CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Rural development has today become an objective not only of the local and regional concern, but a pragmatic objective fully backed by national government and international organizations like the United Nations, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, World Bank and the International Fund for Agricultural Development. Rural development is advocated today as a basic strategy for economic development all over the world. The sheer largeness of the numbers who continue to live and work in the rural areas in the developing countries attracts our attention to this important and neglected sector of economy. No country can achieve the desired goal if a large section of its population is living under unhygienic and destitute conditions. India, being a developing country, whose large population is living in rural areas, has necessity to pay special attention to the improvement of the economic, social and educational conditions of rural masses. Before independence, the Britishers whose only and exclusive motto was exploitation of the country, did not bother about the improvement of living conditions of rural population. Hence during freedom struggle Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru and other leaders came in contact with rural masses and knew about the destitute and unhygienic conditions of rural people’s living under. Though a few steps were taken before independence for rural development, these are too few to tackle the problem.

In 1947, when India achieved independence, eighty (80) per cent of her population was dependent on agriculture and until the lot of this vast majority was improved, the picture of India would not look brighter\(^2\). The per capita yearly income at that time was Rs.200/- (two hundred) and there was great disparity in the income of upper, middle and lower classes\(^3\). Coupled with the problems of acute food shortage and general poverty of the masses, were the problems of illiteracy and public health. Only 14.4 per cent of people could read and write, 9 per cent of the school going children were in schools and only half of them reached the fourth grade\(^4\). The average life of an Indian was 29 years. Among the children, the death rate was 146 per 1000. Taking the country's population as a whole, there was one doctor for every 6,300 people but most of them were concentrated in urban areas. In the villages, it was estimated that there was one doctor at every 8,500 population. It was under this condition that independent India launched her career as a welfare state. Most of the people living in rural areas could not satisfy even their basic needs and there was dominance of illiteracy, poverty, unemployment, ignorance, diseases and other scourages of mankind. So it was necessary for the Government to make special provisions for elimination of the above said evils, without which a smooth and spontaneous progress was impossible and it was difficult to create an environment free from deficiency with various kinds of restraints. Hence the Government of India after independence, adopted various programmes for rural development starting from Community

\(^3\) Ibid., p.68.
\(^4\) Ibid., p.54.
Development Programme in 1952. With the adoption of planning for development the country embarked upon a long, silent, arduous and non-violent socio-economic revolution for ensuring social equality and economic justice for every citizen of the country. The nature of Government tasks in post independence India has thus underwent a sea-change. Its emphasis shifted from maintenance of law and order to social welfare and individual progress. A suitable administrative set-up was called for, to plan and implement, the development tasks. Unfortunately, this did not happen and the existing administrative set-up designed by her colonial ruler-the Britishers, with minor changes in its traditional characteristics was made responsible for planning, implementation, coordination and vigilance of these new developmental programmes. Development planning was adopted in the hope that the existing administrative machinery would be able to cope successfully with various demands that would be made on it. Efforts were made to make these programmes more and more development oriented and accordingly changes were made in administrative set-up to make it more and more development oriented. But these programmes could not achieve the desired goals and the later events clearly demonstrated that the existing administrative machinery was quite inefficient to deliver the goals. It not only impeded development, but also led to a fall in the growth rate. The Government brought new programme to cover the failure of earlier one, but the administrative set-up

---

6 Mathur, Kuldeep, Administrative Institutions, Political Capacity and India’s Strategy for Rural Development, (Asian Center for Development Administration, 1975).
continue to remain almost the same with minor changes. As the success of a scheme is determined by various factor and the machinery responsible for its implementation is the major one. A specific programme requires a specific type of administrative set-up for implementing it efficiently so that the attitudes and orientations of people towards the programme as well as the administrative set-up should respond effectively. Rigidity, elitist feelings, power lust and overload of work on the required administrative set-up were some of the major causes of failure of these schemes. As a result despite four decades of planned economic development, the poor remained poor, living below the minimum standard of consumption of Rs.20/- (twenty) per capita per month at 1960-62 or Rs. 71/- (seventy-one) at 1971-72 price or Rs. 180/- (one hundred eighty) at 1981-82. They form the bulk of the poorest thirty (30) per cent of the population. For the majority of the people who are poor and belong to the socially economically weaker sections in society, social and economic justice is still a far cry and an empty slogan.

Thus the problem of rural development has presented numerous problems of planners, administrators and social workers. The first five-year-plan was based on the idea of “allround development” followed by the “socialistic pattern of society” approach in the second five-year-plan. “Increasing national income and improving conditions of the rural masses” was the goal set before the third five-year-plan. The fourth five-year-plan aimed at “growth with stability” and the emphasis was laid on “removal of poverty” in the fifth five-year-plan. “The alleviation of rural poverty” was the prime objective of sixth five-year-plan. Thus from early fifties, with the launching of first five-year-plan development of rural areas has been one of the abiding concerns of national
endeavour. Hence various approaches to rural development were adopted starting from trickle down to specific area approach followed by target group approach. It all started with Community Development Programme (1952) which was instrumental in establishing a network of the basic extension and development service in the village\(^9\). How far these were helpful in ameliorating the lot of the rural poor is a question which is debatable, but it, indubitably, helped in creating awareness in the rural masses about the potential and means of development which made quicker adoption of major technological advances in the field of agriculture, community service and creation of basic infrastructure, very essential for development in latter years.

The awareness acted as a spur for many of reformative measures undertaken by the central and the state governments, like abolition of intermediary landlords, reforms of land tenure system, mechanization of farming and transforming of agriculture operations on scientific lines. Also the total investment made in five year plans on agriculture, irrigation facilities, various inputs like seeds etc., setting up of fertilizer plants, rural electrification and power generation did bring about a qualitative change in the rural scene. It led to the creation of essential physical and institutional infrastructure of socio-economic development in many rural areas. Efforts were also made to evolve schemes and programmes especially designed for the development of small and marginal farmers and the landless and agricultural labourers in particular\(^10\). With the objective of specific area development the


programmes like the development of drought prone areas and desert areas and tribal people were launched in the seventies. Simultaneously various programmes for rural wage and employment for work were introduced to provide opportunities for work for the rural poors during the bleak seasons, when the farmers were not engaged in sowing or harvesting operation. Their aim was to create additional employment in rural areas with the help of available surplus food stock and their wages were partially paid in cash and partially in form of food gains or works of durable utility to the community. A series of these programmes and schemes specially designed for the upliftment of rural areas would reveal that the objective sought to be realized through their implementation have not always materialized. The Small Farmers Development Agencies programmes aimed at increasing the income level of small and marginal farmers and agricultural labourers has been in operation since 1971. The objective of the programme was to assist specifically identified persons to raise their income level. This was to be achieved by helping them to adopt improved agricultural technology, acquire means of increasing agricultural production like minor irrigation and diversify their farm economy. The actual impact of the programme on the income of the beneficiary varied a great deal and in many cases has been of doubtful significance. It was found that the small and marginal farmers who constituted over 70 (seventy) per cent of the land holders held barely 24 per cent of the land holdings and that of top 10 per cent held as much as 51 per cent of the assets while the lower 40 per cent held barely 2.1 per cent. Since the rural people derive their livelihood primarily from agriculture, their living conditions depend to a significant extent

upon the performance of this sector. The incidence of rural poverty is found to be inversely related to agricultural production per head of rural population. This assets the existence of trickle down mechanism in India. However, the power of trickle down process has been found to be very limited and at the same time weakening over time. This under-scores the importance of some specific measures in the alleviation of rural poverty by increasing production, employment in rural areas and by maintaining the rural wages rate at a reasonable level.

The agricultural labour households and the primarily cultivator households consisting of marginal and small farmers are identified as the rural poor. The 32nd round (1977-78) of the National Sample Survey Report revealed that about 50 per cent of the agricultural labour households and 31.7 per cent of the household self-employed in agriculture (a large section of whom are marginal and small farmers) were living below poverty line in India. The two groups of households together constituted 79.32 per cent of rural poor. The report also revealed that casual labourers were among the poorest segment of the total work force in agriculture whereas 58.2 per cent of the casual workers and 49.3 per cent of the regular wage workers were living below poverty line. 31.7 per cent of the self employment households in agriculture were found to be living in poverty. The programme of land reforms started in the fifties, had made a little progress. Regional imbalances were glaring and poverty was wide spread and disconcerting. Hence the Integrated Rural Development Programme was introduced in 1978-79 to assist the rural population to
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economic benefits from the developmental assets of each area. The programme consists of small and marginal farmers, agricultural labourers, landless labourers and rural artisans etc. Under the programme, the largest coverage has been under improved agricultural category followed by animal husbandry and fisheries. The programme was comprehensive in scope and sought to secure fuller exploitation of the local potentials. Training of Rural Youths for Self-Employment (TRYSEM), started in 1979 for providing self-employment to rural youths and Agency for Development of Women and Children, could not get satisfactory assistance from other rural development programmes, were associated with IRDP in 1983. According to the official estimates, the pattern of growth, emerging from the development strategy and implementation of special poverty alleviation programmes has brought down the number of rural poor living below poverty line. According to the Planning Commission, the decline has been from 51.2 per cent in 1977-78 to 40.4 per cent in 1983-84, 39.9 per cent in 1985-86 and 28.2 per cent in 1989-90. The Sixth Plan envisaged the reduction of the percentage of people below poverty line to less than 10 per cent by 1994-95. However, the success of the programme like IRDP largely depends upon its effective implementation in the field. At the national level, the experience in implementing this programme in the past has shown that though it did have some measure of success in terms of physical and financial achievements, yet certain shortcomings have been noticed in its
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implementation. These includes wrong identification of Beneficiaries, leakage, lack of proper infrastructure, low level of investment and low percentage of people crossing poverty line.

