Empowering Progress: Unveiling the Transformative Influence of Social Audit in India

Amit Kumar[1], Bidushee Singh[2]

[1,2]Research Scholar, University of Lucknow

Abstract

Social audit is vital for evaluating governmental and non-governmental initiatives for societal welfare. It involves assessing policies, programs, and projects to ensure transparency, accountability, and responsiveness to the needs of marginalized communities. In India, social audit acts as a bridge between policy-making and implementation, addressing socio-economic disparities. It promotes transparency and accountability in resource usage, curbing corruption and ensuring effective fund allocation, particularly in key sectors like education, healthcare, and rural development.

However, challenges such as limited awareness, resource constraints, and resistance from vested interests pose obstacles to the widespread adoption and effectiveness of social audit initiatives. Hence, there is a need for concerted efforts from policymakers, practitioners, and the wider society to strengthen the institutional frameworks, build capacities, and foster a conducive environment for the practice of social audit across different sectors and regions in India.

This paper delves into the evolution and conceptual framework of social audit and its impact on governance in India, using suitable case studies of best practices in different states. With a focus on enhancing governance practices and fostering inclusive development, social audit is a vital tool for promoting citizen participation and empowerment.

The relevance of social audits in India cannot be overstated. Its transformative potential lies in its ability to empower communities, enhance governance effectiveness, and promote social justice, thereby contributing to the overall development and well-being of the nation.

Keywords- Social Audit, Governance practices, transparency, accountability, inclusive development.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Understanding Social Audit

In a democratic society, accountability and transparency are essential pillars of good governance. In India, where socioeconomic inequality, bureaucratic opacity, and corruption often obstruct equitable service delivery, the concept of social audit has emerged as a grassroots mechanism that empowers citizens to evaluate the efficacy and fairness of public programs (Aiyar & Mehta, 2015). Social audit is a process whereby a government program is audited with the active participation of the intended beneficiaries of the program. Unlike traditional audits that focus on financial compliance, social audits emphasize participatory oversight, encouraging direct community involvement in monitoring developmental activities (Aiyar & Mehta, 2015).

As compared to other accountability tools, social audit is quite complex and involves several stages. Pioneered by NGO, Mazdoor Kisan Shakti Sangathan (MKSS) in Rajasthan, social audit involves obtaining information on government expenditure specifically on budgets, allotments, estimates of works, payments etc, about the program (Jenkins & Goetz, 1999; Bhushan & Kumar, 2016). Once obtained, official information and records on expenditures and entitlements are verified against the testimonies of beneficiaries. The process culminates with the organization of public hearings where the findings are discussed and discrepancies are exposed in the presence of service providers, officials and beneficiaries. This process enables citizens to not only obtain information on government programs but also use this information to 'enforce' accountability of public officials. Inspired by MKSS, a number of civil society organizations have begun using social audits and public hearings as tools to audit the performance of different government services and programs (Jenkins & Goetz, 1999; Bhushan & Kumar, 2016).

1.2 Significance of the study

Moreover, the study addresses the empirical gap in understanding sectoral and inter-state variations in the impact and effectiveness of social audits. While states like Andhra Pradesh have institutionalized audit units and achieved systemic gains (MoRD, 2021), others have lagged due to inadequate legal backing and weak civil society presence. Importantly, the study also contributes to the literature on participatory governance and social accountability by situating Indian experiences within global debates. Drawing on examples from Brazil, Uganda, and the Philippines (Ackerman, 2005; Björkman & Svensson, 2009), it demonstrates how social audits not only expose inefficiencies and corruption but also catalyze institutional reform and community empowerment.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

- To trace the evolution and conceptual foundations of social audit practices, both globally and in the Indian context, with a focus on institutionalization and legislative support mechanisms.
- To evaluate the impact of social audits on improving transparency, accountability, community participation, and service delivery across key sectors such as rural employment, health, and education.
- To identify challenges that hinder effective implementation of social audits, including bureaucratic resistance, lack of awareness, resource constraints, and political interference.

