CHAPTER IV

GROWTH AND DEMOCRATIC WORKING OF PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

Economic co-operative institutions and socio-political institutions occupy unique position in rural India. They mobilise individuals in the democratic process to participate in various institutional activities. These local institutions have become training grounds for young political leaders. To understand the political participation by individuals one must know their association with the local economic and socio-political institutions which influence the political behaviour of citizens.

The local economic co-operative institutions and socio-political institutions offer ample opportunities to the people for active participation. Hence the study of the democratic working of these institutions is another important aspect of the study of political participation. Grass-root level institutions like Mandal Panchayats, co-operative societies, banks, Yuvak Mandals, Mahila Mandals and Rayth Sanghs serve as spring boards to individuals to attain higher positions in politics.
Panda rightly points out the role of institutions in developing the sense of efficacy of the people. The contention of Panda is that "effective participation of the people is an indicator of true democracy. Therefore, the institutional set-up plays a major role in developing the sense of efficacy. The family, peer group, membership of various associations and political parties help in developing the sense of efficacy. As the institutional and associational affiliation help in developing the sense of efficacy, the absence of these may also retard it."¹

Verba and Nie have made it even more clear. They assert that "there are two possible interpretations of the way organizational affiliation might lead to greater political involvement. One is that organizations expose their members to specifically political stimuli. The member is exposed to conversation about politics or he is exposed to the politically relevant activities of the organization itself. These political exposures, in turn, increase his interest in politics and lead him to greater levels of political activity outside the organizational framework. According to this interpretation, organizations have an impact on the political involvement of their members, either because it is the manifest function of the organization to be involved in political matters or because—whether or not that is the
purpose of the organization - it is location for a large amount of explicitly political stimuli."

"An alternative interpretation is that organizational affiliation has an impact on an individual's involvement in politics, whether or not the organization itself has any explicit involvement in political matters. Even if the individual is exposed to little political stimuli through his organization - i.e. there is little political discussion at the organization, the organization is involved in no politically relevant activities, his very association with that organization may increase his level of political activity."²

Therefore, in developing countries like India, the process of political development and participation can be linked with the growth and democratic working of public institutions. That is why the study of the impact of economic development on the democratic working of these institutions has been taken up in this chapter.

The study of the impact of economic development on the democratic working of public institutions of wet and dry areas consists of three kinds of institutions;
(1) Political institutions - Mandal Panchayats.

(2) Economic co-operative institutions- Vyavasaya Seva Sahakari Sanghs, milk co-operative societies and consumer societies.

(3) Socio-political institutions - Yuvak Mandals, Manila Mandals, and Rayth Sanghs.

The political institutions, viz., Mandal Panchayats were established in 1987 under the Karnataka Zilla Pariwads, Taluk Panchayat Samithis Mandal Panchayats and Nvaya Panchayats Act 1983. The economic co-operative institutions are organised according to the Karnataka Co-operatives Societies Act 1959. These institutions are the centres of economic activities. The socio-political institutions are established by individuals having similar ideas and objectives. They are established as and when their need is felt by the residents of a village to attain the objectives.

Economic development has a great impact on these institutions. Hence this chapter aims to explore the impact of economic development on the democratic working of the institutions of wet and dry areas. A comparative study of the democratic working of the institutions of wet and dry areas is made in terms of :
(1) Mode of elections held to elect office bearers to these institutions.

(2) Changes in the office bearers.

(3) Holding periodical meetings.

(4) Mode of decisions taken.

(5) Role of the opposition.

(6) Responsibility of institutions to their members.

(7) Financial position of the institutions.

(8) Service rendered by these institutions in wet and dry areas.