Haryana is predominantly a rural state with over 75 per cent population living in rural areas. As to the incidence of poverty among the rural population, the 1990-91 household survey had brought out 37 per cent of the total families living below the poverty line. In Haryana too, like other states, the major poverty alleviation programme of IRDP has been implemented since its very inception in 1978-79 with the twin objective of removal of poverty and unemployment among the rural masses. In view of the exceedingly increased importance attached to this programme in the state, it is considered appropriate to study the implementation of this programme in order to ascertain the extent to which it has met the desired objectives in the past and what are its weaknesses. So far no comprehensive study has been undertaken in this regard in the state in general and Bhiwani District in particular on the problem of Administration of Integrated Rural Development Programme in Haryana. It is fruitful and essential to conduct a study to fill up the gap on this subject. The study might provide information about various development programmes with special emphasis on Integrated Rural Development Programme, its performance, administrative set-up, process of implementation, perception of officials associated with the scheme and that of the Beneficiaries and to highlight the loop-holes in the implementation of programme with suitable suggestions. Moreover, the study might open new vistas for further research on the problem.
Rural Development Programmes: A Historical Perspective

The concept of Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP) is the outcome of a long series of various rural development programme extended up to independence or beyond it. Before considering the various aspects of Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP), its performance, process of implementation, administrative structure, Beneficiaries officials perception, it is worthwhile to highlight the various schemes or programmes initiated by the government of India for rural development in brief.

During British Raj rural development, was started as a humanitarian act and the practice was not backed by any executive or legal sanction in the beginning. Legality and legitimacy was provided later. Rural development as a function of government initially began 'as a search for an alternative to laissez-faire', as B.B. Mishra observed. The Famine Commission (1880) observed, 'Agricultural prosperity in ordinary time was the best shield against the difficulties and trials of a reason of drought'. There were various sporadic attempts at agricultural development but no real beginning was made until technical agricultural personnel were appointed. Mahatma Gandhi gave a big boost to rural development through his 'back to the village' movement and his comprehensive programme which included use of Khadi, promotion of cottage and village industries, and women's upliftment. R.N. Tagore set up his

---

18 Ibid, p.85.
Sriniketan Institute of Rural Reconstruction in 1921 to make the rural folk 'self-reliant and self-respectful'. Mr. F.L. Brayne, the District Collector of Gurgaon started in 1927, a programme of rural reconstruction based on self-help and hard work. In the same year, the Martandam experiment was started in Madras under the leadership of the Youngmen's Christian Association 'To bring about a complete upward development towards a more abundant life for rural people, spiritually, mentally, physically, socially and economically'. Similarly in 1932, the princely state of Baroda launched a programme for amelioration of rural ills. Thus, the rural development programmes in India started by R.N. Tagore and Mahatma Gandhi during pre-independence period, which emphasised on self and mutual help, for a change in outlook of villagers as a pre-condition for development. Material advancement of village was considered less important and the contribution of Britishers and princely states toward rural development was microscopic. Hence large scale rural development programmes of various types were initiated after independence by the Government of India. Some of these were meant for general development of rural areas, others for development of specific area or target groups and still others for rural wage and employment generation. To have a better picture of rural development programmes, it is worthwhile here to mention a brief review of these programmes. The emphasis of general rural development programmes was on agriculture. The general programmes include Community Development Programme, National Extension Scheme, Panchayati Raj Institutions, Co-operative Movement, Intensive Agricultural District Programme (IADP),

Intensive Agricultural Area Programme (IAAP), High Yielding Varieties (HYV) etc.

Under the first-five-year plan (1951-56), the strategy of socio-economic transformation was to establish National Extension Service (NES) as a permanent agency and Community Development as a method to unite government services with people's effort to solve commonly felt problems. The role of National Extension Service (NES) was to bring improved knowledge of agriculture and certain basic services to the very doors of the people, while Community Development Programme (CDP) created the climate and the ground through social education, motivation, group formation, aided-self projects etc. The process of people's participation was the very basis of this approach. In fact, the rationale of combining Community Development with National Extension Service was to create a social climate of acceptability and group infrastructure so that extension service could reach and serve more people\(^\text{22}\). Thus Community Development Programme was the first in this direction with a view of systematic integrated rural development by making one multi-purpose functionary responsible at the grass-root-level for all rural development activities particularly in the field of agricultural development. As a result of this programme, a number of rural facilities were provided and certain degree of development conscience was also created among the rural folk\(^\text{23}\). It was the Community Development Organization through which the government reached down to the villages as an agent for the improvement of agriculture and the transformation of rural society.


There was a major change in the functioning of the administrative set up after owning the responsibilities of development and social change by the Government. The administration was given the responsibilities of leadership role in influencing, guiding and managing development process. Though systematic training was imparted but without any training policy and this leads to people's alienation from the development programmes.

By late fifties, it was realized that something was seriously wrong with CDP. It was no more a people’s programme but bureaucratic mobilization to fulfil targets set by the centralized planning process. Hence, periodical evaluation of progress of rural development on the basis of CDP led to change in two directions. First, there was the shift in emphasis to economic development, especially agricultural production. Secondly, there was the broadening of popular participation through democratic decentralization as recommended by the Balwant Rai Mehta Committee (1958). For making CDP more successful, Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) were introduced in 1959 with a three tier structural organization with delegation of authority for decision making and policy implementation. Thus Panchayati Raj was heralded as political revolution that brought democracy to the door steps of the people and ensured their participation in development activities. While every Indian State had adopted the Panchayati Raj system in one form or the other, it has not proved effective in promoting either economic development or political participation at the village

26 Pinto, Marino R., "Rural Development and Bureaucracy in India" op. cit., p.283.
level\textsuperscript{27}. As Ashok Mehta Committee put it, "some would treat it just as an administrative agency"; and still others as "an extension of democracy at the grass-root level"; and still others as a "character of rural local government"\textsuperscript{28}. Apart from this, these institutions are bound to be judged by the operational efficiency of their administrative machinery. Within five years, these institutions began to stagnate and score to decline. The trend continued in the eighties and an attempt is being made to restructure and galvanise them into purposive action. Panchayati Raj was considered as an institutional mechanism for rural development. Its twin objectives were development and democracy\textsuperscript{29}. Though it has contributed to rural development, the scheme could not become successful in most of the states due to odd reasons since long. A basic defect of the community development approach was that it thought of the community as a whole without realizing that this was broken up into various social and economic stratifications. It was alleged that both CDP and PRIs catered to the demands of the dominant class and caste groups\textsuperscript{30}. Another important instrument of rural development has been the co-operative movement. The blue print of the co-operative development programme as an integral part of rural development was provided by the well known Rural Credit Survey Committee Report. It looked upon co-operation as an alliance of the weak against the dominance of the strong element that is the landlords-trader-moneylender group supported by the banking and trading institutions in the city and metropolitan centers. The blue print of the constructive programme of rural development

\textsuperscript{27} Ray, Ramashray, etal, Problems in Rural Development, (Delhi: Discovery,1985), p.vi.
\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., p.10.
\textsuperscript{30} Dubashi, P.R., "Approaches to Integrated Rural Development in India: Administrative and Organizational Issues", op. cit., p.113.
recommended by the Committee was known as "The Scheme for Integrated Rural Credit". The scheme was for integrated rural credit in this sense that agricultural production was to be linked to agricultural finance and recovery of agricultural loans was to be linked to co-operative marketing and processing. These were essential elements of the crop loans scheme which was also a scheme for supervising credit. The credit was to be linked with standing crop rather than with land security. On the recommendation of the committee, National Co-operative Development Corporation was established to encourage co-operative marketing and processing. As the institution was designed to provide short term and medium term credit, for long term credit there was a system of land mortgage banks now known as Land Development Banks. In the past, they provided finance only for redemption of credit with the establishment of the Agricultural Refinance Corporation in 1963. They were geared more and more to provide long term finance for purpose like digging tube wells, land reclamation, horticulture, mechanization etc. As in the case of CDP, the benefit of co-operative development have also gone largely to the richer and middle peasants rather than to small farmers and tenants. Some programmes of agricultural development existed outside the pale of CDP and Co-operative movement. They were essentially the programmes of a technical nature, like supply of improved seeds, improvement of agronomical practices, development of green manure and compost, popularization of chemical fertilizer etc. They were all of a general nature and not particularly developed for the small farmers or weaker sections. It is not as if community development had not emphasised on

31 Dubashi, P.R., "Approaches to Integrated Rural Development in India: Administrative and Organizational Issues", op. cit., p. 113.
Lack of technology was an inherent weakness for accelerating agricultural production, in spite of sincere endeavours of the CD staff. The need for greater concentration on food production itself, almost in preference to the concept around development prevalent then, was reflected in the 'Report on India's Food Crisis and Steps to Meet It; (1959) by a team led by Dr. Sherman E. Johnson under the auspices of Ford Foundation. It observed that "The rate of increase must be tripled to meet the third plan target. If India's food production increases no faster than the present rates, the gap between supplies and targets will be 28 million by 1965-66. This will be about 25 per cent short fall in term of need. No conceivable programme of imports or rationing can meet a crisis of this magnitude." Food production must be given the highest priority and selected crops and selected areas in each state should be chosen which have the greatest increased potentialities. These recommendations led to the strategy for locating well endowed districts and farms therein capable of yielding high agricultural production and marketable surplus. Consequently, more concentration was put on improving productivity per acre than on extending the acreage. A package programme was launched as the Intensive Agricultural District Programme (IADP) in the last year of the Second Plan (1960-61) and 37 districts in 14 states were

covered by 1970.\textsuperscript{33} This was followed by the Intensive Agricultural Area Programme (IAAP) in 1964-65 which also adopted the strategy of IADP, but less intensively. By 1966, 117 Districts covering 1,596 blocks and by 1970, 150 Districts were brought under this programme. IADP advocated a selective area approach to agricultural development and the achievement of intensity of cropping. Towards this, packages for extension services and for improved production practices were designed. Both knowledge and inputs were made available. Preparation of farm plan was stressed incorporating the 'package' needed for output increase. The programme was quite successful. The drought years of 1964-66 were really a harrowing experience but out of this crucible emerged the focus on the utilization of the High Yielding Varieties (HYV) representing the needed mix of research results and farm application. The infra-structure and the experience in IADP to some extent and the technology of the new varieties largely contributed the optimism on the food production front. The HYV which was originally launched in 1963-64, expanded sufficiently to cover 37 million hectares by 1977-78\textsuperscript{34}. Though these programmes (IAAP and HYV) contributed to the 'Green Revolution' and increased in agricultural production, these remained largely confined to regions with better natural advantages. At the same time, they greatly increased economic polarization in rural areas and also contributed to increasing social antagonisms between landlords and tenants and land owners and labourers.\textsuperscript{35}


\textsuperscript{35} Reserve Bank of India, Report of All India Rural Credit Review Committee, Bombay, 1969, p.134.
Associated with poverty in the rural areas are the problems of unemployment and under-employment. These are the two basic factors which affect the poorest segment of the rural population and are the major contributory factors of the high incidence of poverty in the rural areas. A substantial reduction in poverty can be achieved only if there are determined efforts at the distribution of income and consumption in favour of the poorer section of the population, hence a number of rural wage and employment generation programmes were launched simultaneously. These includes Rural Manpower Programme (RMP), Crash Scheme for Rural Employment (CSRE), Pilot Intensive Rural Employment Programme (PIREP), Food for Work Programme (FPW), National Rural Employment Programme (NREP), Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (RLEG) and Jawahar Rojgar Yojana (JRY). The later programme i.e. JRY is presently under implementation in the country and is a culmination of previous efforts in implementing wage employment programmes for the removal of poverty and under employment.

