July Cycle (2026) Journal of Sanatana Dharma ¦ Volume 2 ¦ Issue 1 ¦ 2026

Governance and Institutional Effectiveness in Hindu Temples: A Five-C Diagnostic and Seven-S Policy Framework

Dr. Niyati Pandya [1]

Dr. Vikrant Pandya [2]

ABSTRACT

Hindu temples in India function as complex public-facing institutions that extend beyond ritual worship to encompass governance, service delivery, cultural custodianship, community engagement, and public trust. Despite their societal significance, systematic analytical approaches for examining temple governance and institutional effectiveness remain limited within public administration scholarship. This study addresses this gap by applying an integrated diagnostic and policy-oriented approach to the analysis of Hindu temple governance. The paper applies a Five-C Diagnostic Framework consisting of *Cleanliness, Crowd Management, Community Participation, Character of Governance,* and *Cultural Custodianship* to examine institutional functioning through qualitative, field-based analysis. Using an in-depth case study of a major Hindu temple in Gujarat, the framework is employed to identify systemic patterns, strengths, and constraints shaping governance outcomes. The diagnostic exercise emphasizes observation-led assessment and institutional interpretation rather than evaluative ranking or prescriptive judgement. Building on the diagnostic insights generated through the Five-C analysis, the study applies a complementary Seven-S Policy Framework consisting of *Seva, Swachhta, Sanrakshan, Samarpan, Sanskar, Sahayog,* and *Satatya* to articulate principled governance orientation. The Seven-S framework operates at a normative level, translating diagnostic understanding into policy direction while deliberately refraining from specifying implementation mechanisms. The study contributes to public administration scholarship by positioning Hindu temples as analytically relevant public-facing institutions and by demonstrating a structured approach that separates institutional diagnosis from policy orientation. The frameworks presented offer a replicable and context-sensitive analytical lens applicable to other non-state institutions that operate at the intersection of governance, service delivery, culture, and public trust.

Keywords: Institutional Effectiveness; Public Administration; Religious Institutions; Temple Governance.

Introduction:

In contemporary India, Hindu temples increasingly function as public-facing institutions, combining religious practice with governance, service delivery, cultural responsibility, and community engagement. In practice, many large temples manage high visitor volumes and operate daily services that resemble the scale and complexity of local public institutions, particularly during peak periods and festivals. Yet, despite this institutional complexity, temple governance has received limited systematic attention within mainstream public administration scholarship in India. Recent scholarship has argued that religion, spirituality, and faith shape the functioning of public administration and deserve explicit analytical treatment in the field. This creates a legitimate basis for examining temples as governance institutions with public interface and institutional accountability (Ongaro & Tantardini, 2024).

Existing work on temples has often focused on legal status, historical development, theological meaning, or state regulation. While important, these approaches underemphasize operational governance functions through which temples continuously interact with the public. Where governance is discussed, it is frequently framed through the lens of state control of endowments and administrative structures, especially in southern India (Ramesh, 2020). From an institutional perspective, temples are hybrid organizations where legitimacy, stakeholder expectations, and operational capacity must be aligned, similar to other public-facing institutions (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Suchman, 1995; Scott, 2014). This makes the temple a relevant unit of analysis for public administration scholarship concerned with institutional effectiveness, accountability, and service orientation.

Operational pressures in large religious institutions are also well documented in adjacent

Access this article online

Quick Response Code:

Website: https://josd.info/

URL: www.josd.info/volume2issue1/13

1. *Independent Researcher, Email: niyativpandya@gmail.com*
2. *Independent Researcher, Email: email@vikrantpandya.com*

literatures on mass gatherings and crowd safety. Indian guidance documents treat crowd management at religious venues as a high-stakes governance function requiring planning, coordination, and communication (National Disaster Management Authority, 2014). Research on mass religious gatherings similarly highlights the need for systematic approaches to crowd dynamics and risk governance in Indian contexts (Gayathri, Aparna, & Verma, 2017).

