CHAPTER V

THE ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE

The basic organisational structure of the Panchayati Raj Institutions was formulated by the Balwant Rai Mehta Committee in 1957. This envisaged interconnected democratic institutions at the village, block and district level. Thus, the Panchayati Raj in its totality would include village Panchayat, block level committee and zila parishad as a sequence starting from the grass root level to the district level administration. This framework accepted suitable structural variations in various states taking into account specific local needs and environments within the broad framework. The full scope of state-to-state variations in implementing Panchayati Raj was also emphasized by the National Development Council (see 4, p. 1).

Accordingly, there has been no insistence on the states to follow a single prescribed pattern and structural variations exist in the patterns followed in different states in the country. However, some principles (see 5) have been maintained in the adjustment process throughout.

1. A quick look into the structural patterns in various states reveals (see 5) that at the time of this study out of 21 states, the three-tier system of Panchayati Raj was in existence in 9 states - Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Maharashtra, Punjab,
There should be a three-tier structure from the village to the district level, each tier linked to the other.

There should be adequate transfer of power and responsibility to these bodies.

Keeping in view the transfer of power and responsibilities, adequate resources should be placed at their disposal.

Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh. Both Bihar and Madhya Pradesh had enacted legislations for three tier system, but while Bihar had introduced the three tiers in 8 out of 31 districts in the state, Madhya Pradesh had not constituted the third tier i.e., Zila Parishad. In West Bengal, a four tier system of Panchayati Raj (Gram Panchayat, Anchal Panchayat/Parishad and Zila Parishad) was in vogue. The two tier system of Panchayati Raj (Panchayat Samiti and Gram Panchayat) was in force in five states (Assam, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Karnataka and Orissa). Only Gram Panchayats were in existence in four states - J&K, Manipur and Tripura. In Kerala, the District Administration Bill, 1971, providing for the two tier system of Panchayati Raj was pending.

Meghalaya and Nagaland had no Panchayati Raj. Nagaland had area, range and tribal councils, instead. As regards Union Territories - Arunachal Pradesh had three tier set-up and Dadara and Nagar Hawai had two tier set up. In Puducherry, by enforcement of certain provisions of Puducherry Village and Commune Panchayat Act, Panchayati Raj Institutions were created for the first time in 1974 by declaring the existing Municipal Councils as the successor commune - Panchayat Councils as transitory arrangement.

There were only Gram Panchayats in four Union Territories and these were - Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Chandigarh, Delhi and Coa, Daman, Diu. Gram Panchayats were not in existence in Lakshadweep and Mizoram.
d. All development programmes at each level should be entrusted to these bodies.

e. The system ultimately evolved should be such that further devolution of power will be facilitated.

In U.P., the three tiered structure of Panchayati Raj Institutions (Gaon, Panchayat, Kshetra Samiti and Zila Parishad) is governed by the United Provinces Panchayat Raj Act 1947 and the U.P. Kshetra Samitis and Zila Parishad Adhiniyam of 1961 simultaneously.

The purpose of this chapter is to study the organisational structure of Panchayati Raj Institutions in U.P. Section I is devoted to the envisaged organisational structure and formal hierarchies existing within the envisaged structure. Section II describes the de-facto structure and examines the gaps between the de-jure and de-facto structure and thereby the consequent dysfunctions. Section III presents the role perceptions of the managers of Panchayati Raj Institutions to draw up the pattern of interaction among the various role players in the organisation.

I. The de-jure structure

We will look into the de-jure structure of Panchayati Raj Institutions in U.P. by studying their composition and the administrative hierarchies.

1. Composition — The Gaon Panchayat:

Under the Act 1947, Gaon Sabhas (13:2) were constituted for every revenue village or group of villages having a population of one thousand or more. In 1955, however, by an
amendment, a Gaon Sabha was constituted for every revenue
village with a population of 250 or more. In the year 1976,
there were 72,853 Gaon Sabhas working in the state.

A Gaon Panchayat is the executive of the Gaon Sabha
and is managed by the person selected by all the adult
members of the Gaon Sabha. There is a Pradhan as Head of
the Gaon Panchayat who is elected directly by the members
of Gaon Sabha. The Up-Pradhan (Deputy Head) of the Gaon
Panchayat is, however, elected by the members of the Gaon
Panchayat. The number of members of a Gaon Panchayat is
fixed on the basis of population of village, as follows:

1. for population upto 500  7 members
2. for population upto 1,000  9 members
3. for population upto 2,000 11 members
4. for population upto 3,000 13 members
5. for population above 3,000 15 members

A Gaon Panchayat is known as Zhuni Prabandhak Samiti
(Land Management Committee) for the management of land
within the jurisdiction of respective Gaon Sabha. The Pradhan
and Up-Pradhan of the Panchayat work as the chairman and
vice-Chairman of this Samiti respectively. The Lekhpal of
the area concerned works as the secretary of this Samiti.