Rural Manpower Programme (RMP) was the first major programme started in 1960-61 to provide employment on the mass scale in the rural areas. The aim was to provide employment for 100 days at least to 2.5 million persons in the country by the end of the third five-year-plan. However, the programme did not gain much grounds due to the availability of limited funds. Therefore, this programme came to an end in 1968-69.\textsuperscript{36} In the early Seventies, when the planning strategy emphasised a direct attack on poverty, the Crash Scheme for Rural Employment was introduced in

April, 1971. The purpose of Crash Scheme was to alleviate the prevailing conditions of unemployment and under-employment in rural areas by generating additional employment through rural works. This programme aimed to generate employment opportunities for 1000 persons in each district for 250 days per year during the three years from 1971-74. Apart from employment generation, the other objective of this programme was to generate assets of a durable nature in the areas of minor irrigation, land development, afforestation and school buildings etc. However, the programme failed to generate substantial employment due to poor planning and weak administrative machinery. The Community Development Programme and 'Green Revolution' could not do much for rural poor. Hence special programmes were needed either on target basis or area basis. The All India Credit Review Committee (1969) pointed out "If the fruits of development continued to be denied to large section of the rural community, while prosperity accrues to some, the resulting tensions, social and economic, may not only upset the process of orderly and peaceful change in the rural economy but even frustrate the national efforts to keep up agricultural productions." The broad objectives of planning in India has been ‘growth with social justice’ and it has remained the major concern and focus of the government. In order to achieve the goals of development with social justice, it was necessary to ensure that all patterns of overall economic growth itself is such as to generate adequate income for the weaker sections through its impact on employment generation and on the development of the backward

38 Reserve Bank of India, Report of All India Rural Review Committee, op. cit., p.579.
regions. It was considered that growth in economy and agricultural production will automatically 'Trickle down' to the masses and alleviate their poverty. The first setback to this contention came with disillusionment, which was equally quick, with the emerging pattern of growth which 'bypassed a large section of rural population particularly the small farmers, tenants, share croppers and agriculture labourers'.

In the fourth plan, the attention shifted to the weaker sections. It was realized that the gains of development did not percolate to the poor. The basic problem was now to achieve rapid growth with distributive justice. The 'area based' and 'target based' approach was adopted and a number of programmes devised. Special programmes were introduced for the benefit of the poor, relatively less privileged classes and backward areas. The objectives of these programmes were creation of assets, skill development and creation of infra-structure as well as to take up development works in the backward areas. Beneficiary oriented programmes like Small Farmers Development Agency (SFDA), and Marginal Farmers and Agricultural Labourers Agency (MFAL) aimed at helping the specific target groups of Beneficiaries were started in 1971-72. The main objective of the SFDA was to assist the small farmers, with land holdings between 2.5 to 5.0 acres, who had not benefited from the gains of the green revolution. This was
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to be achieved by helping them to adopt to irrigation and other production increasing measures and diversify their farm economy through subsidiary activities like animal husbandry, dairying, horticulture etc. Subsidy to the extent of 25 per cent was provided to the identified small farmers on capital investments and inputs besides the facility of loans to them from the cooperative and commercial banks. SFDA remained a cent per cent centrally funded scheme up to 1978 and therefore it came to be funded on 50 : 50 sharing basis by centre and state governments. During the fourth five-year-plan, 46 Pilot projects were launched. Each project was expected to cover, during the five year period, approximately 50,000 families of identified small farmers. Similarly the objectives of Marginal Farmers and Agricultural Labourers (MFAL) scheme was to assist the marginal farmers, with land holdings below 2.5 acres and agricultural labourers to improve their productivity and income through a varieties of activities like crop husbandry, increased use of inputs, minor irrigation, animal husbandry etc. The admissible subsidy to the scheme was kept at 33 1/3 per cent, besides the loans on SFDA pattern continued to be floated to them. During the Fourth Five Year Plan, 41 MFAL projects were started. Each project aimed at covering over the five years period, 15,000 marginal farmers and 5000 agricultural labourers out of the identified lists. The two agencies were brought together in 1974 under a combined agency came to be known as SFDA. The basic objective of this agency was to enable selected target groups of marginal and small farmers and agricultural labourers to improve their incomes through undertaking productive activities or improving their existing ones. It consisted of a governing body with a small executive staff, with the collector as the head. Its members were district officers of agriculture, animal husbandry and other departments closely
concerned with its programmes. Financial institutions and Zila-Parishads were represented along with some non-officials. It had no staff or its own except few officials at the District level. It depended upon the existing block officials to identify target persons and implementation of the schemes for their benefit. By 1980, the number of SFDAs rose to 168 from 87 in 1972-73, covering 1818 Blocks in 200 District of the country. During the 9 years of the operation of SFDA-MFAL agencies a total of 16.7 million persons from the target groups were identified for assistance in all project Blocks. The assistance was made available to 8 million Beneficiaries of whom 1.3 million belonged to SCs and STs. About 75 per cent (6.1 million) of the Beneficiaries were helped through subsidised supply of inputs, improved implementation etc. The cumulative medium and long term credit advanced to the Beneficiaries till August, 1980 stood at Rs.382.4 crores and the total money spent up to this period was Rs.239.7 crore which included subsidy and administrative expenses. SFDA programme which could deliver some benefits to only about Eight million persons, suffered from several limitations. First, the total members identified for assistance did not cover all the target group households which were estimated in 1971 to be 51 million. Secondly, even among the identified beneficiary households only half of these were given some assistance. Thirdly, the assistance in the form of subsidy and loan was too small in many cases to enable the very poor households, which were mostly of marginal farmers

and agricultural labourers, to improve their dismal economic lot substantially.

To cover the regional imbalances certain other special programmes like Development of Drought Prone Area (DPAP), Hill Area Development (HAD), Whole Village Development Programme, Command Area Development (CAD), Tribal Area Development (TADP) and Desert Development Programme (DDP) were started in the seventies. These are essentially area-based programmes. These programmes, in general aimed at the overall development of the area where they operated. Moreover, these programmes focused on the development of weaker sections of the society.

Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP) is an area development programme with a thrust on development of irrigation sources, soil and moisture conservation, forestation, livestock development and development of sound dryland farming practices and their adoption. It has occupied special importance as it relates to vast areas which are subject to the hazardous consequences of drought. This programme has been extended to 947 Blocks in 155 District in 13 States, including total area of 746 lakh hectares up to 1994-95. The total expenditure on this programme since its inception in 1973-74 to 1994-95 has been Rs.1742 crore and has improved the position of an area of 57.29 lakh hectares. Though it is essentially an area development programme, the individual beneficiary approach, similar to that of SFDA has also been adopted in DPAP.\textsuperscript{46} Hill Area Development Programme has been in operation in hilly areas with the objective of raising the living standard of the

local population. The programme is oriented to the local conditions so as to benefit directly the local population. Area development plans are prepared for the integrated development of hill areas.\textsuperscript{47} Tribal Area Development Programme is concerned with the development of tribal areas and to bring a qualitative change in the socio-economic structure of the tribal community. The Integrated Area Plans prepared under this programme focus on the development of tribal communities in general and the weakest sections among the tribals, in particular. The main approach to development has been to cover 50,000 to 70,000 tribal Beneficiaries by different agencies under various economic development programmes.\textsuperscript{48} In Command Area Development Programme the emphasis is to ensure alround development of the command area with a view to achieve efficient and optimum utilization of the irrigation potential. Though the programme is area-based, special emphasis on weaker sections has also been laid side by side, in order to enable them to take full advantage of the benefits available to small and marginal farmers under the SFDA programme are also available under this programme with the difference that the target number or Beneficiaries to be covered is not fixed.\textsuperscript{49} Desert Development Programme (DDP) was started in the states of Haryana, Rajasthan, Gujrat, Himachal Pardesh, and Jammu and Kashmir in 1977-78 with the objectives of controlling desertification and promotion of opportunities to raise the level of production, income and employment in areas covered under the programme. The objectives are sought to be achieved by taking up activities like irrigation, afforestation, soil and water conservation,

\textsuperscript{47} Thaha, Mumtaz, "Next Step in Rural Development : Action for Eighties" op. cit., p.266.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., p.266.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid. p.267.
dryland agriculture, ground water development, livestock development etc. The programme covers both hot and cold arid areas and has been extended to 7 States covering 36 Districts and 277 Blocks by 1994-95. From the very beginning of the programme up to 1994-95, a sum of Rs. 597.51 crore has been spent and the position of 5.52 lakh hectares area has been improved. The pattern of funding and allocation for the programme varies according to the extent and severity of aridity. Up to 1978-79, the entire expenditure on the programme was born by the central government. From 1979-80 onwards, the cost is shared equally between the central government and the state government concerned.50

