



International Journal of Humanities & Social Science Studies (IJHSSS)
A Peer-Reviewed Bi-monthly Bi-lingual Research Journal
ISSN: 2349-6959 (Online), ISSN: 2349-6711 (Print)
Volume-I, Issue-II, September 2014, Page no. 98-106
Published by Scholar Publications, Karimganj, Assam, India, 788711
Website: <http://www.ijhsss.com>

Role of Panchayati Raj Institutions in Rural Development with Special Reference to Anantapuramu District of Andhra Pradesh

Dr. K Eswara Reddy

Lecturer & Head, Dept. of Political Science, STSN Govt. UG & PG College, Kadiri, Anantapuramu, India

Abstract

The main responsibility of the Panchayati Raj Institutions is to accelerate the pace of development and involve all people in this process so that the felt needs of the people and their development aspirations are fulfilled. The decentralized planning is a multi-level planning process. It will have to start from lower level (Gram Panchayat), intermediate level (Mandal Parishad) and higher level (Zilla Parishad). Panchayati Raj Institutions are expected to play an important role in planning and implementing various developmental programmes. One may recall that after independence, India has continuously implemented development programmes with the objective of improving the social and economic conditions of the people.

Key Words: *Development Programmes, Grampanchayat, Mandal Parishad, Panchayati Raj, Zilla Parishad.*

Introduction: The main responsibility of the Panchayati Raj Institutions is to accelerate the pace of development and involve all people in this process so that the felt needs of the people and their development aspirations are fulfilled. The decentralized planning is a multi-level planning process. It will have to start from lower level (Gram Panchayat), intermediate level (Mandal Parishad) and higher level (Zilla Parishad).

Panchayati Raj Institutions are expected to play an important role in planning and implementing various developmental programmes. One may recall that after independence, India has continuously implemented development programmes with the objective of improving the social and economic conditions of the people. One of the major development attempts was the Community Development Programme (CDP) introduced in 1952. The Programme was not a success because of the lack of people's participation in it. It was followed by a series of development interventions, but people's participation continued to be a problem. In the mean time, however, the Central government continued to introduce various development initiatives to catalyse rural development. These, apart from community development and allied programmes in the 1950's, included target group approach programmes like Small Farmers Development Agency (SFDA) in the 1970's and employment generation and poverty alleviation programmes like Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP), etc., in the 1980's. When all such experiments failed, the policy makers turned towards the Panchayati Raj system in a more deliberate way. Earlier too, from time to time, the importance of the Panchayati Raj System as a mechanism for effective people's participation had got highlighted through the deliberations of various committees like Balwantha Roy Mehta Committee in 1957, Ashok Mehta Committee in 1977 and so on, but finally these deliberations found their expression in the 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act in 1993.

Now it is strongly felt that an effective Panchayati Raj System can bring about rapid and integrated development through people's participation. In all the recently restructured development programmes like SGSY, SGRY, etc., adequate provision has been made for their implementation through the Panchayati Raj institutions. Thus, the role of Panchayati Raj as a development institution assumes considerable significance.

It is an admitted fact that panchayats constitute the local governments of the people. A democratic government is one that involves people to take decisions about the activities that directly concern their locality and lives. Naturally, panchayats should allow and help the rural poor to participate in the developmental activities directly. For example, if a Gram Panchayat decides to build a school, dispensary or drainage system, the people who need these facilities should decide what kind of the school, dispensary, and drainage system they need. Panchayats should not keep people at a distance. No work or decision should be kept as a secret.

It is necessary that open meetings are held where all the people can meet and discuss the village problems and also anti-poverty programmes. It is the duty of the elected members of panchayats to hold regular Gram Sabha meetings. These meetings will be immensely useful, if the following norms are kept in mind and followed sincerely:

- (1). Explain anti-poverty and other schemes to the people very clearly in the language that they understand.
- (2). Encourage the poor people to speak in these meetings; (Many people may be hesitant to give their views in a meeting for many reasons. The elected members should create an atmosphere that enables the people to speak without fear).
- (3). Try to understand their views and thoughts, and
- (4). Identify the people who are really poor.