2. Methodology

The study adopts a qualitative-descriptive research design with secondary data analysis to explore the role and impact of social audits across various governance processes in India. The research methodology is based on a thematic review of government reports (e.g., reports from MoRD, CAG, NIRDPR), peer-reviewed journals, case studies, and grey literature from reputed policy think tanks and civil society (PRIA, MKSS, Accountability Initiative). Additionally, comparative insights from global practices inform the analytical framework.

The paper offers an in-depth analysis of best practices, in the form of case studies, adopted by different states for the institutionalisation and implementation of social audit practices. The paper has also devised a four-dimensional analytical framework to critically evaluate the transformative influence of social audits in India. This framework focuses on four key aspects: transparency and information disclosure, accountability mechanisms and grievance redressal, community empowerment and participation, and policy outcomes and institutional reform. By examining these dimensions, the study assesses how social audits function not merely as oversight tools, but as catalysts for systemic change in governance. These analytical lenses are applied across essential sectors such as rural employment, education, healthcare, and

welfare to understand the broader implications of social audits in promoting participatory governance and enhancing the effectiveness of public service delivery.

3. Evolution of Social Audit

3.1 International Context

To casual observers social auditing is a new phenomenon. In reality, the concept of a Social Audit was formed much earlier in the 1940's when a depression era academic Theodore Kreps called on companies to acknowledge their responsibilities to citizens (Gray, Owen, & Adams, 1996; Bauer & Fenn, 1972). In 1960-70's a fresh wave of interest in social and ethical accounting, auditing and reporting (SEAAR) emerged. Later on, concept of 'stakeholders' emerges and organizations like the US Chamber of Commerce made the link between improvements in corporate social performance and long-term profitability.

Initially introduced in the United States and United Kingdom, the social audit emerged as a voluntary mechanism used by private companies to assess their social and ethical responsibilities, going beyond financial performance (Bauer & Fenn, 1972). It sought to evaluate how corporate activities aligned with societal interests, particularly in areas such as labour rights, environmental impact, and community development. While most of the early theorizing about Social Auditing came from the US, most of the practical experimentation took place in Europe.

In the 1990s, the concept of social audit expanded from corporate accountability to become a tool for public governance and participatory development, particularly under the influence of international development organizations. The World Bank and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) began promoting social audits in developing countries to ensure transparency and citizen engagement in public service delivery (World Bank, 2004). This shift was part of a broader move toward "social accountability" approaches, which emphasized the active role of citizens in holding governments accountable for the use of public resources.

Countries like Brazil, Philippines, and South Africa adopted various forms of social auditing through participatory budgeting, citizen report cards, and public expenditure tracking surveys (Ackerman, 2005). These methods, although contextually distinct, reflected a common trend: placing citizens at the centre of monitoring government actions. The evolution of these practices contributed significantly to the global understanding of social audits as tools of democratization, accountability, and governance reform.

3.2 Comparative Global Experiences

Globally, similar accountability tools have seen mixed results. In Uganda, Björkman and Svensson's (2009) randomized study found that community scorecards led to a 33% decline in child mortality. In Indonesia, Olken (2007) compared community monitoring with top-down audits and found the latter more effective in reducing corruption but less inclusive. Brazil's participatory budgeting model enables citizens to decide on municipal expenditures, increasing civic trust and redistributive justice (Wampler, 2007). In the Philippines, social audits conducted by civil society groups led to improved textbook delivery and infrastructure accountability (Chavez et al., 2009).

3.3 Indian Context

India's engagement with social audit has deep traditional roots, often traced to community-level monitoring practices within Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs), where local communities had customary rights to question public expenditures. However, the modern and structured practice of social audits in India can be linked to the grassroots activism of the Mazdoor Kisan Shakti Sangathan

(MKSS) in Rajasthan during the 1990s. Through innovative practices like Jan Sunwai (public hearings), MKSS activists exposed irregularities in public works and demanded transparency in wage payments and materials used under government schemes (Jenkins & Goetz, 1999). This movement laid the foundation for the Right to Information (RTI) Act, 2005, which became a powerful legal instrument enabling citizens to access official records and verify government claims.