Based on the equitable distribution of the benefits of development, a Whole Village Development Scheme was conceived. It was based on the recommendations of the National Commission on Agriculture. The main theme of this scheme was the concentration on multi-faceted development endeavour around the village community as a whole and to entrust the programme to suitable voluntary agency if there was one in the area. The programme includes land reforms and consolidation of holdings, land development including soil and water management, maximizing irrigation support and cropping programme for the village as a whole, aiming at maximized use of resources. To start with, it was proposed to take up five pilot projects in four states. Pilot Intensive Rural Employment Project (PIREP) was planned as an action-cum study project to provide employment to the needy rural people in selected areas along with Crash Scheme for Rural Employment. It was introduced in 15 selected Blocks in October, 1972 for a period

of three years. Besides employment generation, it was also aimed at studying the nature and dimensions of the problem of unemployment among wage seeking rural workers. It also tried to find out the potential for employment in the secondary and tertiary sectors and the skill training need for such employment.\textsuperscript{51} Though PIREP proved to be slightly better programme because of the fact that it threw light on certain characteristics of rural unemployment but it was not rated as successful by the Review Committee on PIREP which pointed out that due to certain organizational deficiencies, this programme could not prove to be of much use in evolving a comprehensive programme for the whole country.\textsuperscript{52} Food for Work Programme (FWP) was introduced as a nation wide programme in April, 1977 in view of the abundant availability of food stocks. The basic objectives of the programme were to generate additional gainful employment to a large number of unemployed and under employed persons in the rural areas for raising their income and consequently their nutritional levels; to create durable community assets; and to utilize the surplus food grains for the development of human resources.\textsuperscript{53} The distinctive aspect of this programme was to pay a part of the wage in the form of food grains at subsidised prices, which assured minimum food consumption and therefore, minimum nutrition to the Beneficiaries. The work under this programme was on the whole planned and implemented by taking into account the lessons derived from the working of the rural works and Crash employment programmes launched earlier. It was evaluated by the PEO of the Planning Commission which pointed

\textsuperscript{51} Khanna, B.S., \textit{Rural Development in South Asia-I : India}, op. cit., p.156.
out that the major hindrance in the implementation of the programme was its administrative slackness. It continued up to October, 1980 when it was replaced by a more comprehensive programme named National Rural Employment Programme (NREP).

In view of the emphasis laid down in the Sixth Plan on the alleviation of rural poverty and redistribution of income and consumption in favour of the poorer sections of the population by significantly increasing employment opportunities in the rural areas, the Food for Work Programme was redefined and restructured in the form of National Rural Employment Programme (NREP). This programme was started in October, 1980 as a centrally sponsored scheme on 50:50 sharing basis between the Centre and States. The basis objectives of the programme were generation of additional gainful employment for unemployed and under-employed men and women in the rural areas, creation of durable community assets to strength the rural infra-structure which will lead to a rapid growth of the rural economy and improvement in the overall quality of life in the rural areas. Under NREP, preference was to be given to landless labours, scheduled castes and scheduled tribes for employment and the works which had the potential to provide direct benefits to the poor were preferred. Wages were to be paid partly in cash and partly in food grains. Since its inception up to 1988-89 under NREP, funds to the tune of Rs.4774.13 crore were utilized against the allocation of Rs.4986.25 crore. In addition 5.58 million tonnes of food grains were also utilized. The total mandays generated

54 Government of India, Department of Agriculture, NREP : Guidelines, New-Delhi, 1985, p.5.
under NREP were 3252.44 million during this period.\textsuperscript{56} NREP has however, had a significant impact in terms of stabilization of wages in the rural areas, containing prices of food grains and the creation of wide variety of community assets which could be expected to raise the levels of living of the rural population.\textsuperscript{57} It apparently looked a direct focus on the target group population for whom it was meant.

Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (RLEGP) was launched in August, 1983 to deal with the problem of wide spread poverty among the economically depressed classes of rural people, the landless workers. The objectives of this programme were similar to those of the NREP with the addition that at least one member of every rural landless household would get a guaranteed employment up to 100 days in a year. The programme was entirely funded by the Central Government. The criteria for financial allocation and conditions stipulated for use of funds were similar to those for NREP. Under this programme, since its inception, up to 1988-89, a sum of Rs.3035.07 crore was utilized against the allocation of Rs.2674.7 crore. The total mandays generated were 1395.25 millions and the food grains utilized in the above time period was 25.19 lakh tones.\textsuperscript{58} The report of the Mid Term Appraisal of Seventh Plan, and Annual Report of the Department of Rural Development\textsuperscript{59} have noted that the programme

\textsuperscript{56} Government of India, Department of Rural Development, \textit{Annual Report 1988-89}, New-Delhi, p.77.  
\textsuperscript{58} Government of India, Department of Rural Development, \textit{Basic Rural Statistics-1990}, New-Delhi, pp.68-70.  
has been able to create community assets and generate additional employment, in addition to stabilizing the wage rates in the country side. Certain weaknesses have also been observed in its implementation by the studies conducted by the Planning Commission. Jawahar Rojgar Yojana (JRY) came into existence by merging the erstwhile employment programme of NREP and RLEGP. This programme was launched in April, 1989 all over the country with the objectives: generation of additional gainful employment for the unemployed and under-employed persons both men and women in rural areas; creation of sustained employment by strengthening rural economic infra-structure and also assets in favour of rural poors for their direct and continuing benefits and improvement in the overall quality of life in the rural areas. Jawahar Rojgar Yojana is a centrally sponsored scheme on the cost sharing basis between the centre and states in ratio of 80: 20. The target group and administrative set-up of the programme are similar to that of IRDP. At the District level, the entire work relating to coordination, review, supervision and monitoring of the programme has been entrusted to DRDA/Zila Parishads. At the village levels, the Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) are directly sought to be involved in the implementation of the programme. The state level committee for the rural development programmes is responsible for monitoring and review of the programme at state level. Since its inception in 1989-90 up to 1995-96, a sum of Rs.21335.58 crore has been utilized by the states, constituting 98.18 per cent of the total

60 Government of India, Department of Rural Development, Agenda for the Meeting of States Secretaries of Rural Development on JRY : 21st and 22nd September, 1992, New-Delhi, p.9 and Also see Government of India, Department of Rural Development, Manual on JRY, New-Delhi, 1991, p.1.
allocation and has created 5823.54 million mandays against the
target of 5936.40 million.⁶¹

The Fifth Plan (1974-79) recognized that rural
development should include agricultural development in its widest
sense, so as to embrace, apart from crop production, all allied
activities. This integrated development should encompass both
spatial and functional integration of all relevant programmes
bearing increased agricultural production and reduction of
unemployment.⁶² It is true that the economic betterment of these
weaker sections cannot be achieved without social transformation
involving structural changes, educational development, growth in
awareness and change in outlook, motivation and attitudes. The
policy framework based on these factors should be such as to
provide opportunities for the weaker sections to display initiative to
stand on their feet. To identify the people living in poverty, a
poverty line was drawn, based on the minimum level of the caloric
consumption of 2400 calories for rural areas and 2100 calories for
urban areas per head per day in India. For the first time the number
of persons who could be regarded as poor was estimated on the
basis of consumption index i.e. Rs.240/- at (1960-61 price level) per
capita per year by the study group of Planning Commission, the
abject poverty line was defined as the level corresponding to
Rs.200/-. It was estimated that 164 million people were below the
poverty line in 1960-61. In deciding this procedure more widely
accepted is to find the lowest equal consumer expenditure level in
the observed National Sample Survey data at which the quantum of

⁶¹ Government of India, Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment, Annual
Report 1996-97, New-Delhi, p.5.
⁶² Minhas, B.S., "Rural Poverty, Land Redistribution and Development
Strategy : Facts," SANKHYA (Indian Journal of Statistics), Series c, Vol.36,
No. 2-4, June-December, 1974, p.252.
food intake meets the nutritional requirement and adopt that as the minimum consumption norm. Their composition had a national preponderance among the small landholders but had about 60 million who were landless agricultural labourers or artisans. The percentage of population below poverty line in 1977-78 may be projected at 48 per cent in rural areas and 41 per cent in urban areas. The total number would be 290 million. Hence task to attack this poverty line both by public investment and by activating self-employment was set and Minimum Needs Programme and Adult Education Programme were initiated. Many programmes for target group and area development are under active implementation. It was felt that they did not form part of a unified effort to tackle the different resources endowment in any given area. The inadequacy of the full exploitation of the potentialities in the area and the entire technological build up behind the green and white revolution had to have much wider impact on the rural areas, became the cause of concern.

The analysis of experience of the target group strategy as well as area development approaches in the late seventies has led to the design of a new programme called Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP). Thus the concept of Integrated Programme for Rural Development which is based on the knowledge of local needs, resource endowment and potentialities was introduced in 1976. The programme was initially started in 20 selected Districts of the country and it was reviewed in 1978-79 to integrate the methodology and approach of the three major on-going special programmes of Small Farmers Development Agency (SFDA),

---

Command Areas Development (CADP) and Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP). All the principal contents of these three programmes were integrated into a new programme called Integrated Rural Development Programme and taken up in 2300 Blocks of the country in 1978-79.\(^66\) Up to 1978-79, IRDP was a central sector scheme and 100 per cent funds were provided by the central government. During the 1979-80 the programme was made a centrally sponsored scheme in which funding was shared on 50:50 basis between the center and the states. In case of Union Territories, however, 100 per cent funds were provided by the Central Government. IRDP was extended to all the Blocks in the country w.e.f. 2\(^{nd}\) October, 1980. Since then IRDP continues to be a major instrument of poverty alleviation in rural areas. Over the last fifteen years, since 1980, during which IRDP has been under implementation, a total of 469.96 lakh families have been assisted with total investment of Rs. 22600.80 crore consisting of Rs. 7936.92 crore of subsidy and Rs. 15260.88 crore credit from institutional financing agencies. The per capita investment has been increased from Rs. 2876 in the sixth plan to about Rs. 10200 during the year 1994-95.\(^67\) At the national level, the targets have been achieved in respect of all the qualitative parameters set out in the programme guidelines. However, the programme performance has been uneven between the states.