There are a number of anti-poverty programmes under implementation in various states. In the changing scenario, panchayats are expected to play an important role in the planning and implementation of these programmes. As it is not possible to cover all the development programmes being or expected to be implemented by the Panchayati Raj institutions, the discussion here will be confined to the role of Panchayats in implementing some major centrally sponsored anti-poverty programmes.

Statement of the Problem: One of the tasks stressed from the beginning of Panchayati Raj activities was to assist for the development of rural areas. This has been held to be the objective of various plans, programmes and schemes. The successive Five Year plans and the programme evaluation organizations underlined the need of equitable distribution of fruits from development and the people's participation in the plans of rural development. The welfare services such as health care, housing, water supply, rural roads, nutrition, tribal development and social welfare are being provided with a view to offer reasonable opportunities to the rural masses in general and under privileged sections in particular.

Today the challenge of rural poverty cannot be met without the active involvement of Panchayati Raj. Panchayats are looked upon as a means to achieve socio-economic transformation of our rural societies. With this noble aim, Panchayati Raj institutions have been introduced in India. Panchayati Raj has been made its way from its uncertain past to its so significant present, inspite of the so many adverse situations it had to encounter on its march. Now it is generally believed that the socio-economic benefit of Panchayati Raj and rural development has not gone to the needy people.

The introduction of this system in Andhra Pradesh as elsewhere had aroused lofty expectations in the minds of the rural masses, especially downtrodden sections of the society. But these institutions do not appear to have made much impact on the development of rural areas. Hence, the study entitled, "**Role of Panchayati Raj Institutions in Rural Development with Special Reference to Anantapuramu District of Andhra Pradesh**" is a humble attempt to analyse, evaluate and assess the role of Panchayati Raj institutions in the development of rural areas in Anantapuramu district.

Objectives of the Study:

The objectives of the study are to assess:

1. The impact of Panchayati Raj bodies on the socio, economic, political life of the rural masses.
2. The role of Panchayati Raj institutions on the development of rural infrastructure, alleviation of poverty, providing employment opportunities in rural areas.
3. Perceptions of the people on the functioning of Panchayati Raj bodies in relation to their development.

Research Methodology: Both primary and secondary sources of material have been used in the collection of data on Panchayati Raj in general in the district and more specifically on the rural

development programmes *vis-à-vis* Panchayati Raj institutions in the district. For the collection of primary data two Interview Schedules were prepared for administrating on the respondents. They are, schedule-I relating to beneficiaries of rural development programmes. Schedule-II for the people’s representatives at Village Panchayati level, Mandal Parishad level and Zilla Parishad level. For the illustration of the data, tables, percentages and charts have been used wherever necessary.

The secondary data has been collected from the published books, journals, periodicals, published reports, action plans, unpublished theses, official documents, brochures and official records. Data has been collected from the various offices like District Panchayat Office, Mandal Parishad Offices, and Office of the Zilla Parishad, Research Institutions, and different Libraries.

Sample Design: For in depth study on the impact of rural development programmes on beneficiaries, one mandal, each from the three Revenue divisions of Anantapuramu district was selected by simple random sampling method for administrating Interview Schedule. In the second stage from each selected mandal, 90 sample beneficiary respondents of rural development programmes were selected purposively. The total sample respondents are 270.

Results and Discussions:

Respondents’ image of Panchayati Raj: Image of Panchayati Raj means the impression or opinion which the people have of the functioning and functionaries of the Panchayati Raj Institutions. The public image on the usefulness of services of PRIs is presented in the Table 1.