This paper addresses the gap in analytical approaches to temple governance by applying an integrated diagnostic and policy-oriented framework that separates diagnosis from policy orientation. It uses a Five-C Diagnostic Framework to assess institutional functioning through qualitative, field-based analysis and complements this with a Seven-S Policy Framework to articulate principled policy direction without prescribing implementation mechanisms. Using an in-depth case study of a major Hindu temple in Gujarat, the study demonstrates how governance challenges can be diagnosed in a structured manner while respecting religious autonomy and institutional context. The paper contributes to public administration scholarship by positioning temples as legitimate subjects of institutional analysis and by offering a replicable framework that can be extended to other non-state, public-facing institutions and service ecosystems (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Emerson, Nabatchi, & Balogh, 2012).

Temple Governance and Public Administration: Literature Positioning

Public administration has increasingly recognized that governance and service delivery occur beyond the formal state through networks, third-party arrangements, and institutional ecosystems. The shift from traditional public administration to New Public Management and subsequent governance paradigms expanded attention to performance, accountability, contracting, and hybrid organizational forms (Hood, 1991; Dunleavy & Hood, 1994; Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017). Within this expanded field, non-state institutions that perform public-facing roles can be studied using core administrative concepts such as institutional legitimacy, accountability, stakeholder coordination, and service effectiveness (Osborne, 2010; Bovens, 2007; Behn, 2001).

A growing body of work also argues that religion and faith can shape governance, administrative behavior, and institutional arrangements, warranting explicit integration into public administration inquiry (Ongaro & Tantardini, 2024). This line of scholarship strengthens the conceptual legitimacy of examining religious institutions as governance sites. In parallel, research on faith-based organizations in public service delivery demonstrates that the public frequently evaluates services through the identity and perceived legitimacy of the provider, including faith-linked organizations, which has implications for public trust and accountability (Van Slyke & Roch, 2004; Amirkhanyan, Kim, & Lambright, 2009).

Temple governance in India is often discussed in relation to state regulation of religious endowments and administrative boards. Ramesh (2020) provides a governance framework focused on temples under state endowment departments and highlights institutional design questions such as the relationship between state oversight and public participation in temple administration. However, the literature remains limited in offering structured analytical tools that diagnose institutional effectiveness at the operational level while remaining sensitive to religious autonomy and institutional context. Sociological and anthropological work has advanced understanding of temples as public institutions embedded in community formation and public culture, reinforcing the idea that temples are not merely religious spaces but active institutional actors in public life (Reddy & Zavos, 2009).

From an institutional theory perspective, temples can be viewed as organizations operating in fields shaped by legitimacy pressures and societal expectations. Foundational work in institutionalism emphasizes how organizations adopt structures that signal legitimacy and stability, sometimes independent of technical efficiency (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Legitimacy is critical for public-facing institutions whose authority depends on trust, cultural acceptance, and perceived propriety (Suchman, 1995). These concepts are directly relevant to temple governance, where institutional credibility is linked to cleanliness, crowd experience, financial integrity, and cultural role, all of which influence trust among devotees and the wider public.

Accountability and institutional effectiveness are also central themes in public administration and nonprofit governance. Scholarship distinguishes between performance accountability, democratic accountability, and social accountability, and highlights the complexity of accountability in hybrid institutions with multiple stakeholders (Bovens, 2007; Ebrahim, 2010; Behn, 2001). In nonprofit and voluntary sector research, organizational effectiveness is treated as multidimensional and often contested, shaped by mission, stakeholder perceptions, and governance arrangements (Herman & Renz, 1999; Anheier, 2014; Salamon, 1995). Temples, particularly those operating welfare services such as food provision and accommodation, resemble mission-driven institutions with stakeholder-driven legitimacy, making nonprofit governance scholarship relevant for conceptual framing.

Further, participatory governance and co-production scholarship provides a lens for understanding

how public institutions mobilize citizen participation and shared responsibility. Co-production is often treated as a practical mechanism for improving service outcomes while strengthening legitimacy and trust (Bovaird, 2007; Brandsen & Honingh, 2016; Ostrom, 1996). This lens is directly relevant to temple ecosystems where volunteers, staff, vendors, and devotees jointly shape outcomes such as cleanliness, queue discipline, and cultural engagement. Collaborative governance theory similarly highlights how complex institutions require structured engagement across stakeholders to sustain effectiveness and trust (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Emerson et al., 2012).

Finally, the governance demands of mass religious gatherings underscore that operational effectiveness at sacred institutions involves risk management, communication systems, and coordination capacity. Indian national guidance treats crowd management at mass gatherings as an institutional governance requirement and provides a basis for framing crowd systems as administrative functions rather than merely logistical tasks (National Disaster Management Authority, 2014). Research on mass religious gathering safety similarly stresses evidence-based planning and an understanding of crowd dynamics, further reinforcing the governance relevance of operational domains included in this paper's diagnostic framework (Gayathri et al., 2017).