The percentages indicating the activities of the institutions of wet and dry areas, like mode of elections of the board of directors, chairman and vice-chairman, changes in the board of directors, periodical meetings, attendance of the members to the meetings, opposition in the institutions, incidents of walkout, dropping of some proposals, mode of taking decisions, responsibility of the board of directors to
the general body, financial position of the institutions, extent of working of the institutions and leadership provided by the institutions, are worked out on the basis of the number of each kind of institutions in each area which have actually participated in these activities or related activities against the total number of each kind of institutions in each area and not against the total number of all kinds of institutions in the area.

Growth of Institutions

Economic development has encouraged the growth of public institutions in the wet area. But in the dry area the process of growth of public institutions has been very slow. However, in both areas the number of Mandal Panchayats is equal i.e. 5 in each area. As they are established by the government of Karnataka, on the basis of the size of the population there is no change in the number of these institutions in wet and dry areas. They are statutory bodies. But the study discovered that in respect of economic co-operative institutions and socio-political institutions, there is a significant variation in the number of the institutions between wet and dry areas. In the wet area there are altogether 15 economic co-operative institutions as against only 10 in the dry area.
In the wet area there are 16 socio-political institutions, but in the dry area there are only 9 socio-political institutions. This variation makes it clear that economic development has encouraged an increase in the growth of institutions.

The break up of these institutions shows that in the 10 wet area villages there are 6 Vyavasay Seva Sahakari Sanghs (Agricultural co-operative societies), 4 milk co-operatives, 7 Yuvak Mandals (Youth clubs), 4 Mahila Mandals (Women organisations), 4 Rayth Sanghs (Peasant organisations) and one consumers' co-operative society.

In the 10 dry area villages, there are 5 Vyavasaya Seva Sahakari Sanghs, 4 milk co-operatives, 4 Yuvak Mandals, 2 Mahila Mandals, 3 Rayth Sanghs, and one consumers' co-operative society.

The study discovered that in the wet area, 5 economic co-operative institutions were established during the last 5 years and 2 institutions were established between the last 5 and 10 years. Two institutions were established between last 16 and 25 years and remaining 6 institutions were established 25 years ago. In the dry area two economic co-operative institutions were established during the last 5 years, and 4 were established between 5 and 15 years, and one was
established between last 16 and 25 years. The remaining 3 were established 25 years ago. These figures display that out of 15 economic co-operative institutions of the wet area, 7 were established during the last 10 years. But in the dry area, out of 10 economic co-operative institutions only 3 were established during the last 10 years. So the growth of these institutions is more in the wet area than in the dry area.

Similarly, in the wet area, 8 out of 16 socio-political institutions i.e. half of the institutions have come up during the last 5 years, and 2 were established during the last 5 to 10 years. Four institutions came up between last 11 and 15 years, one institution was established between the period of last 16 and 25 years and the remaining one was established 25 years ago. It means that out of the 16 institutions, 14 were established within the last 15 years. In other words these 14 institutions have come up after a period of nearly 15 years of economic development has taken place in the area. In the dry area 3 out of 9 socio-political institutions were established during the last 5 years, 2 have come up between last 5 and 10 years, and another 2 between last 11 and 15 years. One more institution was established between 16 and 25 years and the one remaining institution was established 25 years ago. It implies that during the last 15 years only 7 institutions have come up in the dry area as against 14 in the wet area. It
illustrates that in the wet area the growth rate of these institutions is twice that of the dry area. Hence it is obvious that economic development has led to a speedier growth of the institutions in the wet area.

**Democratic Management of Institutions**

In both areas members of the Mandal Panchayats were elected by the voters on the basis of adult franchise in 1987. Each of the Mandal Panchayat has members according to the size of the population of each Mandal area. Hence there is not much variation in the number of members in Mandal Panchayats of wet and dry areas. But the study found that economic development has led to more number of memberships in respect of voluntary organisations of the wet area. Unlike the Mandal Panchayats, the membership of economic co-operatives and socio-political institutions is open to all.

