain unsatisfied, indicating that timeliness alone does not guarantee satisfaction; other factors like staff behavior and procedural fairness are critical.
- ii. **Genuine delays (36 cases):** Satisfaction is relatively better, with 61% reporting satisfaction or high satisfaction, likely due to perceived justification or communication.
- iii. **Unnecessary delays (8 cases):** Extremely damaging to satisfaction, with half unsatisfied and none highly satisfied.

A Chi-square test revealed a statistically significant association between satisfaction and timeliness ( $\chi^2 = 10.98$ ,  $p = 0.027$ ), indicating that timeliness plays



an important role in shaping public satisfaction. However, other factors such as staff behavior, fairness, and transparency also significantly influence satisfaction levels.

**Perception of Sustainability of Development**

The analysis of public perception regarding the sustainability of infrastructure development reveals significant improvements across all observed sectors.

**Table 4: Perception of Sustainability of Development (percentage of Good/Very Good Ratings)**

Infrastructure	Before (%)	Now (%)	Change (%)
Road	25	55	+30
Street	20	50	+30
Hospital	15	40	+25

*Source: Author's Calculation*

Positive perceptions of roads and streets each improved by 30 percentage points, while hospitals saw a 25-point increase. These improvements suggest that development programs have enhanced accessibility, urban conditions, and transportation networks. However, healthcare challenges remain more persistent.

**Statistical Significance of Sustainability of Development**

Paired t-tests showed highly significant improvements ( $p < 0.001$ ) across all three domains.

**Table 5: Paired t-test of Sustainability of Development**

Infrastructure	Before (%)	Now (%)	z-stat	p-value
Road	25	55	-4.11	< 0.001
Street	20	50	-4.23	< 0.001
Hospital	15	40	-3.66	< 0.001

*Source: Author's Calculation*

The equal gains in road and street infrastructure suggest targeted investment has been effective, while the smaller gain in hospitals indicates lingering challenges in healthcare service delivery.



## Perception of Corruption

### Causes of Corruption

As shown in Table-6.1, the most cited causes of corruption were fast service (22.2%), low salary (20.0%), and reporting problems (17.8%).

**Table 6.1: Causes of Corruption**

Rank	Causes of Corruption	Frequency	Relative (%)
1	Fast service	20	22.2
2	Low salary	18	20.0
3	Reporting problem	16	17.8
4	To be rich	7	7.8
5	Ignorance of client	7	7.8
6	Bad political system	7	7.8
7	Avoid complex Procedure	6	6.7
8	No strict laws and rules	4	4.4
9	Lack of awareness	4	4.4
10	No moral values	1	1.1

*Source: Author's Calculation*

These indicate that bureaucratic delays, economic inadequacies, and institutional weaknesses are key drivers. Mid-tier causes include desire for wealth, client ignorance, and political dysfunction, while lower-tier causes point to structural and cultural challenges.

### Consequences of Corruption

As shown in Table 6.2, financial loss, inequality, and frustration were the most frequently cited consequences.

**Table 6.2: Consequences of Corruption**

Rank	Consequences of Corruption	Frequency	Relative (%)
1	Financial loss (CONC 2)	28	22.2
2	Inequality (CONC 1)	25	20.0
3	Frustration (CONC 1)	22	17.8
4	Bad effect on development (CONC 5)	7	7.8
5	Injustice (CONC 7)	7	7.8
6	Failure of government (CONC 10)	7	7.8
7	Organized crime and terrorism (CONC 8)	6	6.7

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Consequences of Corruption</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Relative (%)</b>
8	Inconvenience (CONC 4)	4	4.4
9	Bad for honest (CONC 6)	4	4.4
10	Criminal charge (CONC 3)	1	1.1

*Source: Author's Calculation*

Less frequently mentioned but significant consequences include injustice, government failure, and negative effects on development.

### ***Rank of Consequences of Corruption***

As shown in Table 6.3 the public perceives "Bad effect on development" and "Failure of government" as the most serious consequences of corruption.

**Table 6.3: Rank of Consequences of Corruption**

<b>Consequence</b>	<b>Rank 1 Frequency (Most Serious)</b>
Bad effect on development (CONC5)	23
Failure of government (CONC10)	19
Inequality (CONC1)	16
Injustice (CONC7)	11
Financial loss (CONC2)	7
Inconvenience (CONC6)	2
Frustration (CONC9)	2
Bad for honest (CONC4)	5
Organized crime & terrorism (CONC8)	1
Criminal charge (CONC3)	3

*Source: Author's Calculation*

### ***Cumulative Score Analysis (Weighted Sum)***

A weighted score was calculated, as depicted in the Table-6.4, for each consequence by assigning weights (Rank 1 = 10 points, Rank 2 = 9 points, ..., Rank 10 = 1 point).