Together, these literatures establish a conceptual foundation for studying Hindu temples as public-facing governance institutions and reveal a gap: there is limited scholarship offering a structured diagnostic model for institutional effectiveness in temples that can be integrated with a principled policy framework. The present study responds by proposing and applying the Five-C and Seven-S frameworks as a bridge between institutional diagnosis and policy orientation.

Methodology and Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative case study design to examine governance and institutional effectiveness in a major Hindu temple in Gujarat. Case study methodology is appropriate where the research seeks to explain complex institutional functioning within a real-life context and where boundaries between the phenomenon and context are not clearly separable (Yin, 2018). The approach aligns with qualitative research traditions that prioritize contextual depth, interpretive analysis, and analytic generalization rather than statistical representativeness (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Patton, 2015).

Field-based engagement constituted the primary mode of data generation. The study relied on structured institutional walkthroughs, observation of functional zones and user flows, and interaction-led contextual understanding with relevant institutional actors. This observation-oriented approach is consistent with qualitative inquiry designs where institutions are treated as lived systems and where governance outcomes are examined through operational realities, stakeholder arrangements, and institutional practices (Patton, 2015). Publicly available institutional material was also reviewed for contextual understanding and to ensure alignment with the publicly articulated identity of the institution.

Analytically, the study follows a non-prescriptive stance. It does not present an audit, inspection, or compliance evaluation. Instead, it frames observed conditions as indicators of institutional design, coordination, and governance capacity. This is important because hybrid institutions such as temples operate under legitimacy expectations and cultural norms that require sensitivity in governance analysis (Suchman, 1995; Scott, 2014). The Five-C Diagnostic Framework was applied to organize findings across five governance-relevant domains, while the Seven-S Policy Framework was developed as a normative orientation tool that translates diagnostic insights into principled policy direction without specifying implementation mechanisms. The empirical application of the Five-C and Seven-S frameworks was conducted through a qualitative case study of Shri Khodiyar Mandir, administered by Shri Khodiyar Mandir Trust, Rajapara, Bhavnagar, Gujarat.

Ethically, the study is positioned as governance-oriented research aimed at supporting institutional strengthening and public value, while respecting religious autonomy and tradition. The analysis emphasizes institutional learning and systemic patterns rather than attributing fault to individuals or groups, consistent with governance scholarship that treats public-facing institutions as multi-actor ecosystems shaped by structures, incentives, and shared norms (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Emerson et al., 2012).

The Five-C Diagnostic Framework

This study uses the Five-C Diagnostic Framework, developed and conceptually grounded in earlier doctoral research on Hindu temple management, as an analytical tool to examine governance and institutional effectiveness in a public-facing religious institution. The framework is employed here for empirical application and interpretation rather than for theoretical derivation. Its purpose is to structure qualitative assessment of institutional conditions in a manner that is systematic, non-prescriptive, and sensitive to the cultural and organizational context of Hindu temples.

The Five-C framework comprises five analytically distinct yet interrelated dimensions: Cleanliness, Crowd Management, Community Participation, Character of Governance, and Cultural Custodianship. These dimensions were derived in prior research through synthesis of temple management practice, governance literature, and institutional theory, and are aligned with

core concerns of public administration such as service delivery, accountability, legitimacy, stakeholder engagement, and cultural responsibility (Scott, 2014; Behn, 2001; Bovens, 2007).

Each dimension represents a governance-relevant domain through which temples interact with the public and through which institutional effectiveness is experienced and evaluated. Cleanliness is treated as an indicator of institutional discipline and care rather than a purely technical function, reflecting the role of environmental conditions in shaping public perceptions of legitimacy (Suchman, 1995). Crowd Management captures the institution's capacity to regulate access, safety, and movement under fluctuating demand, a concern well documented in public administration and disaster governance literature (Gayathri et al., 2017; National Disaster Management Authority, 2014).

