Concisely speaking, Rural Development does mean all round development in every walk of rural life. It plays a key-role in the socio-economic and political development of our country, as a big chunk of our population habitates the rural areas, and is faced with diverse long-standing problems such as low literacy rate, poor health, scanty resources, lack of irrigation facilities, inadequate power supply, inadequate means of transportation, recurrent floods and famines, growing costs of agriculture inputs, non-availability of latest techniques of farming, meager earnings, inadequate supply of drinking water, etc. Unless and until these problems are solved, national development is unthinkable. So to speak, remedial measures are urgently needed to make rural development possible in the desired direction.

During the British Rule and earlier, the rural areas were overlooked to the greatest extent, resulted in deterioration of the rural life, and with the time, it became a chronic problem. After independence in 1947, the Government started paying heed to the once-neglected area by formulating and launching projects and schemes under the Five-Year Plans to rehabilitate the rural life. Every successive government at the center claimed
to have spent billions of rupees on the projects and programmes aiming at rural development, and apparently it has been the matter of grave concern for the governments. But despite of their tall claims, a vast majority of rural population is still bereft of the things, which are taken to be essential for a meaningful and healthy survival.

No doubt, planning in the post-independence era improved the lot of the masses residing in the object conditions of rural life, but the improvement has been negligible, uneven and imbalanced, which can be discerned at both individual and collective level. On the one hand, a handful rich and influential people have grabbed the maximum benefits offered under the development schemes. But, on the other hand, a greater part of rural population has been deprived of even basic things of life. As a result, the gulf between the rich and the poor kept on widening. Despite the claims of every successive government, the situation remained more or less all the same.

Rural population is squarely relied on agriculture and allied activities to earn livelihood to support a huge part of national population. It supplies about 60% of the raw-materials needed in the industrial sector, contributes about 20% share to Gross Domestic Product, and provides food to nearly one arab people, but as for investment, it has been lagging far behind almost all other sectors. Presently the growth rate of economic development is
expected to be 70% even after the greatest contribution made by the agriculture products. Though agriculture is the backbone of Indian economy, yet it is being weakened day by day.

Undoubtedly, the scientists have made many discoveries and inventions in this sector, and developed new techniques of farming and a variety of improved seeds and fertilizers, but the benefits of these innovations have been a distant dream for most of the farmers owing to lack of long-run improvement policies, indifference and apathy of the administration towards rural development, and lack of proper training and timely information. The fruits of mechanized farming are largely harvested by the big and prosperous farmers, and as for the small and marginal peasants, these things are still out of access.

The situation has been no different in the state of Haryana. Since the inception of the state in 1966, the agriculture sector has not evinced any remarkable improvement despite of considerable amount of the state budget spent by the successive governments. But the previous government started paying attention to the problems of the rural masses by launching some innovative programmes ‘Govt. at Your Door’ and ‘Janata Darbar’ to bring out all round development in every quarter of rural life. These programmes, to the greatest extent, proved panacea for the rural poor, because the latter could get most of their problems solved then and there at their places.
Earlier, they had to frequent the state capital even for the solutions of petty problems. It involved a huge loss of money and time, without any guarantee of redress of their grievances.

At the programme ‘Government at Your Door’ the Chief Minister, Ministers and all the top-officers were supposed to be present to hear and solve the problems of the villagers. The Chief Minister conceded most of the demands as presented by the Panchayats and ordered the concerned Ministers or Officers to carry out the works at the earliest. Grants or funds for rural development were spent through the Village Development Committees assisted by the village Panchayats. Most of the admitted demands were fulfilled within the promised time. The main demands included construction of streets, roads, fminis, ring bandh around the villages, walls around the ponds and schools, opening of civil and veterinary hospitals, dispensaries and health centers, construction of water works, power houses and crematoriums, replacement of electric wires, drainage of flood water, digging up the ponds, opening of community centres, Vardha Ashrams, etc. To a great extent the programmes put the train of rural development on the track. It proved a grand success, as it brought out many fundamental changes in the socio-economic conditions of the rural masses and the attitude of administration towards masses and their upliftment.
The programme succeeded in reducing the ever-increasing gap between the administration and public. Earlier, the people felt fear and hesitation while meeting the officers even for the realization of genuine demands. But with the advent of this programme, that sort of fear and hesitation almost vanished, as the frequent meetings together provided them opportunities to come closer, resulted in friendly rapport.