The institutionalization of social audits in India received a major boost with the enactment of the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA), 2005. Under Section 17 of the Act, social audits were made legally mandatory, requiring Gram Sabhas to regularly conduct them to review the implementation and outcomes of MGNREGA works. Following the enactment of MGNREGA, states like Andhra Pradesh pioneered institutional frameworks by establishing independent Social Audit Units (SAUs), which trained local resource persons to carry out audits across districts. Andhra Pradesh's model gained recognition from the Comptroller and Auditor General (CAG) and the Ministry of Rural Development, and it is often cited as a best practice in participatory governance (CAG India, 2016; MoRD, 2013). Further, the Supreme Court of India, in several PILs, has acknowledged social audits as instruments of constitutional accountability (Khosla, 2013). Moreover, the National Institute of Rural Development and Panchayati Raj (NIRDPR) has been pivotal in capacity building through training modules and standardized procedures (NIRDPR, 2020).

4. Conceptual framework of social audit in India

4.1 Objectives of Social Audit

Social audits in India are designed with the intent of making governance more transparent, citizen-centric, and responsive. One of their core objectives is to identify the gaps between what is needed on the ground and what resources are actually allocated and utilized in public programs (NIRDPR, 2020). Further, it raises awareness among both beneficiaries and service providers about the scope, implementation, and entitlements under various schemes (PRIA, 2017). Social audits also strive to improve the performance of local development programs by bringing inefficiencies and corruption to light (Bhushan & Kumar, 2016). In addition, audits encourage a critical review of policy decisions from the perspective of citizens, particularly the rural and marginalized populations, ensuring that governance reflects the priorities and voices of those it intends to serve (Jenkins & Goetz, 1999). Finally, they help communities understand the cost of not receiving timely services, which is often overlooked. This estimation of "opportunity cost" motivates stronger demand for accountability and timely service delivery (NIRDPR, 2020).

4.2 Salient Features of Social Audit

The essence of social audits lies in their collaborative and evolving nature, always aiming to improve governance through public engagement. As identified in global and Indian practices, there are eight key features that define a strong social audit process as discussed below;

1. It is multi-perspective or polyvocal, meaning it includes inputs from all stakeholders rather than just officials or experts (PRIA, 2017).
2. It must be comprehensive, covering the full cycle of implementation, from planning to outcomes.
3. The process is participatory, ensuring that people—not just administrators—are involved in planning and executing the audits (NIRDPR, 2020).
4. Social audits are also multidirectional, meaning that feedback and data flow between citizens, officials, and implementers in multiple directions.
5. They are conducted on a regular basis, not as one-off events, to build consistent accountability.

6. The findings should be comparative, allowing performance to be tracked over time or across different regions.
7. Verification is crucial; all data and findings must be independently checked to maintain integrity.
8. Disclosure ensures that audit results are made public and are accessible to the community (PRIA, 2017; NIRDPR, 2020).

4.3 Legislative Backing for Social Audit in India

India is among the few countries where social audits are not just recommended but also legally mandated in certain sectors. This legal support has been crucial for their growth and legitimacy.

The 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act (1992) laid the foundation by empowering local self-governance through Panchayati Raj Institutions (Government of India, 1992). This provided a grassroots structure for citizen participation in development planning and monitoring. The Right to Information (RTI) Act (2005) gave legal teeth to the demand for transparency, allowing citizens to access government records and enabling informed auditing (Government of India, 2005). A landmark development came with the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA), 2005, which made social audits statutorily mandatory under Section 17. It requires Gram Sabhas to conduct regular audits of MGNREGA works and outcomes (MoRD, 2013). Further, the National Food Security Act (2013) expanded the scope of social audits by making them applicable to public food and nutrition programs, strengthening accountability in welfare delivery (MoRD, 2021).

5. Impact of Social Audits on Governance

Social audits have emerged as transformative instruments of participatory governance in India. They play a critical role in improving transparency, accountability, citizen empowerment, and policy responsiveness. By enabling communities to verify official claims regarding the implementation of public schemes—such as the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA)—social audits uncover discrepancies in fund utilization, detect ghost beneficiaries, and expose corruption in real-time service delivery (Dreze & Khera, 2017). For instance, in Rajasthan and Jharkhand, social audits have led to the detection of false billing, forged muster rolls, and non-existent labor payments, compelling authorities to take corrective action.