\(^{67}\) Ibid., p.1.
employment in agriculture and allied activities. This necessarily involves concerted efforts by way of training programmes and equipping the 'targeted group' with the necessary knowledge, skills and technology. There are several on-going training programmes designed for achieving specific purposes but the problem has not been tackled in its totality. Hence the need for a comprehensive training programme for the rural youth embracing the various facts of economic activity in the rural areas, particularly in agricultural and allied sector was felt. With this end in view, the Government of India approved a comprehensive training programme known as the "National Scheme of Training of Rural Youths for Self-employment" (TRYSEM) on 15th August, 1979 to cover both IRD and non-IRD areas. Its main objective is to train at least two lakh rural youths every year in agricultural and allied activities for self-employment. The main thrust of the scheme is to equip rural youths with necessary skills and technology to enable them to seek self-employment for which the trainee will be given appropriate support from Government for setting up their own enterprise. In August, 1993, the scope of the programme was enlarged by including wage employment. On completion of training, the TRYSEM Beneficiaries are assisted under the main programme of IRDP. The Beneficiaries of TRYSEM comprises of youths of the age group of 18-35 from families living below the poverty line. About 50 per cent trained youths should belong to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and a minimum of 40 per cent of youths trained should be women. At least 3 per cent of the benefits should be earmarked for physically handicapped persons. The identified youths are put

---

69 Ibid., P.588.
through a period of training either with a training institution or under a master craftsman. The duration of the training is flexible depending upon types of courses and in normal case it should not exceed six months. TRYSEM trainees are given a stipend and a toolkit on successful completion of training and they become eligible to get a culmination of subsidy and institutional credit under IRDP for acquisition of income generating assets. The Block Development Officer selects the eligible youths belonging to the families living below the poverty line with the help of the Gram Sachiv or village level workers (VLWs). The administrative structure of this programme at various level is the same as that of IRDP. Under the programme 37.09 lakh youths were given training since 1980-81 to March, 1996. The percentage of trained youths undertaking self-employment and wage employment was 56 per cent. The coverage of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes was 41 per cent and that of the women was 44 per cent during the above mentioned period. The total expenditure incurred during this period was Rs.497.96 crore and Rs.127.22 crore respectively on recurring and non-recurring heads.  

Realizing the need for development of rural women and to ensure their better participation in the development activities, a new scheme entitled “Development of Women and Children in Rural Area” (DWCRA) was started in 1982.  

poverty line with a view to provide them opportunities of self-employment on a sustained basis. The need for a special programme designed exclusively for women was felt as it was noticed that women members of IRDP families were not availing the benefits of that programme in adequate measure.\(^{72}\) The beneficiary group of DWCRA is the same as that of under IRDP i.e. families living below the poverty line. However, the basic difference with IRDP lies in the fact that under DWCRA, it is not individual family who receive the benefits but the group as a whole. The DWCRA scheme envisages the information of group each consisting of 10-15 women for taking up economic activities suited to their skill, aptitude and the local conditions. The group strategy has been adopted under the programme to motivate the rural women to come together who were not hitherto coming forward to take the benefits. DWCRA scheme operates in conjunction with IRDP and TRYSEM. The group members are given training usually under TRYSEM. Each group of women under DWCRA is given a lump-sum grant of Rs.15,000 as a revolving fund for purchase of the raw materials, marketing and child care etc. This amount is contributed in equal share by the Government of India, State Government and UNICEF. DWCRA like IRDP is also being implemented through the DRDA at the district level. There exists a separate staff on the strength of the DRDAs to supervise and monitor the operation of the programme in the concerned development Blocks in the District. Under DWCRA, 146562 women groups have been organized against the target of 117935 groups formation up to 1995-96 which is 124 per cent of the target. The total membership of the formed groups is about 24.59 lakh members, which comes to an average of 17 members per group

and the same is in accordance with the prescribed target of 10-15 members per group. The total funds utilized during this period is Rs.191.36 crore.\textsuperscript{73}

Main Features of IRDP

The main features of IRDP may be highlighted here. These include:

(i) The Integrated Rural Development Programme is basically an anti-poverty programme in which people living below poverty line are identified and provided loans and assistance, in a bid to bring them above the poverty-line, by raising production and productivity in agriculture and allied sectors and by imparting assets and skills to increase the earnings of such vulnerable groups (target groups) in the rural sector.

(ii) Its strategy is to put to optimum use of the local resources—human, biological and natural through available technology to create assets and employment, increase income, remove poverty and minimise inequality.

(iii) It is a target group programme consisting the weaker sections of the rural population, which includes scheduled castes/scheduled tribes, agricultural and non-agricultural labourers, rural artisans, marginal and small farmers and those whose annual income from all sources is below Rs.6400/- (a figure which determines the poverty line), for the seventh five-year-plan. The cut off line for assistance, however, fixed at Rs.4800/- so that the poorest can have the benefit of this scheme. For the eighth plan (1992-97), the poverty was

\textsuperscript{73} Government of India, Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment, Annual Report 1996-97, p.28.
redefined and kept at an annual income of Rs.11,000/- for a family with cut off point of Rs. 8500/- per annum for assistance under the programme. This has been done by taking into account the price rise upto the year 1991-92.

(v) The poorest of the poor is given priority under this programme.

(vi) The assistance from IRDP is given in such a way that at least 50 per cent of the assisted families should be SC and ST and at least 40 per cent of the total Beneficiaries should be women. Women-headed households must be given priority and at least 3 per cent of the Beneficiaries should be from the category of physically handicapped. The investments made in IRDP are governed by two principal factors: interest shown by the beneficiary and its acceptability to the Banking Institutions.

(vii) Family is considered to be the unit for purpose of the IRDP and the identified families are to be given assistance in the form of subsidies and loans to enable them to take up economic activities which would raise their income. The pattern of subsidy varies from 25 per cent for small farmers, 33.3 per cent for marginal farmers, agricultural labourers and rural artisans to 50 per cent for SC/ST and physically handicapped. The ceiling on subsidy is Rs. 3000/- per family in normal areas, Rs. 4000/- in DPAP/DDP areas and Rs. 5000/- for SC and ST and physically handicapped. Recently the subsidy limits of IRDP have been enhanced by Rs. 1000/- for each category.

(viii) The lynchpin of the IRDP is the DRDA which is responsible for its implementation at the District level.
Review of Literature

The vastness of the Rural Development Programme and the attention of the government towards rural development has attracted the attention of the scholars of varied interest to study the impact of the programme. The researchers and scholars could not remain unconcerned with this area and as a result, a number of studies have been conducted both by the individuals and institutions. Some studies have emphasised the role of bureaucrats in rural development, others on the necessity of people's participation in rural development programmes and still others have advocated structural and behavioural changes in administrative machinery responsible for its implementation. Some have proposed to integrate under a single agency, some others are of the view to integrate all the service sectors. It seems appropriate here to have a glimpse of the studies in this field in order to have a historical and theoretical perspective of the problem under investigation. These studies can be divided into two parts - General studies regarding rural development and Studies on IRDP conducted at various levels. Some of the important studies relating Rural Development and Administration can be cited here: La Palombora74 (ed.) "Bureaucracy and Political Development" (1963) concluded that the upper reaches of a public administrative hierarchy may constitute a paragon of skill, rationality and humanness but all this goes relatively unnoticed if those who deal directly with the public are arrogant, aloof, arbitrary and corrupt in behaviour. A.P. Barnabas75 "Citizens' Grievances and Administration" (1969) found that the public did not have

confidence in administration and the official themselves were not fully satisfied with what the administration can do for the villagers. More than that, they indicated a lack of confidence among each other and consequently, their alienation from administration. Kuldeep Mathur\textsuperscript{76} "Bureaucratic Response to Development" (1972) has pointed out that the performance of the administrators was dependent on their mental make up and a 'developmentalist' was needed to implement development policies. J.N. Khosla\textsuperscript{77} in the article "Research in Development Administration" (1974) pointed out that the key factor in development administration is its capability to enlist mass participation in development schemes. Sharma and Malhotra's\textsuperscript{78} "Integrated Rural Development" (1977) concluded that integrated rural development is a liberating force, a dynamic awakening by restructuring and modernization of the traditional society and the rural setting with proper mobilization of local resources in man and material to ensure comprehensive development specially of those segments which could not keep pace with more aggregative developmental processes. J.S. Mathur\textsuperscript{79} (ed.) "Rural Development in India" (1979) inferred that various programmes of employment generation in rural areas have made some impact on the vast problems of unemployment and under employment but the new approach of Integrated Rural Development Programme can be expected to provide a working base for tackling

\textsuperscript{76} Mathur, Kuldeep, \textit{Bureaucratic Response to Development}, (Delhi : National, 1972).


this problem. Jai Kant Tiwari80 “Rural Development Administration: Perspectives and Prospects” (1984) a research on relations between client-bureaucrats for development activities infers that the clients are highly alienated in a bureaucratic structure, more apathetic towards participation in development activities and less universalistic in orientation than bureaucrats. Ramashray Roy81, et al in the book “Problems in Rural Development” (1985) has pointed out that Block Level Planning is essential for rural development which can provide people’s active participation in shaping their own lives by improving economy and removing poverty and inequality. Bal Ram Jakhar82 on “Plan Policies for Rural Development in India” quoted in Hoshiar Singh “Rural Development in India” (ed.), (1985) briefed out that the success of any programme depends on the synchronization of power, administrative structure and strategies for delivery of local services. Hargain Singh83 “Panchayati Raj Administration in Haryana” (1985) found that Panchayati Raj Administration in Haryana needs complete overhauling and a modern, cooperative, involvement oriented attitude both of the government as well as of the citizens. The system requires not only structural changes but its backbone also needs to be strengthened by providing adequate funds, suitable guidance and proper supervision and control to bear the bestowed responsibilities. S.R. Maheshwar84 “Rural