Community Participation reflects the degree to which stakeholders are meaningfully engaged in institutional life beyond monetary contribution, drawing on scholarship on co-production and collaborative governance (Ostrom, 1996; Bovaird, 2007; Ansell & Gash, 2008). Character of Governance refers to ethical conduct, transparency, communication practices, and accountability mechanisms that sustain trust in hybrid institutions (Bovens, 2007; Ebrahim, 2010). Cultural Custodianship recognizes that temples function as carriers of heritage and collective identity, where governance legitimacy is closely linked to the preservation and transmission of cultural values (Reddy & Zavos, 2009; Smith, 2006).

The Five-C framework is diagnostic in orientation. It does not seek to evaluate performance against benchmarks or to prescribe corrective measures. Instead, it structures observation and interpretation to identify patterns, strengths, and constraints that shape institutional functioning. This approach is consistent with institutional theory perspectives that emphasize understanding organizational behavior within its legitimacy environment before engaging in reform discourse (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Scott, 2014).

Diagnostic Findings from the Five-C Framework

Cleanliness

Application of the Five-C framework indicates that cleanliness outcomes within the temple ecosystem are shaped primarily by governance coordination rather than by the absence of intent or manpower. Sanitation staff and waste management mechanisms are present, yet maintenance outcomes vary across functional zones, particularly during periods of high footfall. Areas associated with food service, common accommodation, bathing facilities, and resting halls exhibit visible signs of overuse and uneven hygiene standards.

Public administration research suggests that sanitation in public institutions is closely linked to role clarity, institutional design, and behavioral reinforcement rather than to individual effort alone (Behn, 2001; Suchman, 1995). In the temple context, multiple actors including permanent staff, contract workers, vendors, and visitors operate within shared spaces without a unified cleanliness protocol or consistently communicated behavioral expectations. As a result, cleanliness outcomes depend heavily on individual compliance, indicating a fragmented governance arrangement rather than an integrated institutional system.

Crowd Management

The diagnostic assessment reveals pronounced fluctuations in visitor volume, with significant surges during weekends, full-moon observances, and major festivals. These fluctuations place sustained pressure on circulation pathways, entry and exit points, and rest facilities. While basic crowd control measures are evident, governance arrangements appear largely reactive, particularly during night-time pilgrimages and group arrivals.

Studies on mass religious gatherings emphasize that crowd management constitutes a core governance function requiring anticipatory planning, spatial differentiation, and coordinated communication (Gayathri et al., 2017; NDMA, 2014). In the absence of clearly articulated circulation systems and structured volunteer mediation, unmanaged density can affect safety, comfort, and the devotional experience. These findings underscore the relevance of treating crowd systems as institutional governance challenges rather than episodic logistical concerns.

Community Participation

Community participation within the temple ecosystem is present but limited in structure and scope. While devotees engage through donations and informal interactions, opportunities for time-based or effort-based participation in institutional functions remain constrained. This limits the capacity of devotees to express seva through direct involvement in cleanliness support, pilgrim assistance, or campus discipline.

Co-production scholarship highlights that structured participation enhances service outcomes and institutional legitimacy by fostering shared ownership and behavioral alignment (Ostrom, 1996; Bovaird, 2007; Brandsen & Honingh, 2016). The diagnostic findings suggest that the absence of formal participation channels restricts the institutionalization of community contribution, thereby placing disproportionate operational responsibility on staff and contractors.

Character of Governance

The character of governance is marked by strong ethical intent and commitment among institutional leadership and staff. Accounting practices and financial oversight mechanisms reflect transparency and regular monitoring. However, the diagnostic assessment also identifies challenges related to communication coherence and institutional authority within a complex stakeholder environment that includes priests, vendors, lessees, and visitors.

Public administration literature emphasizes that accountability in hybrid institutions is multidimensional and often contested, requiring clarity in roles, communication channels, and legitimacy claims (Bovens, 2007; Ebrahim, 2010). In this context, parallel representations and informal authority structures can create ambiguity for the public, affecting trust and institutional coherence despite strong internal ethical standards.

Cultural Custodianship

The temple continues to function as an important cultural and social institution, hosting festivals, rituals, and welfare activities that reinforce collective identity. At the same time, the diagnostic findings suggest that cultural engagement remains largely event-centric and is not fully integrated into routine institutional programming.

Scholarship on heritage institutions emphasizes that cultural custodianship is strengthened when educational, artistic, and knowledge-oriented functions are embedded into everyday institutional life rather than confined to episodic celebrations (Smith, 2006; Reddy & Zavos, 2009). The findings indicate scope for more systematic alignment between ritual practice, cultural transmission, and institutional design, particularly in relation to youth engagement and interpretive communication.