In the wet area, at the beginning of all the 15 economic co-operative institutions, a total of 1855 members were there, but now there are 9558 members. It means in the beginning, each institution has on an average 123.7 members. It has now increased to 637.2. It indicates that the average membership has gone up by 513.5. But in the dry area at the beginning of all the 10 economic co-operative institutions, a total of 1571
members were there and now the number is 4473. In other words in the beginning, each institution had an average of 157.1 members and now it has increased to 447.3. Though in the beginning of these institutions, the average number of members of each institutions of the dry area was more than that of each institution of the wet area, as a result of economic development of the wet area people have been motivated more to become members of these institutions. So the rate of growth of the number of members of each institution has enormously increased in the wet area unlike in the dry area. In the wet area the average membership now is 513.5 as against 290.2 in the dry area.

In the case of socio-political institutions also the number of members of the institutions is more in the wet area than in the dry area. In the beginning of all the 16 socio-political institutions of the wet area there were 735 members. Now it has increased to 1291. It signifies that each institution has began with average 45.9 members and now it has remarkably increased to 80.7 members. On the contrary, in the dry area, at the beginning of all the 9 socio-political institutions, 364 persons were members but now it has gone up to 579 members. It denotes that the average number of members of each institution has increased from 40.4 to 64.3 members. These figures reveal that as a result of economic development
the number of members of the various institutions has steadily increased in the wet area. It is a fact that an individual's membership of institutions exposes him to the political arena and motivates him to actively participate in political activities. In other words institutional affiliation not only widens the horizon of the political participation of the members but also increases their efficacy. Therefore it can be said that compared to the strength of the members of the various institutions of the dry area, the strength of the members of the wet area is more. So more number of people of the wet area are more active and efficacious in the level of participation than people from the dry area.

Every co-operative economic institution and socio-political institution has an executive body called "Board of Directors" to manage the affairs of the institution. The members of the board of directors are also called the office bearers of the institution. The number of directors on the board varies from one institution to another. These members may be elected by the members of the respective institution periodically or chosen unanimously among the members of the institution. After the election or selection of the members of the board, as the case may be, these members elect or choose one from among themselves, as the chairman of the board of directors and another as the vice-chairman. All
the members of the board are responsible for their acts to the members of the institution.

The study has tried to find out the relation between the economic development of the area and mode of election of the board of directors. We found that in both areas members of the Mandal Panchayat (Political institution) are directly elected by the adult citizens. As it is a mandatory election there is no variation in the mode of election to these Mandal Panchayats.

The data projected in Table-1 demonstrate that in the wet area 5 of the 15 economic co-operative institutions i.e. (33.3%) hold elections periodically to elect the board of directors (M.B.D.). It is the most democratic form of electing an executive body. But in the dry area 3(30%) institutions follow this method. In the wet area 10 (66.7%) institutions choose their directors (M.B.D) unanimously among the members of the institution. In the dry area 7 (70%) institutions follow this method. This method is justified on the following ground by the respondents. These institutions are not against elections, but without giving scope for groupism and elections, they want to choose their executive bodies on mutual understanding. These institutions are purely co-operative. Hence to avoid groupism and factions in the
The table shows the modes of election of the board of directors of democratic bodies in wet and dry areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. Kinds of institutions</th>
<th>WET AREA</th>
<th>DRY AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nomination</td>
<td>Election by the members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Political institutions</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>5 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Economic Co-op instns.</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>5 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Socio-political institutions</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36 (100.0)</td>
<td>11 (30.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Figures in the bracket indicate the percentage)
institutions and to obtain whole hearted support of every member of the institution for a smooth functioning of the institution, they follow this method.

In the wet area, out of 16 socio-political institutions 1 (6.3%) institution holds elections periodically to elect its executive body. In the dry area also 1 (11.1%) institution follows this method. In the wet area, 15 (93.8%) institutions and in the dry area, 8 (88.9%) institutions choose their board of directors unanimously.