83 Singh, Hargian, Panchayati Raj Administration in Haryana, (Delhi: India Publisher 1985), p.127.
Development in India" (1985) pointed out that Rural Development Programmes in India suffer from a high degree of centralization as illustrated by the IRDP. S.R. Singh85 "Bureaucracy and rural Development" (1988) noted that the rural development programme is the single most important vehicle of government initiated for purposes of socio-economic change. Anil Chaturvedi 86 "District Administration : The Dynamics of Discord" (1988) concluded that most of the interactions that took place between various departments at District level were routine, with emphasis focused on an exchange of information pertaining to current demands, stating of complaints and conveying of decisions already taken unilaterally and there was little interaction between the actors for a purposive review of the past or planning for the future. Mohinder Singh87 "Rural Development Administration and Anti-Poverty Programmes" (1988) pointed out that small farmers development agency (SFDA) could not attain the desired goal due to lack of proper utilization of physical and human resources. S.K. Jha88 "Rural Development Administration in India" (1988) has remarked that though the number of employees has been increasing, the efficiency of the bureaucratic machinery and its output has remained at a low level. L.N. Dahiya89 "Dynamics of Economic Life in Rural India : A Case Study" (1991) found that the villages are in the process of modernization though the change is not as rapid as it

should have been. C.R. Kothari⁹⁰ (ed.) “Rural Development: Strategy for Rural Development” (1991) has noted that Rural Development is a part of the same process of socio-economic change and depends upon the will of the people and any scheme of rural development would not make significant impact on the rural scene till it is based on local resources, needs and skills. Kumar B. Das⁹¹ “Rural Development Through Decentralization” (1991) pointed out that the transplantation of growth models without paying proper attention to resource base, imperative of socio-economic setting, institutional and structural characteristics can neither be expected to reduce poverty and inequality nor can ensure a self-propelling development process. O.C. Sud⁹² “Administrative Problems of Rural Development in India” (1992) found that the grass root institutions, which were expected to play a crucial role in bringing about socio-economic change in rural scenario, has been far from satisfactory.

After review of various studies on rural development and administration, now we will review in brief the studies on Integrated Rural Development Programme. T.N. Chathurvedi ⁹³ in the article “Rural Development: The Elusive Horizons” concludes that in order to give a purposive direction to the Integrated Rural Development, effort is called to work out the integration of field programmes in the primary, secondary and tertiary sectors with

forward and backward linkages. Amitabh Joshi\textsuperscript{94} in the article "Poverty Alleviation Programmes – Target setting and Removal of Poverty" infers that the term "Integrated Rural Development Programme" is a misnomer. At no stage does the programme seek to provide for an integrated development of the rural society. It is essentially a poverty alleviation programme functioning in isolation of the socio-economic and political realities of rural society. Madhab Prasad Pondyal\textsuperscript{95} in the article "Administrative Hurdles to Poverty Eradication : Nepal’s Experience with Integrated Rural Development Projects" (1984) asserts that though the 6th five-year-plan of Nepal aimed at eradication of poverty through an integrated approach to rural development, no specific programme addressing the poor people of the project areas has been implemented till now. Sudhakar B.Rao\textsuperscript{96} in the article "TRYSEM and ISB Component of IRDP" (1986) suggests that sufficient stress needs to be given to increase the non-farm sectors under IRDP. Sanjay Sinha\textsuperscript{97} “Poverty Alleviation : Anything Goes” (1986) opines that things have gone wrong at a multitude of levels. First, the DRDA officials, charged with plan formulation, have neither the necessary skill nor the planning experience. Secondly, the pressure for achieving quantitative targets, the related malpractices and the consequent policing role thrust upon the DRDA leave little time for such theoretical exercises as planning. Thirdly, detailed directives issued by the centre and by the state governments have, in practice, left

\begin{footnotesize}
\end{footnotesize}
little room for maneuver on the basis of local conditions. Singh and Lal (1987) concluded that about 48 per cent of the beneficiary households had erased the poverty line. P.W. Sharma (1988) observed that the experience gained so far has shown that IRDP could not be organically inter-linked with other on-going programmes. Jasbir K. Singh (1988) has remarked that the Integrated Rural Development Programme is showing its impact on the weaker section served. V.S. Singh (1988) concluded that lack of infra-structural facilities, poor technical guidance to the Beneficiaries, lack of coordination among the bank and block officials, delay in settling of insurance claims and under-financing of the project give rise to poor return and renders the scheme unlivable. Rao et al. (1988) pointed out various deficiencies prevailing in the whole chain of IRDP in the district which are under-financing, providing cash credits by violating the norms, lack of supervision, lack of knowledge on the part of the Beneficiaries to utilize the assets, lack of adequate training to the schemants, the IRDP loans not being utilized to the extent of their

real objectives. Suresh Taneja\textsuperscript{103} in the article "Long Search For Savers" (1989) stated that despite tall claims about the success of various anti-poverty measures such as IRDP, NREP, RLEG and TRYSEM, most of the households are still not able to meet their minimum consumption requirements. Calling it the world most ambitious credit-based poverty alleviation effort, the World Bank\textsuperscript{104} in article "Flaws in IRDP" (1989) found the failure of India's IRDP to its inability to ensure continued access to institutional credit for disadvantaged rural households. Kulkarni, etal\textsuperscript{105} in article "IRDP in Bijapur : An Evaluation of Dairy Scheme" (1989) found out that different socio-economic factors affected the success or failure of different IRDP schemes. L.C. Jain,\textsuperscript{106} etal "Grass Without Roots : Rural Development under Government Auspices" in their field study of seven blocks spread over five states have observed that even the specifically designed poverty alleviation programmes are not reaching the poor. Nor do they have sufficient depth to make an impression on poverty. Lakshman and Narayan\textsuperscript{107} "Rural Development in India" felt that the main inherent flaw in anti-poverty programmes was the lack of local participation and more reliance on bureaucracy. Neela Mukherjee\textsuperscript{108} in the article "Lessons of Poverty Alleviation Programmes" has contended that despite of best of intentions and a number of anti-poverty programmes, not

\textsuperscript{104} World Bank, "Flaws in IRDP", The Tribune, September 3, 1989, p.5.
much dent could be made into the problem of rural poverty. The specific shortcomings of the poverty alleviation programmes, in Sandeep Bagchee’s 109 “Poverty Alleviation Programmes in 7th Plan- An Appraisal” opinion are basically the result of not taking into account the complexities of the environment, of having multiple and conflicting objectives instead of simplifying them by focusing on a single operational goal and designing a suitable and viable strategy on this basis. Bandopadhaya 110 in the article “Direct Intervention Programmes for Poverty Alleviation” recommends linking of these programmes with the programmes of land reforms, better planning and implementation at grass root level. N.J. Kurian 111 in the article “Anti-Poverty Programme : A Reappraisal” has brought out that the IRDP is too much centralized and bureaucratized in its planning and implementation. The benefits under the programme designed for the poor are not reaching them but are largely being taken away by the social process dominated by the rich. Kamta Prasad 112 in the article “Rural Development in the Eighth Plan” deduced the quantum of investment available for per beneficiary under both IRDP and JRY has been very meagre. Sharat Prasher 113 “Rural Development Administration” has pointed out that the present poverty alleviation schemes and programmes though primarily meant for the desperately poor, find it difficult to reach and help them.

Sundaram in the study "Anti-Poverty Rural Development in India" has observed that the main reasons for the failure of various rural development programmes are lack of financial resources, proper identification, lack of co-ordination among various programmes and activities of various departments. Upadhyaya "IRD-Basic Approach and Policy" concludes that undoubtedly IRDP did help in enabling Beneficiaries to cross the poverty line but its role, taking into consideration the totality of the problem, has been insignificant.

The implementation of this programme has been evaluated by a number of individuals and organizations since its inception. Major evaluative studies were carried out by Reserve Bank of India (RBI), National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development (NABARD), Programme Evaluation Organization (PEO) of Planning Commission. Almost all the studies have pointed out shortcomings in the selection of Beneficiaries, low level of investment, lack of infrastructure, linkages etc. The misidentification of Beneficiaries at the implementation level as assessed by the various evaluative studied are surprisingly high and vary from 15 to 47 per cent. It is the result of a wider socio-economic malady of the country arising on account of the collusion of the politicians and bureaucrats at the grass root level. Thus according to the Kottayan study, income of some 55 per cent of the

---

Beneficiaries increased due to IRDP, 63 per cent of the unemployed Beneficiaries got themselves fully employed after taking assistance under the programme, 17 per cent completed repayment and 72 per cent have been repaying loan. Other case studies of the programme confirm the fact that there have been considerable gains in income and employment to the Beneficiaries. Some studies attribute the low performance of IRDP to the personal characteristics of the Beneficiaries. Studies exclusively devoted to the performance of IRDP in respect of SC and ST Beneficiaries found out that they have not done well in the matter of generating income and employment when compared with the Non-SC Beneficiaries. A study carried out by the NABARD indicated that the programme had helped 57 per cent of the Beneficiaries to cross the poverty line and increased the average income of Beneficiaries by 82 per cent. Similarly, a study of the RBI, indicated that the assistance provided under IRDP had led to a progressive shift in rural income in respect of 51 per cent of Beneficiaries and 17 per cent have been to cross the poverty line. The Programme Evaluation Organization of the Planning Commission pointed out that 37 per cent households reported some increase in their family assets, 77 per cent households reported improvement in consumption level and 64 per cent felt that their overall status in

118 Department of Applied Economics, IRDP: Evaluation and Impact Study: Kottayam District, (Cochin University, Cochin, 1984).
120 See Jose, AM and Aziz, Abdul, "IRDP and SC-ST Beneficiaries: A Study of two Blocks in Kerala", paper presented at an All-India Seminar on Development Programmes for SCs and STs, organized by the Department of Applied Economics, Andhra University, Walter, 27-29 March, 1985.
the village society had been elevated as a consequence of their coverage under IRDP. \(^{123}\) Nilkant Rath in the article “Garibi Hatao: Can IRDP do It” has pointed out that IRDP has not come any where near its objective of raising at least a third of the rural (population) poor above poverty line. Indira Hirway\(^{124}\) “Critique of Target group Approach: A Study in Gujarat” has observed that about 55 per cent to 75 per cent of the participants are non-poor and at the same time the non-participants belong to the lowest three declines of consumption level. Kartar Singh\(^{125}\) has criticized the implementation part of IRDP and suggested the need for rationalization of the promotional system for VLWs, raising of limit of subsidy and strengthening the market facilities. Misra\(^{126}\) has pointed out the problem of identification of the Beneficiaries, remote control due to centralized planning and implementation, target-oriented approach, and lack of effective coordination between IRDP agencies and other institutions, cumbersome procedures and inadequate supervision mechanism. Sarita Shardha\(^{127}\) “Administrative Structure and Functioning of IRDP-A Case Study” observed the weak administrative structure as an important factor at various levels for inadequacy of implementation of IRDP. Mukul Sanwal\(^{128}\) gives certain suggestions for the improvement of the implementation process of the IRDP such as selection of the Beneficiaries in open

\(^{123}\) Rath, Nilkanth “Garibi Hatao: Can IRDP do it” Economic and Political Weekly, February 9, 1985, p.245.