**Table 6.4: Weighted Scores**

<b>Code</b>	<b>Consequence</b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>
CONC5	Bad effect on development	384
CONC10	Failure of government	315
CONC1	Inequality	307

Code	Consequence	Weighted Score
CONC7	Injustice	274
CONC4	Bad for honest	247
CONC2	Financial loss	244
CONC9	Frustration	239
CONC6	Inconvenience	234
CONC3	Criminal charge	217
CONC8	Organized crime & terrorism	210

*Source: Author's Calculation*

The weighted scores confirm that "Bad effect on development" and "Failure of government" are perceived as the most severe consequences, followed by inequality and injustice.

### Measures of Controlling Corruption

As revealed in the Table 6.5 proper Investigation (CRM1) is the most prioritized strategy, followed by Delivery in Time (CRM4) and Reform Political System (CRM10).

**Table 6.5: Measures of Controlling Corruption**

CRM Code	Measure	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	R9	R10
CRM1	Proper Investigation	16	11	10	11	8	7	6	6	7	8
CRM2	Strict Laws	8	17	10	10	7	10	6	8	7	7
CRM3	Identify & Hard Punishment	7	17	11	13	10	9	7	5	4	7
CRM4	Delivery in Time	11	11	11	7	8	10	7	10	6	9
CRM5	Modify Constitution	7	7	11	10	6	12	9	8	6	4
CRM6	Increase Salary	9	9	8	6	7	10	8	8	8	7
CRM7	Electronic Contract	6	8	10	11	9	9	11	11	6	9
CRM8	Transparency	8	11	9	9	10	11	11	7	6	7
CRM9	Awareness	7	10	11	8	10	10	10	8	5	9
CRM10	Reform Political System	11	7	7	5	5	5	5	5	4	36

*Source: Author's Calculation*

However, CRM10 also received the most Rank 10 votes, indicating divided opinions on its practicality.

### Barriers in adopting an occupation and business in Nepal

As revealed in the Table-6.6, political instability, corruption, and complex laws are perceived as the top barriers to business and employment.

**Table 6.6: Barriers and Perceived Difficulty Levels**

Rank	Barrier	Great Difficulty (%)	Moderate Difficulty (%)	Not Difficult (%)
1	Political Instability (PI)	48.70%	41.20%	10.10%
2	Corruption (CO)	42.30%	44.80%	12.90%
3	Complex Laws (CL)	38.60%	50.40%	11.00%
4	High Taxes (HT)	35.20%	47.10%	17.70%
5	Loan Management (LM)	32.90%	52.30%	14.80%
6	Frequent Gov. Changes (FCG)	30.50%	55.60%	13.90%
7	Crime (CR)	25.80%	40.10%	34.10%

*Source: Author's Calculation*

Political instability, corruption, and complex laws are perceived as the top barriers to business and employment. High taxes and loan management are also significant concerns, while crime is seen as a lesser barrier.

### Regression Model Specifications

As depicted in the Table 6.7 the logistic regression model shows good explanatory power (McFadden pseudo  $R^2 = 0.28$ , AUC = 0.81).

**Table 6.7: Occupation and Business Difficulty**

Dependent Variable: (1=Great Difficulty, 0=Other)

Variable	Coefficient ( $\beta$ )	Std. Error	Odds Ratio ( $e^{\beta}$ )	p-value	Significance
Political Instability (PI)	0.51	0.12	1.67	0.002	**
Corruption (CO)	0.38	0.15	1.46	0.013	*
Complex Laws (CL)	0.29	0.14	1.34	0.038	*
High Taxes (HT)	0.18	0.11	1.20	0.107	

Variable	Coefficient ( $\beta$ )	Std. Error	Odds Ratio ( $e^{\beta}$ )	p-value	Significance
Loan Management (LM)	0.15	0.10	1.16	0.141	
Frequent Gov. Changes (FCG)	0.12	0.09	1.13	0.201	
Constant	-1.02	0.25	0.36	<0.001	***

Source: Author's Calculation

Political instability, corruption, and complex laws significantly increase the odds of facing great difficulty in business or employment.

### ***Marginal Effects Explanation***

As depicted in the Table 6.8, a one-unit increase in political instability increases the probability of facing great difficulty by 18 percentage points.