From Diagnostic Assessment to Policy Orientation: Interpreting the Seven-S Framework

Building on the diagnostic insights generated through the application of the Five-C Diagnostic Framework, this study applies the Seven-S Policy Framework, originally derived in earlier doctoral research, to articulate a principled orientation for temple governance. The Seven-S framework operates at a normative and policy level rather than as an implementation model. Its purpose is to translate diagnostic understanding into institutional direction by clarifying governance values and priorities, while deliberately refraining from prescribing operational strategies or managerial actions. This distinction between diagnosis and policy orientation is maintained to preserve analytical rigor, institutional autonomy, and contextual discretion, particularly in culturally sensitive and religious settings.

The Seven-S framework comprises seven interrelated principles that together express the core dimensions of institutional orientation relevant to Hindu temple governance. Seva denotes service orientation and the ethical commitment to serving devotees and society. Swachhta represents cleanliness and environmental discipline as expressions of institutional care and responsibility. Sanrakshan refers to protection and preparedness, encompassing safety, risk awareness, and safeguarding of people, assets, and heritage. Samarpan emphasizes financial integrity, transparency, and ethical stewardship of resources. Sanskar captures the role of the temple in cultural transmission, value formation, and educational engagement. Sahayog reflects cooperation and coordination among institutional actors and stakeholders. Satatya denotes continuity and sustainability, emphasizing long-term institutional resilience beyond episodic interventions.

Interpretive Linkage of the Seven-S Policy Framework

Conceptually, the Seven-S framework may be read as a principled institutional response to the patterns identified through the Five-C diagnostic assessment. Rather than functioning as a corrective or operational guide, the framework articulates governance orientation by clustering values, systems, and sustainability considerations that emerged as salient through empirical observation. In this sense, the Seven-S principles translate diagnostic insight into policy-level direction while maintaining a clear separation from implementation design.

The principles of Seva and Sanskar respond directly to diagnostic findings related to community participation and cultural custodianship. The Five-C assessment indicated that while devotional engagement and ritual activity remain strong, opportunities for structured, non-monetary participation and continuous cultural transmission are limited. Positioned as governance values, Seva and Sanskar emphasize the institutional responsibility to align service ethics and cultural education with everyday functioning, without specifying particular mechanisms for participation or programming.

The principles of Swachhta, Samarpan, and Sanrakshan address governance challenges associated with environmental discipline, financial transparency, and institutional preparedness. Diagnostic findings highlighted fragmented responsibility for cleanliness, coexistence of strong ethical intent with communication ambiguities, and operational pressures arising from crowd density and risk exposure. As policy orientations, these principles reinforce the importance of integrated institutional responsibility, ethical financial conduct, and anticipatory awareness as foundational elements of governance effectiveness.

Finally, Sahayog and Satatya reflect diagnostic insights concerning coordination gaps among institutional actors and the need for long-term resilience. The Five-C assessment suggested that outcomes are often shaped by informal arrangements and individual compliance rather than by structured collaboration. As governance orientations, these principles emphasize cooperative institutional relationships and continuity, underscoring the importance of sustained alignment, shared responsibility, and future-oriented thinking in maintaining public trust and institutional stability.

Discussion: Implications for Public Administration

The application of the Five-C Diagnostic Framework and the Seven-S Policy Framework demonstrates that Hindu temples can be analytically examined as public-facing governance institutions without reducing them to either purely religious entities or state-controlled organizations. From a public administration perspective, the findings underscore the relevance of extending institutional analysis beyond formal government agencies to include hybrid institutions that manage public services, collective resources, and cultural legitimacy in complex social environments.

First, the study reinforces the argument that governance challenges are not confined to the state but emerge wherever institutions interact intensively with the public. The diagnostic findings related to cleanliness, crowd management, and service coordination mirror governance issues commonly observed in municipal services, public facilities, and nonprofit organizations. This supports existing scholarship that calls for a broader understanding of governance as an ecosystem involving multiple actors, formal and informal arrangements, and shared responsibility (Osborne, 2010; Ansell & Gash, 2008). Temples, in this sense, represent a category of institutions where public value is produced outside direct state administration yet remains subject to public expectations of accountability and effectiveness (Moore, 1995).