The programme not only made the rural development possible, but increased its speed too. Earlier it had been difficult, sometime impossible, for the villagers to meet the Chief Minister to make him acquainted with the recurring socio-economical problems. For this they had to frequent the tehsil or district headquarters. But the previous regime made it possible for them to present their demands before the Chief Minister or Ministers along with the top officers frequently available in their constituencies. Thus, the programme saved the rural people from the unnecessary expenses, toil and harassment.

The programme could put checks on corruption and red tapism. Earlier, the officers were in the habit of adopting delay tactics in respect of implementation of rural schemes and programmes. But now, being afraid of public humiliation or exposure and government action, in case of complaint, they avoided taking bribe or commission from the Panchayats in lieu of
releasing grants for development works. Earlier, the officers had fixed their commission out of the grants or funds meant for development schemes.

The programme strengthened the Panchayati Raj Institutions by equipping them with more powers and entrusting more responsibilities. Earlier, the successive governments had not given much importance and recognition to the Panchayats, and the latter alike puppets played in the hands of the officers. But with the beginning of this programme, the Panchayats were empowered to carry out development works independently. Earlier, they had to frequently visit the district headquarters to seek advice or order of the concerned officers in respect of the development works. But this programme reversed the situation. Now the officers were supposed to visit the villages to consult the Panchayats or Village Development Committees about the planning and implementation of the admitted demands. Earlier, the officers had prevailed over the Panchayats in respect of decision-making about planning and its execution. But now the villagers prevailed over the officers in this regard.

The programme succeeded in forming healthy public opinion about the democratic system. The increasing people participation in the programme was a clear indication of growing faith in democracy. At the programme, the Chief Minister, Ministers, top officers and Panchayat Representatives used to sit together on a single platform to discuss and find
out the ready solutions of the problems in an amiable way. No scheme or development work was started without the consultation and consent of the Panchayat Representatives. Thus, the programme strengthened the roots of democracy by involving in decision making process more and more people sitting at the lowest level of society. Earlier, the villagers happened to be no figure in decision-making process and implementation of the schemes. Besides, they had to flatter and appease the officers to get the grants sanctioned. But with this programme, officers were supposed to keep the villagers in good humour to avoid any government action.

The programme promoted co-operation and co-ordination, to some extent, between the officers and the Panchayati Raj Institutions. Earlier, there had been a great dearth of co-operation and co-ordination between them, because the Panchayats were the silent spectators to the development process, and their co-operation was not sought, thinking them ineffective. The Panchayats were not assigned with any significant role in carrying out development works. But the previous government facilitated the co-operation and co-ordination by assigning them — administration and Panchayat Representatives — almost equal powers, responsibilities and functions.

The programme succeeded in bringing about awakening in the masses towards their rights and responsibilities. It provided them ample
opportunities to discuss the common problems and find out their effective solutions. Earlier, they had been deprived of such opportunities by the successive governments, and their day-to-day problems remained unsolved. But the programme promoted awareness in the rural masses towards their responsibilities and due share in the state governance. In a democratic set up, the people are the real rulers, but most of the earlier governments had treated them as if they (people) were second-rate citizens, leaving them out of process of development. The previous government made their participation desirable in the process of development by involving them actively in the process from planning to implementation. As a result, the masses came to know about their worth and potentialities as citizens of a democratic state. They actively participated in the programmes and schemes meant for poverty alleviation. Also they realized that it is the duty of the government to help them come out of the mire of poverty. They realized that collective efforts are needed to improve their conditions.