**Table 6.8: Marginal Effects Table**

Variable	Avg. Marginal Effect (AME)	Std. Error	p-value
Political Instability (PI)	0.18**	0.05	0.001
Corruption (CO)	0.13*	0.06	0.016
Complex Laws (CL)	0.10*	0.05	0.042

Source: Author's Calculation

Similarly, corruption and complex laws increase the probability by 13 and 10 percentage points, respectively.

## **Conclusion**

This study highlights the complex interplay between governance practices, corruption, and sustainable development perceptions in Nepal. While infrastructure improvements are recognized, they have not translated into higher satisfaction with government services. Political instability, corruption, and complex legal frameworks are significant barriers to business and employment. Respondents favored enforcement-oriented anti-corruption measures, such as proper investigations and strict legal action. The perceived consequences of corruption include developmental stagnation, governance failure, and social inequality. Reforms focusing on transparency, accountability, and political stability are essential for sustainable development. Policy Implications were recommended in the following ways:

Strengthening investigation mechanisms with legal autonomy and modern tools, enforcing strict laws and deterrent punishments for corrupt practices, improving the efficiency and timeliness of public service delivery, and expanding digital governance tools to reduce human discretion and promoting awareness programs and civic engagement to change social norms.

## References

- Bista, M., & Gurung, P. (2020). *Nepal's electoral transitions: Majoritarian to mixed systems*. *Electoral Studies Journal*, 45(2), 89-105.
- Bradhan, P. (1997). *Corruption: A Review of the Issues*. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 35(3), 1320–1346.
- Bukovansky, M. (2002). *Corruption, Norms, and the Constructive Role of Law in International Political Economy*. *International Affairs*, 78(3), 457–473.
- Gellner, D. N. (2019). *The transitions of Nepal: From monarchy to federalism*. *South Asia Research*, 39(1), 33-50.
- Gupta, A. (1995). *Blurred Boundaries: The Discourse of Corruption, the Culture of Politics, and the Imagined State*. *American Ethnologist*, 22(2), 375–402.
- Johnston, M. (2002). *Building a Culture of Integrity*. In *Corruption and Development: The Anti-Corruption Campaigns* (pp. 7–22). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Johnson, R., & Ahmed, M. (2020). *Governance, democracy, and development in the 21st century*. Oxford University Press.
- Jones, T. (2017). *Understanding the complexity of sustainable development: A multidimensional approach*. *Development Studies Journal*, 34(3), 254-267.
- Karki, B., & Sijapati, M. (2019). *Governance and instability in post-conflict Nepal*. *Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies*, 28(3), 177-195.
- Koirala, S., & Adhikari, T. (2018). *Resource distribution, social groups, and conflict in Nepal*. *Nepal Journal of Development Studies*, 23(4), 65-82.
- Kumar, S. (2016). *Developing nations and the quest for sustainable development*. *International Development Review*, 12(2), 98-115.

- Lederman, D., Loayza, N., & Soares, R. R. (2001). *Accountability and Corruption: Political Institutions Matter*. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 2708.
- Levitt, P. (1999). *Social Remittances: A Local-Level, Migration-Driven Form of Cultural Diffusion*. *International Migration Review*, 32(4), 926–948.
- Myrdal, G. (1974). *What is Development?* *Journal of Economic Issues*, 8(4), 729–736.
- North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge University Press.
- OECD. (2020). *Fragile states and governance challenges*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Rose-Ackerman, S. (2016). *Corruption and Government: Causes, Consequences, and Reform* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Sharma, K. (2017). *Post-conflict governance in Nepal: Challenges and prospects*. Kathmandu University Press.
- Sharma, K., & Basnet, R. (2017). *Nepal's journey to democracy: Challenges and reforms*. Kathmandu University Press.
- Sharma, R., & Khadka, P. (2021). *Political instability and business interests in Nepal*. *Economic Governance Journal*, 39(1), 77-91.
- Smith, A. (2019). *Democracy, governance, and sustainable development: An intertwined future*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Subedi, B. P. (2001). *Corruption in Nepal: An Overview*. Transparency International Nepal.
- Thapa, M. (2020). *Corruption and its role in Nepal's political instability*. *South Asian Governance Review*, 12(1), 99-115.
- Transparency International. (2019). *Corruption perceptions index 2019*. Retrieved from <https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2019>
- Transparency International. (2020). *Global corruption report: Government procurement*. Transparency International.



United Nations. (2018). *Principles of good governance in sustainable development*. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2019). *Sustainable development and good governance: A framework for action*. UNDP.

World Bank. (2021). *Governance and development indicators*. World Bank Report.

World Bank. (2021). *Governance challenges and instability in fragile states: The case of Nepal*. World Bank Report.