Nyaya Panchayats

According to the provisions of the Act, 1947,
Panchayat Adalats (courts) now known as Nyaya Panchayats
had been set up in rural areas all over the state in 1949.
For this purpose, districts were divided into various circles roughly comprising an area of 20 to 25 square kilometres, and contained in their orbit roughly 8 to 10 Gaon Sabhas. The number of Nyaya Panchayats set up in the beginning was 3,543. As a result of an amendment in the Act 1947 in the year 1955, the number of Gaon Sabhas was roughly doubled and thus the number of Nyaya Panchayats increased to 6,791.

The strength of members of a Nyaya Panchayat varies from ten to twenty five. In the first instance, the D.M. nominates two Panches from each Gaon Sabha falling in the orbit of a Nyaya Panchayat. In case of six villages included in one Nyaya Panchayat, the number of Panches would be rounded to 15 so that benches of 5 Panches each might be constituted. In this way, a Nyaya Panchayat consists of ten, fifteen, twenty or twenty five Panches. After the nomination, all the Panches hold a meeting at the place and date as specified by the D.M. and elect a Sarpanch and a Sahayak Sarpanch.

(b) Kshetra Saniti

In U.P., the block level unit functioning as the second tier of Panchayati Raj is called Kshetra Saniti and is governed by the U.P. Kshetra Sanitis and Zila Parishads (Adhiniyam of 1961). Apart from the basic idea of democratic decentralisation, the Act was intended to integrate and correlate the functions of Gaon Sabhas under their Act 1947 with Kshetra Sanitis and Zila Parishads.
Composition of Kshetra Samiti

A Kshetra Samiti is composed of:

1. all Pradhans of the constituent Gram Sabhas,
2. Chairman of the Committee of Town Areas and Presidents of the Notified Area Committees,
3. representatives of cooperative societies with a minimum of two and maximum of five,
4. all M.L.A.s. representing constituencies or area included in the Khurd (Block),
5. all members of Council of State and State Legislative Council as above, subject to rules of the state government.

All the above said members have the right of speaking.

a) persons not exceeding two in number who appear to be interested in planning and development.
b) women up to the maximum of five in all, and
c) persons from scheduled castes to make their overall strength as eight in a Kshetra Samiti.

Every Kshetra Samiti has a Pramukh who is elected by its members. Two Up-Pramukhs are also elected from amongst the members.

The term of a Kshetra Samiti is five years from the date of its constitution and the same is the term of members,
Pramukh and Up-Pramukh from the date of election. However, the offices of pramukh and up-pramukh may be vacated by divisional commissioner or by a vote of no-confidence by the members of the Samiti by a two-thirds majority.

The functions of Kshetra Samiti are performed through three committees constituted under section 67 of the Act 1961. These are (1) Karya Karini, (2) Utpadan Samiti, and (3) Kalyan Samiti. The Karya Karini, with the help of A.D.O., Utpadan Samiti and Kalyan Samiti, prepares the Kshetra Development Plans.

The office of the Kshetra Samiti is the office of A.D.O. who works as the Secretary of the Samiti. The Kshetra pramukh is the supreme authority of block level and exercises control over the A.D.O. for the purpose of implementation of the decisions and resolutions of the Kshetra Samiti.

(c) Zila Parishad

The Zila Parishad constitutes the apex tier in the Panchayat Raj set-up functioning at the district level. At present 53 Zila Parishads are working in U.P. The Zila Parishads in U.P. are composed of the following permanent to section 18(1) of the Act 1961.

1. Pramukh of all Kshetra Samitis established in the district.
2. Prescribed number of persons chosen by each Kshetra Samiti.
3. Presidents of all Municipal Boards in the District.
4. Not more than five members, who are representatives of the cooperative societies in the district.

5. One member who is a social worker.

6. Prescribed number of persons elected from each Khadya/Khand on the basis of adult franchise.

7. Members of the Parliament and Members of the Legislative Council from the district, and,

8. Five women members and five scheduled caste members. They are co-opted if the prescribed number is not obtained through election.

The chairman of Zila Parishad is known as the Adhyaksha in U.P. Both the Adhyaksha and Up-Adhyaksha are elected by the secret ballot by the members of Zila Parishad. The office of the Adhyaksha is coterminus with Zila Parishad, which is five years. But the term of Up-Adhyaksha is one year from the date of election and cannot be extended beyond the term of Zila Parishad. The Adhyaksha presides over and conducts the meetings of Zila Parishad. He exercises administrative control over the Secretary and Chief Executive officer of the Zila Parishad for the purpose of implementation of resolutions of the Parishad or any of its standing committees.

The functions of Zila Parishad are performed through the following committees under section 64 of the Act 1961.
1. Karya Samiti,
2. Vitta Samiti,
3. Shakha Samiti,
4. Sarvajani Niram Samiti, and
5. Jan Swasthya Samiti.

These committees prepare budgets, watch the progress of income and expenditure of the zila parishad throughout the year, to formulate the programmes and watch the progress of medical, and public health activities, constructional, educational and agricultural programmes.

To facilitate proper planning section 64(2) provides for the setting up of a Miyajan Samiti as being composed of the Adhyaksha, Up-Adhyaksha, Mukhya Adhikari as secretary of the committee and all the district level officers.