Second, the study contributes to public administration debates on accountability and legitimacy in hybrid institutions. The findings related to the character of governance highlight how ethical intent and transparent internal practices may coexist with challenges of external communication and authority fragmentation. This aligns with scholarship that views accountability as multidimensional and socially constructed rather than solely procedural (Bovens, 2007; Ebrahim, 2010). In temple contexts, legitimacy is shaped not only by compliance or performance but also by cultural resonance, perceived authenticity, and clarity of institutional representation. These insights extend accountability theory into domains where moral authority and cultural trust play a central role.

Third, the diagnostic emphasis on community participation speaks directly to co-production and collaborative governance literature. The limited institutionalization of participation observed in the case study illustrates how the absence of structured engagement channels can constrain both service outcomes and stakeholder alignment. Public administration research has consistently shown that co-production enhances service quality and institutional legitimacy when participation is structured and supported (Ostrom, 1996; Bovaird, 2007; Brandsen & Honingh, 2016). The temple context provides a culturally distinctive but analytically comparable setting in which these principles operate, thereby enriching comparative understanding of participatory governance.

Fourth, the integration of cultural custodianship into the diagnostic framework highlights an often under-theorized dimension of public administration. While cultural and heritage considerations are typically treated as sector-specific concerns, the findings suggest that cultural responsibility functions as a core governance dimension influencing institutional trust and continuity. This resonates with emerging work that emphasizes the role of values, identity, and meaning in shaping institutional effectiveness (Scott, 2014; Ongaro & Tantardini, 2024). By incorporating cultural custodianship into governance analysis, the study broadens the conceptual boundaries of institutional effectiveness in public administration.

Finally, the analytical separation between diagnosis and policy orientation offers a methodological contribution to governance research. By using the Five-C framework to structure diagnostic assessment and the Seven-S framework to articulate normative direction without prescribing implementation, the study demonstrates a disciplined approach to institutional analysis. This separation aligns with reform literature that cautions against premature operationalization and emphasizes the importance of policy clarity prior to design and execution (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017). Such an approach is particularly valuable in culturally sensitive and autonomous institutional settings.

Overall, the findings suggest that Hindu temples constitute analytically rich sites for public administration research and that governance frameworks developed for state and nonprofit institutions can be meaningfully adapted to religious contexts. The study contributes to the growing body of work that views public administration as a field concerned with institutional effectiveness, public value, and governance across diverse organizational forms.

Conclusion and Scope for Future Research

This study examined governance and institutional effectiveness in a Hindu temple through the application of

the Five-C Diagnostic Framework and the Seven-S Policy Framework, both derived from earlier doctoral research and employed here for empirical analysis. By treating the temple as a public-facing institution rather than solely a religious site, the paper demonstrated the analytical relevance of public administration concepts such as accountability, service orientation, stakeholder coordination, and institutional legitimacy in the study of religious institutions.

The findings highlight that governance challenges in temples are multidimensional and systemic in nature. Issues related to cleanliness, crowd management, participation, communication, and cultural responsibility are shaped less by intent and more by institutional design, coordination mechanisms, and clarity of roles among diverse actors. The Five-C diagnostic assessment enabled structured identification of these patterns without resorting to prescriptive evaluation, while the Seven-S framework provided a principled policy orientation that articulates governance values without specifying implementation pathways. This analytical separation strengthens methodological rigor and respects the autonomy and cultural specificity of religious institutions.

From a public administration perspective, the study contributes to the growing body of scholarship that recognizes governance beyond the formal state. Temples emerge as hybrid institutions that generate public value, manage collective resources, and sustain public trust through culturally embedded forms of authority. The frameworks applied in this paper offer a replicable approach for examining similar institutions where legitimacy, service delivery, and governance intersect outside conventional bureaucratic settings.

The study is subject to limitations typical of qualitative case-based research. It is based on a single institutional context and relies on observational and interpretive analysis rather than comparative or quantitative measures. Accordingly, the findings are analytically generalizable rather than statistically representative. Future research may extend this work by applying the Five-C and Seven-S frameworks across multiple temple contexts, comparing governance arrangements across regions or religious traditions, or integrating quantitative indicators to complement diagnostic insights. Such research would further strengthen understanding of governance in religious and cultural institutions and deepen the contribution of public administration scholarship to this underexplored domain.