Gram Sabha, issues of passbooks, effective monitoring and evaluation system, better cooperation between Beneficiaries and implementors and simplifying the loan procedure. Yadav\textsuperscript{129} et al., conclude that the personnel of various departments involved in the implementation of different programmes have no clear understanding of the concept of integrated rural development. They work in isolation, without linkages with other agencies, creating serious obstacles to the programme. The scheme undertaken under IRDP are often uneconomic, unsuitable to the area and Beneficiaries. The Concurrent Evaluation of IRDP (GOI, 1988)\textsuperscript{130} and (GOI, 1990)\textsuperscript{131} revealed that the coverage of the destitute and the very-very poor group had been 71 per cent, 81 per cent Beneficiaries had found the assistance adequate and in 72 per cent cases the assets were found intact and in about 70 per cent cases the assets had generated additional income. An Evaluation study of IRDP conducted by R.N. Tripathi\textsuperscript{132} et al found the short coming in staffing pattern, lack of effective supervision and co-ordination as the significant drawbacks of IRDP. In a similar study conducted in Gorakhpur District of Uttar Pardesh\textsuperscript{133}, the authors found that the staff at block level considers IRDP work as an additionality and an unnecessary imposition on them. Similarly Rohini Nayyar\textsuperscript{134}
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pointed out that there was lack of coordination between the departments, absence of proper planning, lack of infrastructural facilities and absence of appropriate linkages all of which have led to structural and administrative weaknesses in the execution of IRDP at the ground level. Patil and Singh\textsuperscript{135} pointed out that the IRDP has failed to a great extent in eliminating rural poverty and unemployment due to lack of technical expertise in respective fields and lack of technical expertise in respective fields and lack of awareness amongst the poor households about the anti-poverty programmes. The Report on Concurrent Evaluation\textsuperscript{136} (GOI, 1996) of IRDP revealed that in 72 per cent of the villages, the BPL survey was conducted and among the Beneficiaries 47 per cent were SC and ST, 1.3 per cent Physically Handicapped and 27 per cent women. Among the families assisted 50 per cent were from Primary Sector followed by 40 per cent in tertiary sector and 10 per cent in secondary sector. The percentage of families above poverty assisted under the programme was negligible. The selection of Beneficiary families was 52.6 per cent by Gram Sabha, 95 per cent Beneficiaries have purchased the assets of their choice, 85 per cent of the Beneficiaries found the assistance adequate and the quality of assets was good in 70 per cent cases. In 79 per cent the assets was found intact and 55 per cent of the Beneficiaries have crossed the poverty line.

Thus the review of these studies would help to have a clear and indepth understanding about the present problem besides


to help in formulation of theoretical framework. The definition of Rural Development and Integrated Rural Development Programme observed by various individuals and institutions are given in the following pages of this chapter with basic assumptions and objectives of the study.

**Conceptual Frame**

The Rural Development and Integrated Rural Development Programme have been defined in various ways. The concept of rural development was born in the context of agriculture and continued for a long time incotermnisus with agricultural development in India\(^{137}\). No other person has a better understanding of rural development than Mahatma Gandhi, the father of nation, back in 1936, he wrote in Harijan, “I have believed and repeated times without number that India is to be found not in a few cities, but in its 7 lakh villages. Further more, I would say that, If the village perishes, India will perish too”\(^{138}\). To Gandhi Ji, every village must be self-sufficient, and basic needs are two important goals of rural development. The World Bank defines rural development as a strategy designed to improve the economic and social life of a specific group of people, the rural poor. It involves extending the benefits of development to the poorest among those who seek a livelihood in the rural areas. The group includes small scale farmers, tenants and the landless\(^{139}\). Bajpai writes that the main aim of rural development is to break the vicious circle of poverty through better and higher production, reasonable


\(^{138}\) Gandhi, M.K., Harijan, 16\(^{th}\) Novemebr, 1934.

distribution, better living standard and balanced development among the regions as well as among the various sections of rural population\textsuperscript{140}. Rural Development, since the seventies, reflects the reduction of poverty, inequality and exploitation, and is manifested in special programmes for the weaker sections of the rural community and for fighting backwardness\textsuperscript{141}. Rural Development means development of villages which constitute the bulk of the population of India. Traditionally, rural development was considered the development of agriculture but now in modern times this concept has changed considerably, now it includes agriculture, small scale industries including social aspects\textsuperscript{142}. Reddy defines Rural Development as the process of improving living conditions, providing minimum needs, increasing productivity and employment opportunities and developing potentials of rural resources through integration of spatial, functional and temporal aspects\textsuperscript{143}. Haldipur views the rural development as a process of social change which is bound to evoke conflict and resistance from the existing power structure\textsuperscript{144}. To Kothari rural development means increasing employment opportunities, production, productivity and similar other measures to bring about economic and social change in the rural areas, especially for the benefits of poorer sections\textsuperscript{145}. Desai believed that critical element in the rural development is the improvement of living standard of the poor through opportunities
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for better utilization of their physical and human resources.\textsuperscript{146} Raju contends that rural development is an indigenous process involving a multi-dimensional effort by a variety of institutions. The Beneficiaries of the development process have a distinct role to play.\textsuperscript{147} Today, rural development is seen as a process aimed at improving the well-being of people living out-side the urbanized areas.\textsuperscript{148} Mishra et al enumerate the rural development as a process of increasing in agricultural productivity; improving the use of scarce land and water resources; supply of capital resources; maximization and creation of employment opportunities and raising the standard of living of rural population.\textsuperscript{149} Rutten views the rural development as institutionalization of a revolutionary solidarity movement through the methodology of the mass movement.\textsuperscript{150} The ideas of various scholars regarding the concept of rural development is aimed at improvement in the various fields of life of ruralities viz. economic, social and cultural. In other words, rural development means conscious effort made to raise the standard of living of the rural poor by providing them employment opportunities of various types.

After mentioning of various definitions of rural development, it would be pertinent to present have a picture of the concept of Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP) which is the central theme of this study. C. Subramanyam defined the
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Integrated Rural Development Programme as systematic, scientific and integrated use of all our natural resources and as part of this process enabling every person to engage himself in a productive and socially useful occupation and earn an income that would meet at least the basic needs. Lele sees IRDP as scientific management of resources and providing adequate work to the mass of workers in the region and in the process, increasing the internal potentials of growth. Sharma, etal view the integrated rural development as a strategy to improve the economic and social life of the rural poor and the rural weak in the overall spectrum of development.

Sen defines IRDP as functional and spatial integration mean appropriate location of social and economic activities over a physical space for the balanced development of a region. Sharma and Mishra consider IRDP as a wide and broad concept which includes not only increased productivity, particularly agricultural but also increased and more diversified rural employment to generate higher incomes for the rural poor. Desai and Chaudhary see the IRDP as an approach for tackling the problem of rural poverty. The Integrated Rural Development has been defined as development which can help to increase the purchasing power of the rural poor through the generation of greater opportunities for
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gainful employment. Mahajan perceives IRDP as an integrated development of agriculture, industry and related activities. In other words the process of integrated rural development under IRDP aims at quick development of small scale rural consumer and agro-based industries and thus reduce the monopoly hold of big manufacturers.

Himachalam views the IRDP as an organized and systematic effort to alleviate mass poverty in rural India and as an area specific and beneficiary oriented programme. Sharma, et al consider it as an integration of methodology and approach of both Beneficiaries-oriented programmes and development programmes. Shah observed that the term ‘integrated development’ refers to integration of sectoral with spatial. Rural development aims at the development of all the sectors-agriculture, industry, transport, communication, housing, environment etc. Frankel viewed the IRDP as a programme for direct attack on poverty and attempts toward elimination of poverty among the target groups of small and marginal farmers, agricultural labourers, rural artisans etc. By creating new avenues under secondary and tertiary sectors in the rural areas. In view of Sharma and Malhotra IRDP is a broad concept covering practically all aspects of rural
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life, agriculture and allied sectors, small cottage industries, social services like health, education, sanitation, recreation, production, employment, transport, commerce, power supply, water, political and social tensions and more than these instituting a programme for institutional changes to ensure mass participation in the massive development efforts.\textsuperscript{164} Roy viewed the concept of Integrated Rural Development a multi-level, multi-sector and multi-section concept.\textsuperscript{165} Hence IRDP is an organized and systematic efforts to alleviate mass poverty in rural areas with the help of assets purchased through loan. It is an area specific and Beneficiaries oriented programme which aims at eliminating destitution through formulation of projects based on local resources on sound scientific lines.