(2) **Flow of Hierarchies in Panchayati Raj Structure:**

The structure of Panchayati Raj Institutions in U.P. is a conglomerate of hierarchies of Rural Development Department, Panchayat Raj Department and the people who constitute democratic component of the whole set-up. The flow of administration in these institutions, thus, can be viewed as having three streams, viz., executive hierarchy of R.D., executive hierarchy of Panchayat Raj and hierarchy of people's elected representatives in the total framework.

**Executive Hierarchy of Rural Development:**

The executive hierarchy stands for the vertical arrangement of officers who have been given positions in
the entire Rural Development and Panchayat Raj set-up. At
the state level, the Department of Rural Development is
charged with the responsibility of implementing the C.D.
Programmes and looking after the whole development admin-
istration. In fact, the hierarchy starts from the Commissioner
of Agricultural Production and Rural Development, and flows
down to V.L.W. through the Development Commissioner, Collector,
district Development Officer/Ad. M. (Dev.), Block Development
officer and A.D. Os. A brief role profile is given below to
analyse the formal structure at the district level.

Collector:

The collector is the officer at the apex in the
existing administrative chain at the district level. Under
the collector, the district administration provides the main
link of communication between Panchayati Raj Institutions and
State Government. He serves not merely as the Chief
administrator of Community Development programmes but also
as coordinator of the activities of other development
departments (see 15, p. 52).

The role of collector has been viewed both with doubts
and convictions as regards development administration. In
Maharashtra and Gujarat he is not associated with Zila
Parishad and is so with development-administration. In
Tamil Nadu and Karnataka, he is the Chairman of District
Development Council, and, therefore, made completely
responsible for development administration. In Andhra
Pradesh and Rajasthan, he is made the member of Zila Parishad and thus, in the absence of provision for any Chief Executive Officer (C.E.O.), plays a significant role in development administration. At the same time, it has been felt that the collector could not devote adequate time for the development administration. It was observed in the Annual Conference of C.D. (1968) that ... any special role given to the collector would hinder the autonomous functioning of representative institutions (see 6, p. 107). But, being the representative of the Government, he is expected to keep a watch on the progress of work and guide the Panchayati Raj Institutions.

The Ashok Mehta Committee considered the role of collector as regulatory and that he should discharge the functions of protecting the interest of weaker sections. In this process he should organise and help the conduct of social audit (see 7, p. 97).

In U.P. like Gujarat, Rajasthan, Punjab and Bihar, the Collector attended the meetings of Zila Parishad without any right to vote. However, under the provisions of section 232 of the Act 1961, the Zila Parishad is liable to be dissolved or superseded by the State Government upon the representation or in case of ill performance of functions. As a result of supersession or dissolution, the Collector takes over as Adhyaksha and works as Zila Parishad himself. The Zila Parishads and Kshetra Samitis in U.P. were superseded twice in 1970 and 1977. Consequently, the powers and

2. See Chapter IV, p. 59
functions of Adhyaksha, Up-Adhyaksha, and Committees of the parishad have been vested in the Collector. This arrangement has placed him in the supreme-status in matters of policy formulation and functional management at district level, including Zila Parishad.

district level officers:

There are a number of departments at the district level, viz., Agriculture, Animal Husbandry, Minor Irrigation, Cooperatives, Panchayat Raj, Planning and Community Development, Harijan and Social Welfare, Tube-wells, Education, Labour, food and civil supplies, cane, weight and measures, Medical and Public Health, statistics and Industries. The district level Heads of Development Departments, viz., A.D.M. (Dev.)/D.D.O., Agriculture, Medical and Public Health, Animal Husbandry, Minor Irrigation, Cooperatives, Panchayat Raj, Plant Protection, had been brought under the control of Zila Parishad. They formulate their departmental programmes under the guidance of A.D.M. (Dev.)/D.D.O., who is designated as C.E.O. of Zila Parishad. Yet the coverage of Zila Parishad's control over development department seems to grow lean and thin as the Education and Medical and Public Health have been taken over by the state Government and separate Directorates have been set up. Similarly other departments still left under the control of Parishad, follow the instructions reaching them from their respective Directorates at the state level.
Block Development Officer

The B.D.O. (Block Development Officer) is the captain of the team of block level team of subject-matter specialists known as Assistant Development Officers. The appointment of Block development officer is intended to ensure that a properly planned programme of work could be drawn up in association with various block specialists and the necessary coordination between the various specialists, secured.

Like a Collector, the B.D.O. plays a dual role in the development administration. He has to act as the administrative head at the block level as well as the Chief Executive Officer of the Kshetra Samiti. He is an immediate boss of the A.D.O.s on the matters like - agriculture, animal husbandry, cooperative, panchayats, rural industries, rural engineering, social education and welfare of women and children.