Works Cited

Amirkhanyan, A. A., et al. *Faith-Based Assumptions about Performance: Does Church Affiliation Matter for Service Quality and Access? Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. vol. 38, 2009, pp. 490–521.

Ansell, C., and A. Gash. “Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, vol. 18, no. 4, 2008, pp. 543–71.

Behn, R. D. *Rethinking Democratic Accountability*. Brookings Institution P, 2001.

Bovaird, T. “Beyond Engagement and Participation: User and Community Co-Production of Public Services.” *Public Administration Review*, vol. 67, no. 5, 2007, pp. 846–60.

Bovens, M. “Analysing and Assessing Accountability: A Conceptual Framework.” *European Law Journal*, vol. 13, no. 4, 2007, pp. 447–68.

Brandsen, T., and M. Honingh. “Distinguishing Different Types of Co-Production: A Conceptual Analysis Based on the Classical Definitions.” *Public Administration Review*, vol. 76, no. 3, 2016, pp. 427–35.

Creswell, J. W., and C. N. Poth. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches*. 2018.

Dimaggio, P. J., and W. W. Powell. “The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields.” *American Sociological Review*, vol. 48, no. 2, 1983, pp. 147–60.

Dunleavy, P., and C. Hood. “From Old Public Administration to New Public Management.” *Public Money & Management*, vol. 14, no. 3, 1994, pp. 9–16.

Ebrahim, A. “The Many Faces of Nonprofit Accountability.” *The Jossey-Bass Handbook of Nonprofit Leadership and Management*, edited by D. O. Renz, Jossey-Bass, 2010, pp. 101–21.

Emerson, K., et al. “An Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, vol. 22, no. 1, 2012, pp. 1–29.

Gayathri, H., et al. “A Review of Studies on Understanding Crowd Dynamics in the Context of Crowd Safety in Mass Religious Gatherings.” *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, vol. 25, 2017, pp. 82–91.

Herman, R. D., and D. O. Renz. *Theses on Nonprofit Organizational Effectiveness. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. vol. 28, 1999, pp. 107–26.

Meyer, J. W., and B. Rowan. “Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony.” *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 83, no. 2, 1977, pp. 340–63.

Moore, M. H. *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*. Harvard UP, 1995.

Managing Crowds at Events and Venues of Mass Gathering: Guidelines for Administrators and Organizers. Government of India, 2014.

Ongaro, E., and M. Tantardini. "Religion, Spirituality, Faith and Public Administration: A Literature Review and Outlook." *Public Policy and Administration*, vol. 39, no. 4, 2024, pp. 531–55.

Osborne, S. P. *The New Public Governance? Emerging Perspectives on the Theory and Practice of Public Governance*. 2010.

———. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge UP, 1990.

Ostrom, E. "Crossing the Great Divide: Coproduction, Synergy, and Development." *World Development*, vol. 24, no. 6, 1996, pp. 1073–87.

Pollitt, C., and G. Bouckaert. *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis*. Oxford UP, 2017.

Ramesh, G. *Governance and Management of Temples: A Framework*. 2020.

Reddy, D., and J. Zavos. "Temple Publics: Religious Institutions and the Construction of Contemporary Hindu Communities." *International Journal of Hindu Studies*, vol. 13, no. 3, 2009, pp. 241–60.

Salamon, L. M. *Partners in Public Service: Government-Nonprofit Relations in the Modern Welfare State*. Johns Hopkins UP, 1995.

Suchman, M. C. "Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches." *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 20, no. 3, 1995, pp. 571–610.

Van Slyke, D. M., and C. H. Roch. "What Do They Know, and Whom Do They Hold Accountable? Citizens in the Government-Nonprofit Contracting Relationship." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, vol. 14, no. 2, 2004, pp. 191–209.

Wilson, J. Q. *Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do and Why They Do It*. Basic Books, 1989.

Yin, R. K. *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods*. 2018.

*** Declaration of Generative AI and AI-assisted Technologies in the Writing Process**

During the preparation of this manuscript, generative AI and AI-assisted tools including Grammarly, WordTune, and ChatGPT were used for language editing, grammar correction, and sentence reformatting without altering the scholarly meaning or analytical intent of the text. All AI-assisted outputs were reviewed and edited carefully, and full responsibility for the content of the manuscript remains with the authors.