'Janata Darbar' programme provided the rural masses with vast opportunities to make the ruler apprise of their day-do-day problems. Earlier, they had to frequent the tehsil or district headquarters to get done even small tasks like making of ration-card, caste, domicile, and income certificates, driving license, recording of intkals, etc. But at the 'Janata Darbar' about 80% of the total problem heard thereat found prompt
solutions. Now, they not only got their works done on the spot, but also saved their money and time from being drained out on the frequent visits to the officers.

The programme ‘Janta Darbar’ mitigated the wide gap existed between the administration and public. This programme, with the time, made the masses dispel the fear of the government officers. At the Darbar, they came closer to the top-officers as well as lower-ranked ones, who were previously reluctant to entertain the problems or demands of the former. Earlier, most of the villagers couldn’t even see the faces of those who run the administration. But this innovative programme brought the officers and masses together on a single platform. Now, without displaying any fear and hesitation they started seeing the officers even in their offices. If they tried to avoid them, the complaint of the same could be lodged with the higher authority. Earlier, the officers adopted snobbish attitude towards the masses. But now, they came to realize that their real duty is not to rule over them in a dictatorial way but to serve them and behave in a friendly manner. Thus, the gap between them got reduced. The officers come to know that their duty is to cater to the essential needs of the masses and reduce their miseries and hardships, not to harass or embarrass them. On the other hand, the rural people came to know the limitations of the officialdom. The prompt solutions at the darbars increased the faith of masses in the participatory
democracy. They came to know that it is not the villagers who are supposed to serve or entertain the officers or leaders, but it is the officers who are meant to serve the public by finding out ready solutions of their problems. Holding of 'Janta Darbar' or 'Open Darbar' imparted momentum to rural development.

But there were noticed some pitfalls of these programmes. No doubt, they did a lot to redress the grievances of the rural masses, but still there are some problems standing gaping mouth. The opposition leaders exaggerated the facts in order to criticize the programmes. To them, these programmes were only the wastage of public money on the T.A. & D.A. of the officers, and nothing concrete was done in reality. They alleged that the programmes were used as ploys to garner votes and cheap popularity at the cost of the public money. And most of the rural problems existed there. Only a handful people, especially the INLD supporters got benefited. Also they alleged that the programmes were party-based, not need-based, and discrimination on a large scale was displayed in the distribution of the welfare schemes, the villages which had voted maximum to the candidates of the INLD party in the Assembly and Parliament Elections received maximum attention in the form of grants or funds, and the villages which had voted least to the candidate of the ruling party were ignored a lot. Also it was alleged that the officers were engaged in amusing the Chief Minister and Ministers to have
personal gains, and least interested in the welfare schemes meant for the rural masses. It was only a drama staged by the ruling party to conceal its failures on all counts.

But the researcher interviewed the new Panchayat Representatives, after the departure of the previous government, to verify the authenticity of the programme. He found that the programmes were effective and good for the rural development. He found that the most of the allegations leveled by the opposition parties didn’t hold much water. But it does not mean that there were no pitfalls of the programmes, as no programme is found without imperfections and lacunae. The researcher found that most of the programmes were held without ensuring whether the information of the same had been supplied to the villagers in whose constituencies they were scheduled to be held. Lack of information or timely information about the programmes made it impossible for the villagers, who were working in the fields, to take part in them. The rich and influential people, leaving the poor people at the margins, supported most of the demands. Works were, no doubt, done, but there was a lack of popular support behind them.

Also, there was lack of co-ordination and co-operation between the Panchayats and village Development Committees. Funds were released but some of the works were stopped in the mid-way owing to fierce rivalry between them. The Panchayats were not ready to accept the increasing role,
popularity and supremacy of the Village Development committees that impeded the smooth flow of development works to some extent in some of the villages. In some other villages, the corrupt, influential members of the committees stopped works owing to misappropriation of funds. In some other cases, grants were not utilized owing to this rivalry.

Problems were also observed, in some cases, in respect of release of grants owing to apathy and indifference of the corrupt officers. The villagers had to frequent the district headquarters and wait many days together to get grants, sometimes, they had to return to their villages, but empty-handed. Some of the officers who looked amiable and friendly at the programmes changed their behaviour as and when the villagers approached them to bring their attention towards their problems. Red-tapism and corruption could not be effectively contained.