In U.P., the B.D.O. is recruited by deputation from civil service or by promotion from the post of A.D.O.s. A certain percentage of this post is filled by recruitment through competitive examinations held by U.P. Public Service Commission. The B.D.O. and his staff are subordinate to Kshetra Samiti. He implements the resolution of the Samiti and its Committees, as its secretary also. He convenes the meetings and sometimes participates in its deliberations. The B.D.O. as the Treasury Officer also has authority to draw and disburse money out of Kshetra Nidhi. He prepares the budget of the Samiti and impacts the financial position of Gram Panchayats.
The Gram Sevak (Village Level Worker) stands at the lowest in the executive hierarchy of Community development administration. He has direct linkage with people at the village level and service departments at the block level. In Kerala, the Gram Sevak is designated as Village Extension Officer to add dignity to the post. Actually, the success of Community Development depends, by and large, on Gram Sevak who is a multipurpose worker engaged in several activities of development. The Expert Committee on Training of Project Personnel defined his functions as that of making the rural people aware of their problems, inspiring in them the desire for better living, educating them to realise that improvement in their conditions can be secured only by their own efforts, and assisting them in formulating their needs, assisting their resources, and securing the assistance of various supply and other services provided by Government agencies for executing the programmes drawn by them. (see 8, p. 5).

The role of Gram Sevak as the development secretary of the village Panchayat has been viewed many times by various committees. The Balvantray Mehta Committee (1957) suggested to assign Gram sevaks this role but not entrusting any other function of the Panchayat (see 9, p. 35). The Govind Sahai Committee of Uttar Pradesh was, however, of the opinion that Gram Sevak can be made a full fledged secretary of the Panchayat. Rajasthan experimented with this idea making Gram sevak the Development Secretary of Panchayat and the system, introduced in 24 panchayat samitis, was found working well (see 10, p. 159).
Gram Sevikas are the counterparts of Gram Swaks working at village level for development of women and children. They are expected to help in making women of the village, good housekeepers, good mothers and good citizens imbued with the desire for improvement in their living conditions and for the community welfare (17:29). However, the role of Gram Sevikas was not appreciated by the villagers, as revealed by a study conducted in U.P. and Andhra Pradesh (see 14: pp. 211-235).

Executive Hierarchy of Panchayat-Raj Department

The Panchayat Raj department in U.P. was in existence much before the advent of Panchayati Raj, because of the promulgation of United Provinces Panchayat Raj Act 1947. This department enjoys a special and overriding status in the total Panchayati Raj set-up. It is the parent department at state level for all the Gram Panchayats. As soon as the democratic-decentralization was enforced in U.P. in 1961, the Panchayat Raj Department was strengthened by effecting a few changes. For instance, the then Prantiya Paksha Bali was renamed on October 1971, in this department as Pradehik Vikas Raj for adding its contribution to the task of rural development. During the year 1972-73, the Director Panchayat Raj was redesignated as Additional Director Panchayati Raj with a view to extending its administrative control on Zila Parishads in some matters like fairs, hat and bazaars managed by the Zila Parishads, Annual Reports, vehicles, enquiry against Parishad officers, coordination of all Panchayati Raj Institutions etc.
At the district level there are Panchayat Raj Officers who supervise the working of Gaon Panchayats and Nyaya Panchayats in their jurisdictions. Then, at the block level, A.D.Os (Panchayat) are recruited to mobilize the Gaon Panchayats and Nyaya Panchayats located in their respective jurisdictions.

At the village level, there are Panchayat Sevaks who work under A.D.O. (Panchayat). In U.D., with a view to gearing up industrial economy of the villages, there is a provision for Gaon Panchayats to establish 'Panchayat Industries'. The Panchayat Raj Department has appointed Panchayat Inspectors (Industry) to provide managerial input to these industries.

Executive Hierarchy in the Overall Panchayati Raj Structure:

With the introduction of Panchayati Raj, the whole district administration was attempted to be clubbed or pooled at one single form. In this process, the council of team of district level officers was designated as 'Zila Parishad'. Section 39(1) of the U.P. Kashetra SSamiti and Zila Parishad Act 1961, clearly provides that Zila Parishad shall have the following posts of Officers:

1. Mulkiya Adhikari
2. Vitta Adhikari
3. Swasthya Adhikari
4. Karya Adhikari
5. Abhiyanta
6. Kar Adhikari
7. Shiksha Adhikari
8. Panchayat Raj Adhikari
9. Sinchait Adhikari
10. Pashu Dhan Adhikari
11. Krishi Adhikari
12. Saharakita Adhikari

The Act 1961, again provides in section 39(3) that the additional District Magistrate (Development) or the
District Development Officer, the Deputy Inspector of Schools, Asst. District Panchayat Raj Officer, the Senior Mechanical Inspector (Minor Irrigation), the District Livestock Officer, district Agricultural Officer and the Assistant Registrar of Cooperative societies of the State Government shall hold the posts of Zila Parishad Officers as above.