At a systemic level, social audits have influenced policy design and institutional reforms. Evidence from pilot audits under the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan in Bihar and health monitoring initiatives under the National Rural Health Mission (NRHM) in Maharashtra has shown that citizen feedback during social audits often translates into mid-course corrections, improved infrastructure provisioning, and more equitable service delivery (George et al., 2015). However, despite these impacts, their effectiveness varies significantly across states, depending on political will, administrative support, and the vibrancy of civil society.

Case Study 1: Rajasthan – Origins in Grassroots Movements

In Rajasthan, the Mazdoor Kisan Shakti Sangathan (MKSS) pioneered social audits through public hearings in the early 1990s (DeeptiRathore, n.d.). These events, attended by villagers, media, and officials, publicly questioned discrepancies in government expenditures and wage payments (Bhushan & Kumar, 2016). MKSS's efforts contributed significantly to the formulation of Freedom of Information Act, 2002 which finally culminated into the Right to Information Act, 2005, and provided a template for participatory governance (Singh & Patnaik, 2019).

The mass social audit under the employment guarantee scheme in Dungarpur is the most significant feature of the MNREGA ("IRJET- Social audit: Its relevance and challenges," 2020). Dungarpur was one of the

200 districts of India in which MNREGA was rolled out initially. It is the place of origin for the RTI act as well. One of the factors responsible for making social audit a reality in Rajasthan is the presence of activist groups like MKSS that monitored the spending of public money on drought and relief works. The involvement of the working class in demanding employment as an entitlement also helped the cause. Moreover, for the first time in a public program, the MNREGA included transparency and public scrutiny as the statutory provisions under section 17 and section 23 of MGNREGA guidelines.

The tampering with the muster rolls was one of the cankers eating into the efficiency. After the process was adopted, the corruption dropped to as low as less than 3 percent (Bhushan & Kumar, 2016; Singh & Patnaik, 2019). Building water harvesting structures is also an important priority in the drought prone district. It also had some significant aspects like reduction of out migration and above all the participation of women in the employment guarantee scheme. The need for effective management of tasks, timely payment of wages and provision of support facilities at work sites has also been emphasized.

Case Study 2: Institutionalized Social Audits under MGNREGA – The Andhra Pradesh Model

Andhra Pradesh is a benchmark for institutionalized social auditing in India. The state created an autonomous Social Audit Unit (SAU) with trained resource persons and systematic processes, including social audit calendars, report dissemination, and follow-up actions (MoRD, 2021). As per Aiyar and Mehta (2015), this model resulted in the identification of over 3,000 cases of fraud and over ₹30 crore in recoveries between 2007–2014. The SAU operated independently of the local implementing agencies, thus ensuring integrity in the process (Pankaj & Tankha, 2010).

Andhra Pradesh has, since the inception of the MNREGA program in 2006, been conducting systematic and regular social audits on its MNREGA works across the state. A strong political will and committed top-level bureaucracy provided the impetus for this venture. The institutional space for developing a team and managing the social audits was found in the Strategy and Performance Innovation Unit (SPIU) of the Department of Rural Development. Initially, the Department collaborated with MKSS, the civic group in Rajasthan that pioneered social auditing in India, to hold training sessions for officials and interested civil society activists, and to help with the design and conduct of pilot social audits. These trainings culminated in the setting up of strong cadre of 25-member state resource persons, drawn exclusively from the civil society, which is crucial to ensuring a high degree of autonomy and objectivity in the exercise. In addition, 260 district-level resource persons were also trained. The actual audit is conducted by educated youth volunteers in the village, who are identified and trained by this pool of resource persons. The first social audit was conducted in July 2006. Since then, an average of 54 social audits are conducted every month across all 13 MNREGA districts. This is a unique instance in that nowhere else in India have social audits taken place on such a large scale with such frequency. And although research needs to address whether such deep institutionalization of accountability mechanisms has indeed resulted in improved accountability in service delivery, emerging evidence points to significant and lasting improvements in citizens' awareness levels, their confidence and self-respect, and importantly their ability to engage with local officials.

Case Study-3: Social Audits by Independent Society in Telangana

Society for Social Audit, Accountability and Transparency (SSAAT) is an independent society set up by the Department of Rural Development, Government of Telangana to conduct social audits of MGNREGS. In recent years SSAAT has been entrusted with the mandate to conduct social audits of the welfare schemes of other departments within the Government of Telangana. This includes the SSP (social security pension), Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP) and Aam Admi Bima Yojana (AABY).