Table-1, Respondents image of Panchayati Raj:

Sl. No.	Views of Respondents	Social Category				Total
		ST	SC	BC	OC	
1	Useful	24 (72.73)	76 (80.85)	81 (84.37)	39 (82.98)	220 (81.48)
2	Not useful	4 (12.12)	7 (7.45)	6 (6.26)	4 (8.51)	21 (7.78)
3	Don’t know	5 (15.15)	11 (11.70)	9 (9.37)	4 (8.51)	29 (10.74)
Total		33 (100.00)	94 (100.00)	96 (100.00)	47 (100.00)	270 (100.00)

Source: Field Data

* Figures in parentheses is percentage of total

The Table: 1 makes it clear that 81.48 per cent of the respondents have answered that the working of the Panchayati Raj Institutions is satisfactory. Only 7.78 per cent of the respondents have said that the services of Panchayati Raj Institutions are not useful. Among various social categories highest percentage (84.37 percent) of backward caste respondents accepted the usefulness of PRIS. It is conspicuous to note that Scheduled Tribes respondents top the list with negative attitude (12.12 percent) as well as unknown attitudes (15.15 per cent).

Participation of Respondents in Local body election: Local Self Governments are established with a view to train the rural people in the democratic process. The Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) give training to the people by giving an opportunity to exercise franchise and to contest in the elections. Elections to PRIs in the state as well as in Anantapuramu district were conducted in the year 2014. Elections to Zilla Parishad and Mandal Parishads were conducted. In April 6, 2014 and in April 11, 2014. Elections to the Gram Panchayats were also conducted. In these elections good number of respondents exercised their franchise. Some of them also contested in these elections. The Table: 2 give the details of respondent participation in their tiers of local body election in recent elections (2014).

Table – 2, Respondents Participation in 2014 Local Body Election (Multiple Responses):

Sl. No.	PRIs	Caste wise participation in 2014 Election								Total	
		ST		SC		BC		OC			
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1	Zilla Parishad	26 (78.79)	7 (21.21)	87 (92.55)	7 (7.45)	88 (91.66)	8 (8.34)	42 (89.36)	5 (10.64)	243 (90.00)	27 (10.00)
2	Mandal Parishad	26 (78.79)	7 (21.21)	87 (92.55)	7 (7.45)	88 (91.66)	8 (8.34)	42 (89.36)	5 (10.64)	243 (90.00)	27 (10.00)
3	Gram Panchayat	32 (96.97)	1 (3.03)	93 (98.94)	1 (1.06)	96 (100.00)	-	45 (95.74)	2 (4.26)	266 (98.52)	4 (1.48)

Source: Field data

*Figures in parentheses is percentage of total

As the elections to the Zilla Parishad and Mandal Parishad held on the same day the respondents who cast their vote in these two tiers of elections is the same. But the level of participation of various social categories is not evenly distributed (see Table 2). The participation of Scheduled Tribe respondents at upper and middle tiers is 78.79 per cent, which is lowest when compared to other social categories. But their participation in lower tier elections is higher than OC respondents.

Nearly 92.55 per cent of Scheduled Caste respondents cast their vote to elect representatives for Zilla Parishad and Mandal Parishad. Their participation in these elections is higher than other social categories. This trend can be attributed to the social and political awareness movements by the caste based organizations. At Gram Panchayati level election, 98.94 per cent SC respondents cast their vote, which is higher than upper and middle tier elections.

All the BC respondents utilised their franchise in Gram Panchayati elections. Their participation is comparatively higher than other social groups. But their participation in Zilla Parishad and Mandal Parishad elections is confined 91.66 per cent.

Around 10.64 per cent of OC respondents did not exercise their franchise in Zilla Parishad and Mandal Parishad elections. The remaining 89.36 per cent exercised their franchise with regard to Gram Panchayati elections around 95.74 per cent participate in election of their local body representatives.

In all 90 per cent at upper and middle tier and 98.52 per cent at lower tier elections the respondents participated to elect their representatives. The participation in local body elections is higher, when compared to Assembly and Lok Sabha elections, where, generally the participation rate never exceeds 70 to 80 per cent.