Under this changed arrangement, a new executive hierarchy which emerged was like this:

a. The Collector was to act as, ex-officio member of the Zila Parishad without any right to vote. He was, at the same time, the highest officer at district level and in emergency cases was the Adhyaksha or Zila Parishad also.

b. The A.D.E. (Dev.)/D.D.O. worked as the Mukhya Adhikari (C.D.O.) and an Additional Mukhya Adhikari was appointed to assist him in the management of Parishad affairs. The Additional Mukhya Adhikari was delegated the powers of Mukhya Adhikari in routine matters, but in no case he worked as a delegate of Adhyaksha.

c. All other district level officers were placed under the A.D.E. (Dev.)/D.D.O. as subordinate officers. They continued to work as usual as the departmental Heads at the district level, but were now required to run their departments on behalf of Zila Parishad, and so their policies and programmes had to be in conformity with those of Parishad.
d. At the block level, while there had been a team of subject matter specialists, known as A.D.O.s, under the administrative control of B.D.O., they continued to work under the technical guidance of their parent departments. The C.E.O. was made the C.E.O. of the Kshetra Samiti and subordinated to A.D.O. (Dev.)/D.D.O.

e. At the grass-root level, the V.L.M., Cooperative Supervisor, Panchayat Sewak, Plant Protection Supervisors and Veterinary stockmen, Assistant Agricultural Inspectors and minor irrigation and rural engineering staff had to work under their respective departmental A.D.O.s and B.D.O.s. This hierarchy is illustrated in figure 4.

Hierarchy of People's Representatives in Panchayati Raj Institutions:

1. Chairman, Zila Parishad

Chairman of the Zila Parishad in U.P. is called Agyat Kshetra. He is elected from amongst the Kshetra Prapukhe and, therefore, has emerged as the prominent representative of the people having control over the Mukhya Adhikari of Zila Parishad. In this way, the democracy through the Chairman would dominate the bureaucracy. In U.P., under the existing legislation, the Collector assumes the role of Agyat and Parishad himself, at the time when the Panchayati Raj Institutions are superseded.
2. **President Kshetra Samiti**

The President of the Kshetra Samiti, known as Kshetra Pramukh, is the supreme demerit at the block level. He watches the financial and executive administration and is empowered to inspect the work undertaken by the Samiti. He exercises control over the B.D.O. for implementing decisions of Samiti and its standing committees. He has the power to make entry in the C.C.R. of the B.D.O.

3. **Gon Pradhan**

At the village level, the Gon Pradhan acts as the Chairman of the Gon Panchayat and is assisted by the Panchayat sevaks and V.L.W.s in preparing village plans.

In the entire structure of Panchayati Raj Institutions, two directional hierarchies can be seen:

1. Executive or bureaucratic hierarchy flowing from above downwards.

2. Democratic hierarchy - rising from below upwards i.e. representation of Gon Pradhans at block level, one of them as Kshetra Pramukh, representing Kshetra Pramukha at district level and one of them as Adhyaksha Zila Parishad. Thus a Goon Pradhan has every likelihood of representing a Goon Sabha in the Zila Parishad.
The executive hierarchy in the Panchayati Raj, however, indicates the extent of delegation from district to gramswat level. A separate executive team exists within the internal structure of zila Parishad to facilitate coordination, at district level, of plans of lower tiers. The six of all these arrangements would appear as shown in figure 5 which depicts the de-jure organisational structure of Panchayati Raj Institutions.

II. The De-facto Structure: The Gaps

A close look at the six districts in our sample reveals that the district administrative set up does not assign, in real terms, the due role to Panchayati Raj Institutions. This conforms to Ashok Mehta Committee’s finding (7:8). While the zila Parishad was envisaged to be the apex administrative and planning unit for district development, it had found place in the district administration as one of the less important departments. The de-jure structure gets seriously distorted at the implementation level. The de-facto structure appears to be as given in figure 6.
In this structure the collector who was supposed to be a coordinator, continued to enjoy the sovereignty as he did before democratic decentralisation. He was the chief supervisor of all district departments, on behalf of the State Government. The Zila Parishad, having been vested in the Collector, had no sense of being in existence.
As was the practice, the A.D.M. (Dev.)/D.D.O., as the case might be, worked as the agent of the collector and a few powers relating to routine affairs of Zila Parishad office were delegated to Additional Mukhya Adhikari who was, de-facto incharge of Zila Parishad. In any organisation, the Deputy Chief or Additional Chief Officer officiates as the chief Executive Officer in the absence of the latter. However, in the case of smaller districts, it was observed that whenever the Mukhya Adhikari was on leave or absent, a senior district level officer was given the charge of Mukhya Adhikari. The Additional Mukhya Adhikari was not given this responsibility. In fact, the post of Additional Mukhya Adhikari, in U.D., is filled in by P.C.S. (Allied) men who do not enjoy the equal status and rank in matters of district administration.

As the de-facto structure of Panchayati Raj Institutions suggests, the Zila Parishad is not more than an inferior office where the collector and A.D.M. (Dev.)/D.D.O. come not as the men of this organisation but as some external controllers from State Government side. (See shaded parts of figure 6).