SSAAT lends its technical skills and expertise in helping programmes and governments both nationally and internationally (SSAAT, 2015). At the national level, the programmes include Government of India's centrally administered (coordinated) mid-day meal scheme (MDM) which is the world's largest hunger intervention programme for children. Government of Jharkhand's Swarna Jayanti Gram Swarojgar Yojana (SGSY) scheme for promoting community managed rural livelihoods (SSAAT, 2015). On the international platform SSAAT has provided technical guidance to many programmes including Constituency Development Fund in Kenya and refuse collection and sanitation programme in South Africa. This was really a proud moment in the history of the country.

Case Study 4: Social Audit in Meghalaya

Meghalaya became the first state in the country to have a dedicated law for social audit i.e. Meghalaya Community Participation and Public Services Social Audit Act, 2017, that makes social audit of government programmes a part of government practice. Prior to this law, social audits of government programmes were done at the initiative of the civil society organizations but these social audits had no official legal sanction. The law was followed by pilot social audits for 26 schemes in 18 villages of the state. It is presently applicable to 11 departments and 21 schemes in Meghalaya. The introduction of this law has brought about radical changes in the field and has resulted in better monitoring by the people who are the beneficiaries.

The overall impact of social audits can be broadly summarised in following headings;

Transparency and Information Disclosure-

Social audits promote transparency by making information publicly accessible and intelligible. Under MGNREGA, for instance, job card details, wage payments, and material procurement are displayed on Gram Panchayat notice boards and digital portals (MoRD, 2021). Aiyar and Samji (2009) observed that transparency alone could deter corruption by increasing the perceived probability of detection (Aiyar & Samji, 2009; World Bank, 2010; MoRD, 2021). Moreover, studies indicate that in states like Andhra Pradesh and Telangana, digital data management combined with community verification has improved access to information (Aiyar & Mehta, 2015).

Accountability and Grievance Redressal-

Social audits provide structured forums for beneficiaries to question service providers and officials. Public hearings or Jan Sunwais is integral to the process. Dreze and Khera (2017) documented multiple cases in Rajasthan and Jharkhand where beneficiaries exposed ghost workers and false material bills through public testimonies. Grievance redressal, however, varies. States like Andhra Pradesh have independent Social Audit Units (SAUs) with autonomy, while others lack institutional clarity (Pankaj & Tankha, 2010). Moreover, lack of follow-up action and political interference often hinder accountability (Singh & Patnaik, 2019).

Community Empowerment and Participation-

Empowerment lies at the core of social audit. The process educates citizens about their entitlements and strengthens their civic voice. PRIA (2017) found that community members who participated in social audits reported a greater sense of confidence in engaging with public institutions. The case of the Mazdoor Kisan Shakti Sangathan (MKSS) in Rajasthan is illustrative. Their early efforts in the 1990s led to the Right to Information (RTI) movement and eventually institutionalization of social audits under MGNREGA (Bhushan & Kumar, 2016). Still, empowerment is uneven. Factors like caste, gender, literacy, and local power dynamics affect who participates and how effectively (Sharma & Singh, 2021).

Policy Outcomes and Institutional Reform-

Where implemented effectively, social audits have led to improvements in service delivery, fund utilization, and policy correction. A World Bank study (2010) noted that in districts where social audits were conducted regularly, leakages in wage payments under MGNREGA reduced significantly. In the education sector, pilot audits under SSA in Bihar and Madhya Pradesh helped identify infrastructure gaps and absenteeism (Accountability Initiative, 2018). Similarly, in health, community monitoring in Maharashtra revealed systemic issues in maternal healthcare, prompting corrective action (George et al., 2015).

Challenges in the implementation of social audit in India

Despite some remarkable advancements due to legal & institutional support, social audits face systemic hurdles including poor awareness, resistance from bureaucrats, political patronage, and lack of legal enforcement (Sharma & Singh, 2021). Additionally, the uneven quality of audits and superficial public participation dilute their impact (Goetz & Jenkins, 2001).