Lack of knowledge of the schemes also hindered the development programmes or works. The works were started, but the villagers were not enough informed about the schemes under which the works were to be done, and which agency or officer was to be approached for the release of grants. As a result, they had to move from office to office for many days. There was also found a great lack of training about the new schemes, that hampered, to great extent, implementation of the same.
Lack of co-ordination and co-operation among the administration, village Panchayats and Village Development Committees obstructed the development works. Clashes over supremacy were found common among them. They tried to prevail over each other and the power find among them created unhealthy atmosphere for development works.

Least attention was paid to the use of new techniques of farming, new variety of seeds and fertilizers. It was the result of lack of proper training about the use of these innovations. Only the leading farmers could harvest the fruits of these techniques and inputs. Lack of subsidies on the inputs made it difficult for the poor farmers to procure these with their meager incomes. Proper arrangements for marketing of the agriculture products were not facilitated. Lack of grain markets in the smaller villages proved costly for poor farmers for transporting their produce to the far-off markets.

No doubt, there were certain shortcomings, but it is not that they can’t be overcome. The programmes can be made more effective and people-friendly if certain positive measures were taken seriously.
Main findings of the Study are as follow:

- These programmes have greatly benefited the masses, as they saved a lot of their time and money from litigations.
- They have succeeded in reducing the gulf between the administration and public, as the frequent face-to-face meeting brought them closer.
- They have increased people's participation in the implementation of welfare schemes in the rural areas, as the public found significant role in the development process from planning to implementation.
- These programmes have strengthened the functioning of the Panchayati Raj Institutions by assigning them more powers and responsibilities.
- These programmes have promoted public awareness and participation in the poverty alleviation programmes.
- These programmes have promoted co-operation and co-ordination between the Government and Panchayati Raj Institutions, as they acted as the pillars of development process by good hand-in-hand.
- These programmes have formed healthy public opinion about democratic system, as they promoted the people a platform from where they got their problems solved.
• These programmes have succeeded in solving most of their problems at a single place, as they had not to visit the District headquarters at State capital to get their work done.

• These programmes have succeeded, to some extent, in making popular government

• These programmes have succeeded in lessening the political vacuum between the government and masses, as they have provided them simple opportunities to interact with the Chief Minister, Ministers and officers.

• These programmes have contained, to some extent corruption and red-tapism in administration, as most of the problems solved promptly, and the money for works was spent through Village Development Committees, as the role of administration has been minimized in the development process.

**Shortcomings**

• Before-hand information about the programmes has not often been supplied to the villages, as most of the villagers working in the fields cold not participate in these programmes.

• Participation of Chief-Minister or Ministers was not to the expectations of the people, as the officials took little interest in the problems in the absence of Chief-Minister or Ministers.
• Some officers seemed to be reluctant in hearing the people when the latter visited the offices of the former.

• The rich and influential people, leaving the poor people behind at the margins, supported most of the demands. So there was a lack of popular demand.

• There was lack of co-ordination and co-operation between the Panchayat and Village Development Committee in some villages owing to feud for supremacy.

• In some cases, funds were released after a lot of harassment done by the officers.

• Desired changes in the behaviour and attitude of the officers were lacking.

• Red tapism and corruption could not be contained effectively.

• Lack of knowledge of the schemes hindered the development process.

• Least attention was paid to the new techniques of the farming and new variety of seeds and fertilizers.

• Lack of subsidized rates of seeds and other inputs made impossible for the poor farmers to procure the same.
• Lack of proper arrangements for marketing of agriculture goods proved costly.

• Some cases of misappropriation of grants were also observed.

• Discrimination in the distribution of development works was to some extent discerned.

**Suggestions:**

• More powers should be delegated to the Panchayats so as to enable them to work more independently and more effectively.

• The powers of Panchayats and VDCs should be made clearer to avoid frequent clashes between them.

• Tainted leaders, officers and Panchayat Representatives should be spotted and kept them away from development process.

• Exemplary punishment should be meted out to those who fail to discharge their duties sincerely so that tendencies of non-seriousness and reluctance may be checked.