While District Development office which should have been working as the ‘planning cell’ of Zila Parishad, and its departmental head, viz., A.D.M. (Dev.)/D.D.O. should have been working as the Development Managers of Zila Parishad, the practice was that the A.D.M. (Dev.)/D.D.O. would like to be identified more as the A.D.M. (Dev.)/D.D.O., than the Mukhya Adhikari of Zila Parishad. They would remain in their ‘Pooled Development Establishment’ (Pikrit Vikas Adhikaran) very rarely visiting the Zila Parishad office.
The system of Panchayati Raj envisaged the functional interdependence amongst various district level departments by way of task sharing and inter-departmental officers. For example, the Panchayat Raj Department could issue loans to Gaon Sabhas but such loans were to be realised by Revenue Department. Similarly, the idea of task-sharing and departmental interdependence is desirable in as much as it can promote integrated functioning of all the departments. The actual experience, however, shows that departmental interdependence has emerged as a chief goal of Panchayati Raj Institutions. A finding of this type is mentioned in a departmental report (see 10). To illustrate, loans were issued to villagers by the Panchayat Raj Department under two schemes, viz. 1. Creation of Development and productive Assets initiated in 1961-62 (see 10, pp. 27-31), and 2. Rural House construction scheme initiated in 1958-59 (see 10, p. 53). The realisation of loans was to be done by Revenue Department, but both the Revenue and Panchayat Raj Department could not be coordinated and the amount of loans remained unrealised.3

Similarly many departments have to depend on each other for inter-departmental officers. The idea of department interdependence is, no doubt, desirable inasmuch as it can promote integrated functioning of all the departments. What was seen in practice was an urge of self-dependence and

3. A quite similar finding has been quoted by Nibhashi in his Rural Development Administration on the basis of findings of Pilot Surveys conducted by DPIA on Coordination, Communication and Initiative in Agricultural Development in Rajasthan, Punjab and U.P., 1966, p. 215 (see 3).
distinctive identity in various departments which added to functional overlapping as opposed to complementary role performance on their part.

System's boundaries which are essential part of systematic interrelationship between Panchayati Raj Institutions inter alia seem to have not often been observed by the institutional components. AGRICULTURAL department in U.P., prepared by large, similar programmes for blocks as were prepared by Minor Irrigation, Cooperative and Revenue departments.

At the block level, the departmental relationship was rather more confusing. At this level, the Kshetra Samitis have merged in sub divisional officers who replaced Kshetra Pramukhs since 1977. A S.D.O. is a Revenue Agent of the district authorities with specific departmental policies and attitudes. The S.D.O.s, who have been, hitherto, working as the C.E.O. of Kshetra Samitis have been subordinated to S.D.O.s, on one hand and are the reporting officers for their usual bosses i.e. A.D.O.(Dev.)/D.D.O. This situation is very likely to create a dilemma in the role performance of the S.D.O. who is ultimately accountable for block-development.

At the block level, the A.D.O.s are considered the subject matter specialists and represent their respective district departments, stationed at block level. The A.D.O.s take all technical instructions and decisions from their parent departments. On the other hand, they are under

4. A quite similar situation was found in other states regarding Panchayati Raj Institutions, by Ishwar Naylor, Nathur and Bhattacharya (See 2).
Immediate subordination of A.D.O. who works as the Administrative Head. The result is that the A.D.Os. look to their parent departments for protection, whenever the B.D.O. exercises his powers over former. In fact, it was observed in the sample blocks that all the B.D.Os and A.D.Os. were unhappy with their positions. This dissatisfaction, according to all of them, emanated from the conflicting instruction issued by the District departments directly served to A.D.Os. and their inconsistency with the policies of B.D.Os.

At the village level, the situation is still more confusing. Before 1961, the year when Panchayati Raj was enforced in the State, there were only Gaon Panchayats to look after the development work at village level. They would take instructions from District Panchayat Raj Officer and Director of Panchayat Raj. There was a clear cut vertical hierarchy. With the advent of Panchayati Raj, the new hierarchies which were associated with Panchayats made the structure a bit complicated. Now while Gaon Panchayats were, as usual, working under direct control of Director, Panchayat Raj, they had also to function as a subordinate units of Kshetra Samiti. Various functionaries were appointed for village development tasks such as V.I.Wa., Lakhpals, panchayat Sewaks, Cooperative supervisors, Veterinary stockmen etc. What was actually found was the sense of rivalry among these functionaries which caused the functional overlapping.
Each functionary would have its own plan of action for a single task and attempts would be made to surpass each other. This not only confused the ordinary villager of the local needs but also added to the bulk of finances wasted on a small item. While a coordination should have been reached in the plan implementation, all departments took up independently their own plans of action. One can hardly call it Panchayati Raj where so many vertical arrangements are operating parallel to each other.

The stereotyped hierarchies working parallel to each other in the total Panchayati Raj structure, created the problem of authority. For this reason, the managers, saddled with the responsibility of executing the development programmes, did not enjoy adequate powers and authority to direct the activities of their subordinate staff. Several Block Development Officers, in informal interviews maintained that they could not function well as Executive Heads in their blocks. One B.D.O. remarked - "I cannot get work done from my subordinates because I have no control over them. Nor can I take action against my A.D.O.s., for neglecting my instructions. Another B.D.O. complained - "Since A.D.O.s. know that their career is independent of B.D.O.s. control and all the worse is their awareness of being promoted to the post of Departmental Heads and sometimes as D.D.O. who becomes the boss of the B.D.O.s. Similarly, the B.D.O. has no jurisdiction over the Revenue Department and cooperative institutions. The A.D.O.s. are equally handicapped in performance of their role due to
no control over the Village Level Workers appointed formerly in the N.E.S. blocks. The position of Village Level Worker is somewhat critical in as much as he is neither directly linked with Gon Panchayats, nor with Kshetra Samitis and Zila Parishads, yet he is supposed to perform many diverse functions.