The sophisticated nature of this tool at times makes it difficult to apply in situations where there is limited capacity on the part of local communities, civil society organizations and government. Moreover, as social audits are resource and labour-intensive exercise, finding sufficient funds to support the audit exercise can be a genuine problem. Further, technical expertise and training, required to interpret information gathered through the audit exercise, are often difficult to find at local levels. Finally, in the absence of a strong civil society and a systematic legal enforcement mechanism, social audits might remain an idea concept than reality.

6. Conclusion & Suggestion

Social audits have emerged as transformative tools for deepening democratic governance in India by enabling transparency, enhancing accountability, and fostering grassroots empowerment. grassroots activism, particularly led by the Mazdoor Kisan Shakti Sangathan (MKSS) to become institutionalized mechanisms within flagship programs such as MGNREGA (Jenkins & Goetz, 1999; Bhushan & Kumar, 2016). India's social audit journey is globally significant for demonstrating how legal mandates, grassroots mobilization, and institutional innovation can converge to build a more transparent and accountable public administration system. Social audits represent a powerful convergence of democratic participation, legal entitlement, and administrative accountability in India's public service delivery landscape. While their transformative potential has been demonstrated in states like Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan, and Telangana, their broader impact remains inconsistent due to systemic challenges such as bureaucratic resistance, limited public awareness, and lack of institutional capacity. To strengthen the practice and sustainability of social audits, it is crucial to embed them more deeply within governance structures beyond flagship schemes like MGNREGA. This requires a multi-pronged strategy: expanding legal mandates to cover other welfare programs, ensuring timely access to government data, investing in capacity building at the grassroots level, and fostering strong partnerships between civil society and local governments. Above all, social audits must be seen not merely as monitoring tools but as continuous platforms for citizen engagement, enabling communities to shape the governance they are part of.

REFERENCE

1. Ackerman, J. (2005). Social accountability in the public sector: A conceptual discussion. World Bank.

Retrieved from https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/327471468779445304/pdf/338180rev0Social0accountability.pdf

2. Accountability Initiative. (2018). PAISA for education: Tracking funds, availability and expenditure for elementary education in Bihar and Madhya Pradesh. Retrieved from https://accountabilityindia.in/paisa/

3. Aiyar, Y., & Mehta, S. K. (2015). Spectators or participants? Examining the effects of social audits on citizen-state relations and the local politics of corruption in India. Accountability Initiative. Retrieved from https://accountabilityindia.in/publication/spectators-or-participants/

4. Aiyar, Y., & Samji, S. (2009). Transparency and accountability in NREGA: A case study of Andhra Pradesh. Accountability Initiative. Retrieved from https://accountabilityindia.in/publication/transparency-and-accountability-in-nrega-a-case-study-of-andhra-pradesh/

5. Bauer, R. A., & Fenn, D. H. (1972). The corporate social audit. Russell Sage Foundation.

6. Bhushan, C., & Kumar, A. (2016). The right to know: Institutionalizing social audits in India. Centre for Science and Environment.

7. Björkman, M., & Svensson, J. (2009). Power to the people: Evidence from a randomized field experiment on community-based monitoring in Uganda. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 124(2), 735–769. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1162/qjec.2009.124.2.735

8. Chavez, R., Chua, J., & Santiago, A. (2009). Social audits in the Philippines: A learning experience. Affiliated Network for Social Accountability in East Asia and the Pacific (ANSA–EAP). Retrieved from https://www.ansa-eap.net/assets/207/Social_Audits_in_the_Philippines.pdf

9. Comptroller and Auditor General of India. (2016). Compliance audit on Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme in Andhra Pradesh. Retrieved from https://cag.gov.in/en/audit-report/details/2063

10. DeeptiRathore. (n.d.). Mazdoor kisan Shakti Sangathan (MKSS). World Bank. http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/484901468050066053

11. Dreze, J., & Khera, R. (2017). Recent social audits of the MGNREGA: Notes from the field. Economic and Political Weekly, 52(6), 77–80. Retrieved from https://www.epw.in/journal/2017/6/notes-recent-social-audits-mgnrega.html

12. Dryzek, J. S. (2000). Deliberative democracy and beyond: Liberals, critics, contestations. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1093/019925043X.001.0001