With this historical perspective and conceptual frame of Integrated Rural Development Programme, we started our present study with certain broad assumptions. These include:

1. The success of any scheme for development is determined to a large extent by the administrative set-up responsible for its implementation and its method and procedure of working.
2. The administrative structure for development programmes should be flexible, goal-oriented and development-oriented in nature.
3. The performance of the administrators depends on their mental make up and a developmentalist is needed to implement development policies.
4. The success of a development scheme is determined by the perception of both the officials concerned and that of the people for whom it is going to be implemented.
5. Training of personnel in

management technology specially in areas of project planning and sharpening of professional skills determined the success of a scheme. 6. The approach of officials towards people should be that of persuasion, cooperation and mutual understanding. 7. A programme of integrated nature like the IRDP cannot get the expected results without proper coordination and communication among various agencies. 8. The Beneficiaries’ positive attitudes towards the development schemes will be essential for maximizing their output. 9. Operational deficiency in proper monitoring hampers the desired success of the development programmes. 10. The success of IRDP depends on infra-structural support available.

With these assumptions in brief our aim was to analyse:

- The various programmes of rural development undertaken by the Government of India so far with special reference to Integrated Rural Development Programme in the State of Haryana in general and District Bhiwani in particular.

- To study the profile of the area of study.

- To examine the administrative structure of IRDP at various levels.

- To study the process of implementation of IRDP.

- To study the performance of IRDP.

- To study the perception of Officials concerned and that of the Beneficiaries.
To review the progress and actual implementation of IRDP and its utility in present context.

To suggest suitable measures for effective implementation of the programme.

Focus of The Study

The focus of the present study is on the Administration of Integrated Rural Development Programme in Haryana with special focus on District Bhiwani which is situated on the South-Western parts of the State, though forms the part of Indo- Gangetic Alluvial Plain, yet largely it is dry and sandy. In spite of the fact that the climatic conditions of the district are not favourable, it has an edge over the other districts so far as the development activities are concerned. It is the second largest district in the State constituting 11.6 per cent of the total area and 7 per cent of the total population. More than four-fifths of the districts populations is inhabiting in rural areas and most of them are engaged in agriculture and other allied activities for their livings. The district is sparsely populated and majority of the population is Hindus. The Scheduled Castes constitutes about one-fifth of its population. The district is not evenly populated and the density in the South-Western parts is less than half to the North-Eastern parts. About one-fourth of the district population forms the main work force of which more than two-thirds are engaged in primary sector. Agriculture is the backbone of the rural economy of the district. In spite of all the oddities the district has presented an eventful growth in all fronts of development. All the villages are enjoying the
facilities of electricity, safe drinking water and metalled roads in addition to the satisfactory network of health, transport and communication services. The execution of various irrigation projects has transformed the rural scenario in the district and it has brought a prominent change in its economy. The district has not only a fragile network of industry, but also is centralized in some parts. The area of the study was chosen Bhiwani District in which nine Gram Panchayats, spread over three Blocks-Bhiwani, Badhara and Loharu, have been taken up for identification of sample Beneficiaries for collecting primary data. The other source of primary data is IRDP officials of DRDA, Bhiwani. Various programmes of rural development undertaken by the Government of India have been discussed with special emphasis on Integrated Rural Development Programme. Besides, review of IRDP at various levels, its administrative structure and process of implementation have been critically examined. The main focus of study is on the perception of Beneficiaries and that of Officials with a view to assessing the impact of this programmes. The data given in the study are up to 1995-96. The period of study has been 1980-96. However, for field work Beneficiaries assisted during the period from 1990-95 have been interviewed.

Methodology

Broadly speaking the study is exploratory in nature and the conclusions are tentative. In term of scope, the study seeks to provide an initial step towards understanding the various programmes of rural development with special emphasis on Administration of Integrated Rural Development Programme in Haryana. The study is primarily based on emperical evidences
collected by conducting interviews with selected respondent Beneficiaries and that of the IRDP Officials. Simple random sampling technique has been adopted for the selection of Beneficiary respondents. For the selection of the sample at each level, the following procedure was adopted. **First**, Bhiwani district was taken for the purpose of indepth study, of course the following factors have been taken into account while selecting the District Bhiwani for indepth study of the problem:

- Not much work has been done in Haryana so far. However, not even a single study is available on the present problem of District Bhiwani.

- The proximity and acquaintance of the area and the people was also one of the considerations for choosing the Bhiwani District.

The district is average in its demographic features as well as from the point of families assisted under IRDP in the state.

The district is both agriculturally as well as industrially among the most backward districts in the state.

**Second**, the selection of Blocks in the District has been done by applying simple random sampling technique on the basis of families assisted under IRDP since 1980-1995. Out of the total eight Blocks in the district: Tosham (6381), Badhara (5589), Bawani Khera (5505), Bhiwani (5003), Dadri-I (4621), Loharu (4544), Dadri-II (4236) and Siwani (3445), three have been taken for sampling. Thus, the selected Blocks are Bhiwani, Badhara and
Loharu. **Third**, for choosing the Gram Panchayats from each Block, the lists of Gram Panchayats covered under IRDP during the above mentioned period were taken from the DRDA’s Office. The number of Gram Panchayats assisted under IRDP in each selected Block was Bhiwani (61), Badhara (78) and Loharu (79). From each of the selected Blocks, three Gram Panchayats were chosen on the basis of number of Beneficiaries assisted during 1980-95 with simple random sampling. Thus the selected Gram Panchayats are: Mitathal, Devsar and Tigrana in Bhiwani Block, Allauddinpur, Gagarwas and Jhumpa Kalan in Loharu Block and Gopi, Bandhwa and Pichopa Kalan in Badhara Block. The number of Beneficiaries in the selected Gram Panchayats during the above mentioned period was Devsar(172), Tigrana(133), Mitathal(94), Gopi(116), Bhandwa(84), Pichopa Kalan(69), Jhumpa Kalan(131), Allauddinpur(98) and Gagarwas(39). **Fourth**, the respondents were of two types i.e. the Beneficiaries of IRDP and the Officials of DRDA, Bhiwani. For interview, a sample of 240 respondent Beneficiaries was taken from the District Bhiwani, taking 80 Beneficiaries from each selected Block. The number of respondent Beneficiaries taken from each selected Gram Panchayat was proportionate to the size sample. These respondent Beneficiaries have been spread over the nine selected Gram Panchayats. To identify the Beneficiaries simple random sampling technique has been applied. For this the lists of IRDP Beneficiaries during 1990-95 was taken from DRDA, Bhiwani. As the number of IRDP officials in the district was 20. Hence all of them have been chosen for interview. There was no need of sampling in this case. Besides, all the nine Branch Managers of concerned Rural Development Banks and nine public opinion leaders/Sarpanches of the selected Gram Panchayats have been interviewed to evaluate their
perceptions and participation in the programme to make the study more comprehensive and indepth. The primary data for the study were collected from the sample Beneficiaries and Officials concerned with the help of carefully prepared questionnaires consisting of both structured and unstructured questions. The questionnaires were designed to elicit responses relating to the respondents background information, administrative structure of IRDP, its process of implementation and Officials-Beneficiaries perceptions about each other as well as about the programme on the whole. Data were also collected through the techniques of observation and discussions. The personal knowledge gained through stay in villages and informal discussions with officials have provided a lot of useful information for the study. For collection of primary data, separate sets of questionnaires have been used- one each for the IRDP Beneficiaries, IRDP Staff, Bank Officials and Sarpanch/public opinion leaders. These schedules/questionnaires were administered personally with the respondents. The responses were collected from the respondents individually, though group discussions were also utilized in the study. Bank Branches were also visited to verify the facts relating to financial aspects.

In addition to the information collected from the respondents, the secondary data were collected from the relevant official records including various guidelines of the programmes and schemes, the manuals, correspondence between Government of India, State Government and between State Government and lower level agencies, the progress reports, agenda notes and the proceedings of various meetings conducted at Central and State levels. The data were collected from the office records of the DRDAs, Branches of concerned Banks in the District.
Statistics Office, District Development and Panchayat Office, Country and Town Planning Office, the Directorates of Economics and Statistics, and Rural Development. Moreover, a number of publications and evaluation reports of Ministry of Rural Development, Planning Commission, National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD), Government of India, Rural Development and Panchayati Raj and Economics and Statistics Departments of the Government of Haryana were extensively used in the course of the present study. The information from books, journals, research articles and news papers were also used in the study. However, a question often asked in empirical studies is about the general conclusions of the study because there is always a problem of generality. The reasons might be the limitations of time, the universe of study, place and size of sample etc. Some times, the tools of analysis also pose a problem in making generalization. But this does not mean that there can not be any specific conclusion.

Plan of Chapterization

The data and information collected through various sources for the study have been classified in seven chapters including the concluding chapter.

Chapter 1. touches upon the problem of administration of Integrated Rural Development Programme, importance of study, review of literature, conceptual frame, basic assumptions, the universe of study and the methodology.

Chapter 2. deals with the profile of the State of Haryana, District Bhiwani and that of the selected Blocks in the District of Bhiwani.
It gives information about the administrative history, demographic, geographical and economic aspects about each of the above mentioned levels.

Chapter 3. examines the administrative structure of Integrated Rural Development Programme at Central, State, District and Block levels. It provides knowledge about the organizational setup of IRDP, composition of consultative committee and other subsidiary organizations at various levels with a critical view.

Chapter 4. describes the process of implementation of IRDP. In this chapter, the various steps taken in the implementation of IRDP particularly at Block and District levels have been discussed. It consists of information about identification of BPL families, formulation and approval of annual action plans, organization of credit camps, processing of loan applications, disbursement of loan, purchasing of assets, monitoring and recovery of loans.

Chapter 5. deals with the implementation of IRDP. In this chapter, the performance of IRDP at State and District levels has been presented. It provides information about the BPL families-caste and category wise, number of families assisted, their caste and category wise composition, financial allocation, sector wise coverage of Beneficiaries and per capita investment at District and State levels.

Chapter 6. highlights the perception of IRDP Officials and that of Beneficiaries towards each other and the programme as a whole. It consists of information about the background of Beneficiaries, process of implementation of the programme and Officials-Beneficiaries perception about administrative structure of IRDP, its
process of implementation, its performance, the evaluation as a whole and their views about each other.

Chapter 7 deals with the thread of the preceding chapters in the form of conclusions. Along with the findings of the study, some suggestions have also been offered in this chapter.

In the next chapter we have attempted to describe in brief the profile of Haryana and of the District Bhiwani which was the universe of our study.