III. Role Perceptions

Parsons defines roles as “that organised sector of an actor’s orientation which constitutes and defines his participation as an interactive process. It involves a set of complementary expectations concerning his own actions and those of others with whom he interacts.” (See 16, p. 23).

Self role perceptions (what a role incumbent perceives to act as desirable) and reciprocal role perceptions (what a role incumbent expects of others to act as desirable) are important determinants of the pattern of interaction in an organisation and, thereby, are important elements of the organisational structure.5 Therefore it is imperative to study the role perceptions (self and reciprocal) of the government officers and people’s representatives of the Panchayati Raj Institutions.

self Role Perceptions

In order to elicit information on the self-role perceptions, fifteen statements6 were put before government officers.

5. Also see Kies and Kahn (12) and Harner and Tosi (11).

6. The statements on self-role perceptions have been framed with the help of a study conducted by Chaturvedi (see 1).
officers and people's representatives separately and they were asked to select only five statements in order of importance (see Appendix X-XIII).

Table III-5.1 and III-5.2 respectively show the statements selected and ranked by the government officers and people's representatives.

Table III - 5.11: Showing aggregated scores of statements as ranked by Government Officers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Aggregated scores of Statements as ranked by Government Officers</th>
<th>Total Score Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table III = 5.21: Showing the Aggregated Scores of Statements as ranked by People's Representatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number of statements as appearing in Table III-5.2</th>
<th>Aggregated Scores of Statements</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>district</td>
<td>block</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We tried to find the relative importance of these statements as perceived by the respondents. For this purpose, weight of 5 was given to a statement ranked number '1' by a respondent. Similarly, weights 4, 3, 2 and 1 were assigned to the statements which were respectively ranked 2, 3, 4 and 5. These scores were added for each statement over the responses of district level respondents and block level respondents separately. Table III-5.11 shows the aggregated scores of each statement as obtained from the ranking given by the district and block level officers. Table III-5.21 shows the corresponding scores for the statements ranked by the people's representatives.
As Table III - 3.11 indicates the role perception of reserving the decision making power to government officers and asking the elected representatives only to advise whenever needed, obtained the highest score. The second highest score was given to the role of keeping a powerful faction of leaders satisfied if that action helped the implementation of government programmes. The role perception of observing strictly the government rules even if it caused delay in implementing the development programmes got the third highest score. The role perception of execution of decisions made by Zila Parishad/Kahota Samiti, executing such decisions even if these are unsound, conveying the wishes and demands of local leaders to superior officers and bringing all irregularities committed by leaders to the notice of their superior officers, obtained the fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh highest scores respectively.

As Table III-3.21 reveals the role perception of reserving the decision making power to the elected representatives and getting them executed by government officers obtained the highest score. The second highest score was given to the role of using the officers in factional politics. The third highest score was given to letting the officers take decisions themselves and work in their own ways. The role perception of keeping watch on the activities of government officers got the fourth highest score. Communicating the wishes and opinions of the people to the officers obtained the fifth highest score. The role perception of
advising the officers for the rural development and help them in implementing government programmes was given the lowest but one score. Accepting the decisions of the officers on policy matters got the lowest score.

**Reciprocal Role Perceptions**

In order to elicit information on reciprocal role perceptions four alternative statements were put before the respondents as symbolic of four dimensions of interaction. These four statements are as follows:

1. A government officer and a people's representative have nothing to do with each other while performing their duties. This statement is indicative of the isolated and secluded style of working on the part of role incumbents of Panchayati Raj Institutions falling in the category of government officers and elected representatives.

2. The responsibility of a government officer is confined to explaining policies and rules to people's representatives. This statement reflects a reconciling situation, however, echoing the supremacy of bureaucracy over the elected representatives.

3. There exists the situation of mutual consultation and cooperation between a government officer and a people's representative in doing work. This

7. These statements have been adopted from Chaturvedi (1971) with necessary modifications.
statement indicates a collaborative management style where both the categories of role incumbents of Panchayati Raj Institutions extend their cooperation and consultation in setting work target and its achievement.

4. The government officer mainly depends on the guidance and advices of people's representatives. This statement is indicative of the situation where the government officers are vehemently dictated by the norms set by the people's representatives.

The respondents were asked to opt for only one such statement as they would perceive to be most desirable. Their responses are given in table III - 5.3.

As table III-5.3 indicates, there existed variation on the reciprocal role perceptions of officers at the district level and those at the block level. At the district level the statement number '1' appeared as favoured by the largest majority of officers (62.73%), and statement number 3 desired by smallest number of officers (13.73%). The fourth statement was desired by none from the district and block level officers. At the block level, this situation appeared as reverse. There the largest number of officers (65.22%) desired the fourth statement. The second and third statements were favoured by 10.87% and 19.57% officers respectively.
Table II 2-5.3: Showing the Reciprocal perception of Government officers and People's Representatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Government Officer</th>
<th></th>
<th>People's Representatives</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mist. Block Mist. Block Mist. Block Govt. People's Officer Representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. A government officer and representative have nothing to do with each other while performing their duties.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The responsibility of a government officer is confined to explaining policies and rules to representatives.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There exists the situation of mutual consultation and cooperation between a government officer and a representative, in doing work.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The government officer mainly depends on the guidance and advice of representatives.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation at District and Block levels - (Government Officers and People's Representatives together):
Rank correlation: -1

Correlation among government officers and People's Representatives (at both levels):
Rank Correlation: +1
A quite similar tendency was found to prevail the reciprocal role perceptions of people's representatives, at the district level and those at the block level, while 65.22% representatives at district level opted for the first statement as most desirable, only 12.96% block level representatives opted for this statement. In contrast, the largest number of block level representatives (44.44%) perceived the fourth statement as most desirable reciprocal role, against 6.9% district level representatives.