Respondents who contested in 2014 Elections: Every citizen of India with certain qualifications can contest in elections. In the recently held local body elections only microscopic minority contested in the elections. The respondents, who contested in recent elections, faced the elections either as independent candidates or on party ticket they turned victorious. Table: 3 gives the details of candidates who contested in 2006 local body elections.

Table – 3, Number of Respondents contested in 2014 Elections:

Sl. No.	Name of the Office	Social Category								Total	
		ST		SC		BC		OC			
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1	ZPTC	-	33 (100.00)	-	94 (100.00)	1 (1.04)	96 (98.96)	-	47 (100.00)	1 (0.37)	269 (99.63)
2	MPTC	-	33 (100.00)	1 (1.06)	93 (98.94)	2 (2.08)	94 (97.92)	1 (2.13)	46 (97.87)	4 (1.48)	266 (97.77)

3	Gram Panchayati President	-	33 (100.00)	2 (2.13)	92 (97.77)	2 (2.08)	94 (97.92)	1 (2.13)	46 (97.87)	5 (1.86)	265 (98.14)
4	Ward Member	2 (6.06)	31 (93.93)	3 (3.19)	91 (96.81)	4 (4.17)	92 (95.83)	2 (4.26)	45 (95.74)	11 (4.07)	259 (95.93)

Source: Field data

*Figures in parentheses is percentage of total

The Table: 3 indicate that the respondents who contested in the elections is less than 5 per cent. Moreover, none of candidates emerged victorious in elections. None of the Scheduled Caste respondents contested for ZPTC or MPTC or Panchayati President Posts. Only two respondents of ST category contested for ward membership. With regard to Scheduled Castes none of them contested for ZPTC membership. Among SCs one for Mandal Parishad membership, two for Gram Panchayati President, and three forward memberships contested in elections. The Backward Caste respondents contested for all four categories of posts. It means the political awareness among the BCs is increasing year by year. One for ZP membership, two each for Mandal Parishad and Gram Panchayati Presidentship and 4 for ward membership contested in elections. Like STs and SCs, none of the OC respondents contested for Zilla Parishad membership. One each for Mandal Parishad and Panchayati Presidentship, two forward memberships contested in 2006 elections.

Knowledge about Rural Development Programme: The developmental schemes under taken by Panchayati Raj Institutions intended to assist various sections of the society. They are helpful to cultivators, agricultural labourers, unemployed youth, women, businessmen etc. The knowledge and awareness is a pre-requisite to estimate the precautions of beneficiaries on rural development schemes/programmes. The Table: 4 give the details of respondents' knowledge about development schemes.

Table – 4, Respondents' Knowledge on Major Rural Development Schemes (Multiple Responses):

Sl.No.	Name of the Rural Development Programmes	Social Category				Total
		ST	SC	BC	OC	
1	MGNREGP	33 (100.00)	94 (100.00)	93 (96.88)	43 (91.49)	263 (97.41)
2	Indiramma Housing	32 (96.97)	93 (98.93)	95 (98.95)	45 (95.74)	265 (98.14)
3	Watershed Programme	19 (57.57)	74 (78.72)	78 (81.25)	40 (85.10)	211 (78.15)
4	IKP	30 (90.90)	92 (97.87)	95 (98.95)	45 (95.74)	262 (97.04)
5	Rajiv Arogya Sri	29 (87.87)	81 (86.17)	90 (93.75)	44 (93.62)	244 (90.37)
6	CLDP	16 (48.48)	79 (84.04)	76 (79.16)	39 (82.98)	210 (77.78)

Source: Field data

*Figures in parentheses is percentage of total

The data in the Table: 4 show that all the 33 respondents from Scheduled Castes are aware of National Rural Employment Programme. It means that good number of ST respondent families are benefiting by the scheme. Indiramma Housing Programme is known to 96.97 per cent of ST respondents. The knowledge with regard to Watershed Programme and Comprehensive Land Development Programme stands 57.57 and 48.48 per cent respectively. The reason behind the poor

knowledge about these programmes is limited scope of these programmes. About 90.90 per cent and 87.87 per cent of ST respondents are aware of IKP and Rajiv Arogya Sri Programmes.