13. Fung, A. (2004). Empowered participation: Reinventing urban democracy. Princeton University Press. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400826740

14. George, A., Scott, K., Mehra, V., & Sriram, V. (2015). Community participation in health systems research: A systematic review assessing the state of research, the nature of interventions involved and the features of engagement with communities. PLOS ONE, 10(10), e0141091. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0141091

15. Goetz, A. M., & Jenkins, R. (2001). Hybrid forms of accountability: Citizen engagement in institutions of public-sector oversight in India. Public Management Review, 3(3), 363–383. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/14616670110071847

16. Government of India. (1992). 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act. Retrieved from https://legislative.gov.in/constitution-seventy-third-amendment-act-1992

17. Government of India. (2005). The Right to Information Act, 2005. Retrieved from https://rti.gov.in

18. Gray, R., Owen, D., & Adams, C. (1996). Accounting and accountability: Changes and challenges in corporate social and environmental reporting. Prentice Hall.

19. IRJET- Social audit: Its relevance and challenges. (2020, January 1). Academia.edu - Find Research Papers, Topics, Researchers. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/44200550/IRJET_Social_Audit_Its_Relevance_and_Challenges

20. Jenkins, R., & Goetz, A. M. (1999). Accounts and accountability: Theoretical implications of the right-to-information movement in India. Third World Quarterly, 20(3), 603–622. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/01436599913713

21. Khosla, M. (2013). The Indian Constitution and the right to information. In A. Bhan et al. (Eds.), Accountability and rights in India (pp. 21–44). Oxford University Press.

22. Ministry of Rural Development (MoRD). (2013). Report on social audit of MGNREGA. Government of India. Retrieved from https://nrega.nic.in/netnrega/writereaddata/circulars/SA_report2013.pdf

23. Ministry of Rural Development (MoRD). (2021). Social audit under MGNREGA. Government of India. Retrieved from http://www.socialaudit.ap.gov.in/SocialAudit

24. National Institute of Rural Development and Panchayati Raj (NIRDPR). (2020). Social audit manual. Retrieved from https://nirdpr.org.in/socialaudit

25. Olken, B. A. (2007). Monitoring corruption: Evidence from a field experiment in Indonesia. Journal of Political Economy, 115(2), 200–249. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1086/517935

26. Pankaj, A., & Tankha, R. (2010). Empowerment effects of the NREGS on women workers: A study in four states. Economic and Political Weekly, 45(30), 45–55. Retrieved from https://www.epw.in/journal/2010/30/special-articles/empowerment-effects-nregs-women-workers.html

27. Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA). (2017). Social accountability: A practitioner's handbook. Retrieved from https://www.pria.org/knowledge_resource/1514527157_Social%20Accountability-%20A%20Practitioner's%20Handbook.pdf

28. Sharma, A., & Singh, R. (2021). Sustaining community participation in social audits: Lessons from Maharashtra. Journal of Development Policy and Practice, 6(1), 93–112. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/2455133320983266

29. Sridhar, C. N. (2020, May). Social audit: Its relevance and challenges. International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology (IRJET), 7(5). Retrieved from https://www.irjet.net/archives/V7/i5/IRJET-V7I599.pdf

30. Singh, R., & Patnaik, S. (2019). Social audits in India: Innovations and challenges. Accountability Initiative. Retrieved from https://accountabilityindia.in/blog/social-audits-in-india-innovations-and-challenges/

31. SSAAT. (2015). Annual report on social audits and transparency initiatives. Society for Social Audit, Accountability and Transparency.

32. Society for Social Audit, Accountability and Transparency (SSAAT). (2015). Annual report on social audits and transparency initiatives. Government of Telangana. Retrieved from http://www.socialaudit.ap.gov.in/SocialAudit

33. Wampler, B. (2007). Participatory budgeting in Brazil: Contestation, cooperation, and accountability. Penn State Press.

34. World Bank. (2004). From shouting to counting: A new frontier in social development. Retrieved from https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/851561468781739918/pdf/299920PAPER0From0shouting01public1.pdf

35. World Bank. (2010). Social accountability and service delivery: Experimental evidence from India. Retrieved from https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/724661468042262483/social-accountability-and-service-delivery-experimental-evidence-from-india