It was considered pertinent to hypothesise that there should be a high degree correlation between the responses of district level and block level officers and also between the responses of district level and block level people's representatives. In order to test this hypothesis, rank correlations were obtained on the basis of information given in tables III-5.11, 5.21, and 5.3 separately.

The correlation coefficients (r) so obtained are arranged as follows:

Table III-5.4: Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Perceptions</th>
<th>Category of Respondents</th>
<th>Correlation between block and district vice Representatives on Role Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Role Perceptions</td>
<td>Government Officers, People's Representatives</td>
<td>Correlation: +.83 (Very high positive), +.04 (Very low positive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal Role Perceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation: -1 (Perfect Negative), -.85 (Very high Negative)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The correlation coefficients on self role perceptions were found to be +.83 (Ψ = +.83) for officers and +.04 (Ψ = +.04) for people's representatives. A comparison of calculated 't' values (t = 3.3231 at 5 d.f. in the case of government officers, 't' = .0892 at 5 d.f. in the case of people's representatives) with the tabulated values (t=2.571 at 5% level of significance) shows that correlation between the responses of officers at both the level is highly significant while that between the responses of representatives at the two levels was found to be insignificant.

As regards reciprocal role perceptions of respondents, there was found to be a negative correlation between the responses of officers at the district and block level inter-se and also of the representatives at the two levels inter-se. As the table XIII-5.4 shows, the negative correlation on reciprocal role perception of the government officers is unity (Ψ = -1). The negative correlation coefficient in the case of people's representatives on reciprocal role perception is -.85 (Ψ = -.85). The mix of positive of and negative correlation in the responses of officers and representative suggest that while the role incumbents at the district level (the separate groups of officers and representatives) perceive their roles to be played in isolation, the role incumbent of corresponding groups at block level perceive their roles to be played in collaboration. These isolatory and collaborative reciprocal role perceptions at the district and block levels respectively are followed
by the tendency of laying stress by the incumbents regarding their self role perceptions. This tendency of role stress seems to have resulted in role conflicts. A marked tendency of insistence on claims of decision making power and detaching the other group from this role as also the tendency of fault finding in the other group is very likely to draw the role incumbents away from the process of rural development itself. As the Ashok Mehta Committee has also found: “Bureaucracy had probably its own role in dissociating the Panchayati Raj Institutions from the development process. Several factors seem to have conditioned their perceptions. The system of line hierarchy would find favour with them as an organisational principle.... They would not easily get adjusted to working under the supervision of elected representatives.... The field bureaucracy was handicapped because the elected representatives also quite often failed to own and work with them.” (See 7, pp. 5-6.).

The factors which usually have conditioned the perception of role incumbents of Panchayati Raj Institutions are to a great extent, responsible for the variations in their responses on the role. These may be enumerated in terms of the levels and socio-economic background of the role incumbents.

The data on perception and the corresponding correlation coefficients help reach the conclusion that the organisational structure of Panchayati Raj Institutions as defined by the role perception of the officials and
representatives is secluded or isolated at the district level and collaborative at the block level.

An overview of the total framework of organizational structure of Panchayati Raj Institutions leads to the following conclusions:

1. The structure of Panchayati Raj Institutions as conceived to work under the provisions of the U.P. Kshetra Sanitie and Zila Parishad Act 1961 has undergone several distortions. The functions assigned to Panchayati Raj Institutions have not been exactly the same as being performed by them e.g., education and development planning. The de facto status of units of Panchayati Raj appeared to be less important in the management of development than the status originally accepted in the Acts and literature.

2. The structure of Panchayati Raj Institutions which has emerged as a conglomeration of various vertical hierarchies such as Rural development department, Panchayat Raj department and people's representatives, has caused the emergence of organizational dysfunctions. These are the lack of coordination amongst the district level departments and their tendency to assert distinctive identity which has often resulted in functional overlapping, lack of well-defined system boundaries, installation of Shikrit Vikas Abhikaran which has undermined the Zila Parishad, no clear cut line of authority in development administration and the dual role of block development officer, etc.
3. The socio-psychological basis of organisational structure is echoed in Panchayati Raj Institutions as the government officers and people's representatives perceived their self roles and reciprocal roles as assertive and conflicting rather than complementary. In effect, this has taken the role incumbents far from the joint commitment of integrated rural development as an organisational objective. Furthermore, because of inconsistent reciprocal role perception of officers and representatives the organisational structure emerging at district level is isolatory while that at block level is collaborative.
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