In case of Scheduled Caste respondents also the knowledge with regard to NREGP is cent per cent. In case of Indiramma Housing Programme and IKP the knowledge of respondent is more, than other developmental schemes. To be precise 98.93 per cent are aware of Indiramma Housing Programme and 97.87 are aware of Indira Kranthi Patham. The knowledge with regard to Rajiv Arogya Sri is 86.17 per cent while knowledge about CLDP is 84.04 per cent which is highest when compared to the other social categories. Knowledge about Watershed Programme is less than all other programmes.

The knowledge of BC respondents with regard to Indiramma Housing Scheme and IKP is not only the highest but also the same. The knowledge of BC respondents about MGNREGP is 96.88 per cent and that of Rajiv Arogya Sri is 93.75 per cent. The awareness on Watershed Programme and CLDP stands at 81.25 per cent and 79.16 per cent respectively.

When compared to other social categories the knowledge of OC respondents is less with regard to MGNREGP (91.49 per cent) and Indiramma Housing Programme (95.74 per cent). The knowledge about IKP and Rajiv Arogya Sri is 95.74 per cent and 93.62 per cent respectively. The knowledge with regard to CLDP is confined to 82.98 per cent respondents.

In all 265 out of 270 respondents are aware of Indiramma Housing Scheme. It is followed by MGNREGP with 263 and IKP 262 in second and third places. The benefits of Rajiv Arogya Sri are known to 244 respondents. The knowledge about Watershed Programme and CLDP is confined to 78.15 per cent and 77.78 per cent of beneficiaries.

Selection of Beneficiaries: Various rural development programmes initiated by Central and State Government yield results, only when the really needy people get enrolled in those programmes. There are reports that in some schemes, affluent and dominating families are getting their names enrolled at the cost of marginalized sections. As such beneficiaries were asked to express their satisfaction over the selection of beneficiaries for various developmental schemes and the same is presented in the Table: 5

Table – 5, Respondents’ Satisfaction Levels on the selection of Beneficiaries for Rural Development Schemes:

Sl.No.	Social Category	Responses			Total
		Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory	No Response	
1	Scheduled Tribes	16 (48.48)	15 (45.45)	2 (6.06)	33 (100.00)
2	Scheduled Castes	43 (45.75)	48 (51.06)	3 (3.19)	94 (100.00)
3	Backward Caste	47 (48.96)	47 (48.96)	2 (2.08)	96 (100.00)
4	Other Castes	29 (61.70)	14 (29.79)	4 (8.51)	47 (100.00)
	Total	135 (50.00)	124 (45.93)	11 (4.07)	270 (100.00)

Source: Field data

*Figures in parentheses is percentage of total

The data in the Table: 5 make it clear that only half of respondents have expressed satisfaction over the selection of beneficiaries for various development programmes. The remaining half of them has either dissatisfaction or no response. To be precise about 45.93 per cent have expressed dissatisfaction, while 4.07 per cent have expressed neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction.

Coming to social groups highest percentage (61.70 per cent) OC respondents expressed satisfaction, while only 45.75 per cent of Scheduled Caste respondents expressed satisfaction. In the case of remaining two social categories 48.96 per cent and 48.48 per cent BC and ST respondents expressed satisfaction respectively.

More than half of the Scheduled Caste respondents expressed their dissatisfaction by the present method of selection of beneficiaries for various developmental programmes. They said that the landlords of the village selecting beneficiaries are obedient to them. They are followed by BC and ST respondents with 48.96 per cent and 45.46 per cent in second and third place respectively, who expressed dissatisfaction. About 29.79 per cent of OC respondents also expressed dissatisfaction. The OC respondents top the list in case of no response. They are immediately followed by STs with 6.06 per cent.

Respondents views on the selection of Beneficiaries: The data in the previous Table (Table 6) reveals that nearly half of the respondents are not satisfied, with regard to selection of beneficiaries. Closely following their satisfaction levels on the selection of beneficiaries, they have been asked to suggest the correct method/procedure for selection of beneficiaries.