• More funds should be made available to the Panchayats so as to avoid closure of development schemes owing to lack of money.

• Copies of the Panchayat Act (latest) should be supplied to the Panchayats so that they may be acquainted with their duties, rights and responsibilities.
• Special training should be imparted to new Panchayats to make them aware of the technicalities of new schemes, and technical staff should be attached to Panchayats.

• Need based development works should be emphasized.

• In the agriculture sector, seeds, fertilizers and other inputs should be made available at subsidized rates to the poor and marginal farmers.

• Proper arrangements for marketing of agriculture product should be ensured.

• Agriculture Vigyan Kendras should be opened at each district headquarters.

• More items should be put under these programmes.

• Before – hand information about the date and venue of the programme should be supplied to the Panchayats.

• Multi-purpose workers on the model of Gram Shevak should be appointed as Gram Sachiv to carry out socio-economic development works, and they should be empowered to make the Panchayats accountable to it.

• BDPO should be empowered to look after the block level Panchayati Raj administration, but he should be put under the Chairperson, Panchayat Samiti.
• Zila Parishad should be made full-fledged administrator, and the Government officers should be put under the control of Zila Parishad Chairman.

• Special training should be imparted to the elected and official functionaries under Panchayat Raj administration.

• Separate training programme should be launched for female representatives.

• Mindset of the Panchayati Raj Representatives and officers should be changed to democratize and decentralize the functioning of Panchayati Raj Institutions.

• Government officers and political leaders should be committed to make the decentralized planning a success.

• Decentralized planning should be promoted.

• Panchayati Raj Institutions should focus their attention more on socio-economic justice than development works.

• Panchayati Raj Representatives should learn from the experiences of other states like Kerala, Madhya Pradesh and West Bengal.

• Agro-processing industries based on local skill should be set up in the rural areas.

• Contract farming and pilot tube well system should be emphasized.
QUESTIONNAIRE

On

‘Government At Your Door’ and ‘Janta Darbar’ Programmes

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information from Panchyati Raj Representatives about ‘Government at Your Door’ and ‘Janta Darbar’ Programmes.

1. How have you taken the programme ‘Government at your Doorsteps’?
   Good/Bad

2. Has work been accomplished on the announced projects?
   Yes/No

3. Has people-participation increased under the programme?
   Yes/No

4. Has the programme reduced the gap between people and government?
   Yes/No
5. Has it proved helpful in the development of villages?
   Yes/No

6. Has the programme brought out changes in the
   behaviour of officials?
   Yes/No

7. Has any discrimination been shown on the political grounds?
   Yes/No

8. Has the VDC increased development process, quality and
   transparency?
   Yes/No

9. Has the role of VDC been pro-Panchayat or Anti-Panchayat?
   Pro/Anti

10. Has the programme increased co-operation between
    government and public?
    Yes/No
11. Are you satisfied with the government in respect of development works?
   Yes/No

12. Has the programme improved social, economic and political conditions of rural life?
   Yes/No

13. Has it promptly solved the problems of people?
   Yes/No

14. Has it given more powers to Panchayats? Or has it supported the decentralization of power?
   Yes/No

15. Has the VDC proved helpful in the development of villages?

16. Has Janata Darbar Programme proved helpful in the development?
    Yes/No
Questionnaire
for
Panchyati Raj Institutions

Q.1. Socio-Economic and Demographic Characteristics

1.1. Name of respondent :-

1.2. Name of the Village Panchayat :

1.3. Name of Panchayat Union :- Village, Block, District body.

1.4. Name of District

1.5. Designation :- Village : President, Block and District

1.6. Age :

1.7. Sex :

1.8. Religion :

1.9. Community :- SC/ST/BC/MBC/FC/Others

1.10. Education Status : Primary / Middle / Hr. Sec./B.A. /M.A./Others

1.11. Marital Status : Married / Unmarried

1.12. Occupation :

1.13. Annual Income :

1.14. Hobby :
Q.2 Knowledge of Panchayati Raj System:

2.1. Are you aware of year of origin of Panchayati Raj in India? Yes/No

2.2. Are you aware of year of implication of New Panchayati Raj System in Haryana? Yes/No

2.3. Are you aware of the Constitutional Provision of Panchayati Raj System? Yes/No

2.4. Are you aware of schedule and its subjects? Yes/No

2.5. Are you aware of Panchayati Raj System, Constitutional provision, XI Schedule and Article 40? Yes/No

Whether the Sources through which you are aware above mention:

Journals, T.V., Radio / Training / Contact with Govt. officials contact and with Leaders.