Table – 6, Respondents suggestion on the selection of Beneficiaries:

Sl. No.	Responses	Social Category				Total
		ST	SC	BC	OC	
1	Gram Sabha	30 (90.90)	89 (94.68)	84 (87.5)	38 (80.85)	241 (89.26)
2	Gram Panchayati President	2 (6.06)	2 (2.13)	6 (6.25)	1 (2.13)	11 (4.08)
3	Village Leader	-	-	2 (2.08)	6 (12.77)	8 (2.96)
4	Government Officials	1 (3.04)	3 (3.19)	3 (3.13)	2 (4.25)	9 (3.33)
5	Other Political Leaders	-	-	1 (1.04)	-	1 (0.37)
	Total	33 (100.00)	94 (100.00)	96 (100.00)	47 (100.00)	270 (100.00)

Source: Field data

*Figures in parentheses is percentage of total

The data in the Table: 6 shows that majority (89.26 per cent) of respondents opted Gram Sabha, for the selection of beneficiaries for all rural development programmes. It means that in Gram Sabha meeting the needy and marginalized sections will get due say in enrolling their names for various developmental schemes. It is a healthy development that the people have recognized the principle of democratic method for selection of beneficiaries. Only 7.41 per cent (4.08+2.96+0.37) of the respondents favoured some political involvement in the selection of beneficiaries. On the other hand only 3.33 per cent opined to left the selection procedure to concerned government officials.

None of the ST respondents favoured the involvement of either village leader or other political leaders like ZPTC member, MPTC member, MPP, ZP Chairperson, MLA, MP, etc., in the selection of beneficiaries. More than 90 per cent of them favoured Gram Sabha as the best agency to select beneficiaries. About 6.06 per cent and 3.04 per cent of them favoured the role of village president and government officers respectively.

Like Scheduled Tribes none of the Scheduled Caste respondents favoured the role of either village leader or other political leaders in the selection of beneficiaries. About 94.68 per cent of them have given due recognition for Gram Sabha in the selection of beneficiaries. They have posed much confidence in government officials than Gram Panchayati President.

About 9.37 per cent (6.25+2.08+1.04) of BC respondents said that political leaders should have say in the selection of beneficiaries, while 3.13 per cent of them favoured the role of government officials. But majority (87.5 per cent) of them recognized Gram Sabha as the best guarantee to select the beneficiaries on need based.

With regard to OC respondents also majority (80.85 per cent) favoured Gram Sabha for selection of beneficiaries. When compared to other categories highest percentage (14.90 per cent) of them welcomed political involvement in selection of beneficiaries. Nearly 4.25 per cent favoured official involvement. Here also 80.85 per cent favoured Gram Sabha as the best agency for the selection of beneficiaries.

Utility of Rural Development Programme: The rural development programmes/schemes are intended for the comprehensive development of rural areas. During the field study the respondents perception were recorded about the usefulness or non-usefulness of these programmes and the same was tabulated in the Table: 7.

Table – 7, Respondents views on the Utility of Development Schemes:

Sl. No.	Responses	Responses			Total
		Useful	Not-useful	No Response	
1	Scheduled Tribes	31 (93.94)	1 (3.03)	1 (3.03)	33 (100.00)
2	Scheduled Castes	90 (95.75)	3 (3.19)	1 (1.06)	94 (100.00)
3	Backward Castes	87 (90.62)	6 (6.25)	3 (3.13)	96 (100.00)
4	Other Castes	41 (87.23)	5 (10.64)	1 (2.13)	47 (100.00)
	Total	249 (92.22)	15 (5.56)	6 (2.22)	270 (100.00)

Source: Field data

*Figures in parentheses is percentage of total

As per the Table: 7, about 92.22 per cent of the respondents considered that rural development programmes are essential for the development of rural areas. Only 5.56 respondents expressed negative impact of these programmes. It is observed that medium landholding respondents expressed their dissatisfaction and non-utility of NREGP programme, as it made difficult for them to get labour at cheaper rates. One respondent each from SC, ST, and OC did not respond. About 93.94 per cent of ST respondents gave positive response, 3.03 per cent gave negative responses. More than 95 per cent of Scheduled Caste respondents considered rural development programmes as useful, while 3.19 per cent of them considered them as not useful. With regard to Backward Caste respondents 90.62 per cent responded positively, while 6.25 per cent responded negatively towards rural development programmes. More than 10 per cent OC respondents considered rural development programmes as not-useful, while 87.23 per cent considered them as useful.

Findings of the study:

1. The awareness of people on such rural development programmes, whose scope is wide, is high and vice versa.
2. Nearly 50 percent of the respondents expressed dissatisfaction over the present procedure of selection of beneficiaries. As such around 90 percent opted for Gram Sabha as impartial body to select the beneficiaries.
3. Around 92.22 percent of respondents accorded that the rural development programmes are useful.
4. The percentage of younger and middle age is increasing in the Panchayati Raj leadership.
5. The awareness levels of Panchayati Raj leaders with regard to rural development programmes are also decreasing with an increase in the tier of panchayat.
6. Large number of the leaders of rural local bodies conceded that the ongoing rural development programmes are useful and the leaders are, also expecting to introduce more such programmes.

7. The peculiar finding of the study is that nearly 58 per cent of Panchayati Raj leaders acknowledged that their involvement in the implementation of the rural development programmes is almost nil.
8. Almost all the leaders, of Panchayati Raj Institutions expressed that the district authorities shall make them as part and parcel of rural development planning as well as development.
9. Around 36.37 per cent of leaders said that the allocation of funds to the Panchayati Raj Institutions is done by the government by partisan attitude.
10. Highest number of beneficiaries in the district under NREGP and CLDP programme hail from Scheduled Castes.

References:

- [1] Aditya Kumar Patra “**Rural Development, National Rural Employment guarantee Act and Panchayati Raj Institutions: An overview**” in M.R.Biju (Ed) Panchayati Raj System towards sustainable Rural Livelihood and Development”, Kanishka Publishers, New Delhi, 2008, p.154.
- [2] **Panchayati Raj Institutions in India-An Appraisal**, National Institute of Rural Development, Hyderabad, August 1995, p.5.
- [3] Rajani Ranjan Jha, “**Panchayati Raj and Rural Development: Some Critical Issues**”, in J.L. Singh and G.P. Pandey (Eds.), 50 years of Panchayati Raj and Rural Development, Manaks Publications, New Delhi, 1998, pp.60-61.
- [4] Mathur, P.C, “**Rural Local Self Government in India: Ideological Nuances from Rippon to Jayaprakash Narayan-1882-1964**”, in “Occasional Papers of Renewing Local Self-Government in Rural India”, Ministry of Rural Development, Department of Rural Development, Government of India, New Delhi, 1994.
- [5] Dr. Neela Mukherjee, “**Resource Sustainability: Developmental Goals and Panchayati Raj Institutions**”, Kurukshetra, (Jou) Vol.XLIV, No.7, April, 1996, pp.25-27.
- [6] Padmakar, P.L.D.V, “**Panchayat Raj a Look Back**”, Kurukshetra (Jou), Vol.52, No.3, February, 1998, pp.22-26.
- [7] Mehta G.S. (2002) in his book entitled, “**Participation of Women in the Panchayati Raj System**”, Kanishka Publishers, New Delhi, 2002.
- [8] Narayana, K.S, “**Unending Debate on Rural Development Issues: A Relook at Diagnostics-part II**”, Kurukshetra, (Jou), Vol.IV, No.2, February, 2003, pp.4-11.
- [9] Ranbir Singh (2004) in his article entitled, “**Why the Panchayati Raj Institutions have not been Empowered so far**”, Kurukshetra (Jou), Vol.52, No.3, January 2004, pp.42-43.