2.6. Whether the copy of Panchayati Raj act is given to the Panchayati Raj Institution: Given/Not Given

2.7. Have you ever read and discussed on the act in the meeting? Yes/No

2.8. Do you understand Panchayati Raj act? Yes/No
Q.3. Power and Resources for functioning of Panchyati Raj Institutions

3.1. Whether the devolution of power, resources, decision making etc. as per the 73rd Amendment Act of 1993 is sufficient?
   a) Devolution of Power ___________ Sufficient / Insufficient
   b) Money Sanctioned ___________ Sufficient / Insufficient
   c) Independent decision making ___ Given / Not given

3.2. If not, give your suggestions for devolution of power, Resources and decision making as per 73rd Constitutional Amendment?

3.3. Was there any difficulties / differences of opinion among the Panchayati Raj Institutions in coordinated functioning Panchayati Raj System? Yes/No

3.4. If yes, give your suggestion for coordinating functioning of Panchayati Raj Institutions.

3.5. Do you feel that the Panchayati Raj Institutions functioning as unit of Local Govt., Permission required from Govt. for decision making, responsibility of State Govt. and Power to modify Govt. Schemes to suit local conditions? Yes/No

3.6. If no, specify the reasons?

Q.4. Training for functionaries of Panchayati Raj Institutions

4.1. Have you attended training programme? Yes/No
4.2. If yes, mention the place and the period of training?

4.3. Do you find that the undergone training on Panchayati Raj system is useful? Yes/No

4.4. If yes, tell the use?

4.5. If no, State the reasons

Q.5. Needs assessment and fulfillment

5.1. Are you understand people's expectations? Yes/No

5.2. If yes, list ut their expectations.

5.3. Are you able to fulfill people's expectations? Yes/No

5.4. if no, give the reasons.

Q.6. Reservation policy for women.

6.1 What have you to say in general about the reservation for wom

   Yes/No

   Need of reservation for females /33% sufficient / increase to 50% or

   No need of reservation for females: Give the comments

6.2 What would you say the female leaders can win the election without reservation? Yes/No

6.3 If no, give the reason for not winning the election.

6.4 Are you willing to function under female leadership? Yes/No

6.5 Do you feel that female leader are better in administration than male leader? Yes/No
6.6 If yes, give the reasons for better administrator.

6.7 If no, give the reasons for not able to provide better administration.

6.8 Do you think that Introduction of Reservation Policy should improve the status of women? Yes/No

6.9 If yes, give the reason for improvement?

Q.7. Reservation Policy for Scheduled Caste:

7.1. Whether the Reservation Policy is required for Scheduled Caste? Required / Not Required)

7.2 If no, give the reasons.

7.3 If yes, explain.

7.4 Do you think that chance of winning election by the scheduled caste without Reservation? Yes/No

7.5 If yes, explain.

7.6 If no, why?

7.7 Do you feel that due to reservation help to improve in socio-economic and political life of scheduled caste? Yes/No

7.8 If yes, give the nature if improvement.

Q. 8. Supportive Agencies in Rural Development

8.1. Did you received co-operation from other elected representatives / Govt. Officials, Centre Govt., NGO's and Other Agencies? Yes/No

8.2. If yes, give the names:
8.3. If no, give the reasons.

Q.9. Obstacles faced and means of solving them.

9.1. What are the obstacles faced while implementing the schemes and programme for rural development. Yes/No

9.2. If yes, specify the nature of obstacles.

9.3. What are the means use for solving the problems about the schemes and programmes of Rural Development. Yes/No

9.4. If yes, give the detail of means.

9.5. Are you discuss with the community about their power and functions? Yes / No

9.6. If yes, give the reasons for discussion.

9.7. If no, describe the reasons.


10.1. Do you participate in discussion related to planning / decision making, programme implemention, monitoring and evaluation? Yes/No

10.2. If yes, explain the nature of participation.

10.3. Explain the level of participation by scheduled caste related representatives in discussion, decision making and implementation of schemes? Yes/No

10.4. Whether the Govt. officials is cordial/strained rotations with the panchayati Raj Institutions. Cordial/Strained
10.5. If cordial, specify the nature of relations.

10.6. If strained, give the reasons.

10.7. Do you have any idea that the NGOs participation in Panchayati Raj Institutions development programmes? Yes/No

10.8. If yes, give the lost of NGO's of participation.

Q.11. Elected Representatives perception and opinion about the Gram Sabha

11.1. How many meetings held in one year of Gram Sabha?

11.2. If yes, give the number.

11.3. If no, give the reasons.

11.4. Are the Gram Sabha members participate in Gram Sabha meeting. Yes/No

11.5. Mention the Gram Sabha members percentage of attendance.

11.6. List out the nature of Rural Development programmes implemented and prepared list of below poverty line people of the village declared in Gram Sabha. Yes/No

11.7. Give your important suggestions for effective functioning of Panchayati Raj System.
Q.12. What is your perception about the Village Development Committee?

12.1. What you say about the Village Development Committee, it is useful for Development of village. Yes / No

12.2. If yes, give the reasons.

12.3. If no, why?

12.4. The Village Development Committee reduce the power of Panchayats. What you say? Yes / No

12.5. If yes, give the reason.

12.6. If no, why?

Q.13. What is your perception about the District Grievance Committee?

13.1. What you think about the District Grievance Committee. It is useful for the people. Yes/No

13.2. If yes, give the reasons.

13.3. If not, explain.

13.4. Do you know composition of Grievance Committee Yes/No

Q.14. What is your perception about the Janata Darbar?

14.1. Which C.M. started this concept to remove the problem of the people? It is useful for the people? Yes/No

14.2. If yes, explain.

14.3. If no, give reasons.
14.4. Janata Darbar able to achieve their aims to reduce red tapism of Beauracrats and gap between rural and ruled. Yes/No

14.5. If yes, give the detail.

14.6. If no, explain

14.7. This concept able to motivate the people to participation in this programme. Yes/No

14.8. If yes, give the reasons.

14.9. If no, explain.

Q.15. What is your perception about the Lok Adalat?

15.1. Lok Adalat Programme is useful for the people. Do you agree? Yes/No

15.2. If yes, give the reasons.

15.3. If no, explain.

15.4. Do you think that many disputes settled in the Lok Adalat Programme and benefit of people money, and time. Do you agree? Yes/No

15.5. If yes, give reason.

15.6. If no, why?

Q.16. The previous Govt. of Haryana started New concept, Govt. at your Door.

16.1. This new concept is useful for rural development. Do you agree? Yes/No
16.2. If yes, How to say.

16.3. If no, give the reasons.

16.4. This new concept successful to gear up the rural development in rural areas. Yes/No

16.5. If yes, give the detail.

16.6. If no, explain.

16.7. This concept able to change socio-economic and political states in rural areas. Yes/No

16.8. If yes, given the reasons.

16.9. If no, why?

This concept able to remove the gap between ruler and ruled. Do you agree? Yes/No

If yes, give the reasons.

If no, explain.

16.10. This concept is useful to remove corruption, red tapism and Imbalance Development in the rural areas. Do you agree? Yes/No

If yes, explain.

If no, give the reasons.
16.11. This concept should be continue in future for Rural Development. You are agree? Yes/No If yes, explain. If no, why?

Q.17. What do you think about Role perception and Development orientation for Rural Community?

17.1. Which kind of Role perception and Development orientation to solve the problems of villagers. Individual/Collective

17.2. If yes, Individual give the reason.

17.3. If no, explain.