The posts of chairman and vice-chairman of the Mandal Panchayats are designated as Pradhana and Upapradhana under the Act which governs them. In the wet area, among the 5 Mandal Panchayats (Political institutions) 3 (60%) M.P.Pradhana and Upapradhana, are elected by the members of M.P. and in the dry area out of 3 M.Ps. 1 (33.3%) M.P. follows this election method. In the wet area 2 (40%) Pradhana and Upapradhana are unanimously selected among the members. But in the dry area 2 (66.7%) M.Ps. follow this method. Hence in the wet area 60% of the M.Ps. and in dry area 33.3% M.Ps. follow the election method to elect their Pradhana and Upapradhana.

Of the 15 co-operative economic institutions of the wet area 3 (20%) hold elections to elect the chairmen and vice
chairmen of the institutions, whereas in the dry area, out of 10 institutions only 1 (10%) follows the election method. In the wet area 12 (80%) institutions unanimously select their chairmen and vice-chairmen. In the dry area this method is followed in 8 (80%) institutions and in the dry area 1 (10%) institution follows the rotation system. On the basis of the seniority of the members on the board these posts rotate.

The figures relating to the mode of election of the members of the board of directors and the election of the chairmen and vice-chairmen of the institutions of wet and dry areas illustrate that elections are held more in the wet area than in the dry area. As a result of economic development and more association with the institutions, people of the wet area are more politicised and efficacious. Hence they prefer competition to elect the members of the board of directors and chairmen and vice-chairmen of the executive bodies.

Changes in the members of the board of directors are desirable in democratic institutions. These changes give scope to new leaders. Because the institutions will be exposed to new dynamic leadership. The changes in the office bearers help to rectify whatever wrongs might have been done by the earlier office bearers. The changes in the members of
the board of directors prevent the monopoly of a few leaders and prevent the office bearers from becoming dictators in the affairs of the institution. In short, such changes are the indicators of a healthy democratic working of the institutions.

It is found in the study that no changes among the members of political institutions (Mandal Panchayat) have taken place in both areas, because M.P.s were established only in 1987. Hence naturally there cannot be changes among the members by this time.

In the wet area out of the 15 co-operative economic institutions, M.B.D. (Members of Board of Directors) of 6 (40%) institutions are frequently changed and in 4 (26.7%) institutions change takes place at long intervals. But in 5 (33.3%) institutions no changes of M.B.D. have taken place. In the dry area in 5 (50%) economic co-operative institutions changes in the M.B.D. have frequently taken place, and in 3 (30%) institutions changes take place at long intervals. But in 2 (20%) institutions no changes have taken place.

In the wet area, in 6 (37.5%) socio-political institutions frequent changes in the M.B.D. take place and in 3 (18.8%) institutions changes take place at long intervals.
But only in 2(22.2%) institutions of the dry area frequent changes in M.B.D., take place and in 1(11.1%) institution at long intervals. But in 7(43.7%) institutions of the wet area no changes have taken place, whereas in dry area it is still more i.e. 6(66.7%) institutions have not seen any changes.

On the whole, in the wet area M.B.D., of 12(33.3%) institutions frequently change. But in the dry area only in 7 (31.8%) institutions frequent changes take place. In wet area in 7(19.5%) institutions, M.B.D., change at long intervals as against in 4 (18.2%) institutions of the dry area. In the wet area totally in 17(47.2%) institutions no changes have taken place. In the dry area in 11(50%) institutions changes have not taken place. On the basis of these percentages it can be said that changes in the M.B.D., are more in the wet area than in the dry area.

**Working of Institutions**

The study discovered that meetings of the board of directors or the executive body of institutions are held more periodically in the wet area than in the dry area. There is a statutory requirement for every Mandal Panchayat that it should meet at least once in a month for transacting business. Similarly the economic co-operative institutions and socio-political institutions are required to hold meetings of the board of directors according to the meeting schedule provided by the bye laws of the respective institutions.
As shown in table-2, in the wet area 4(80%) of the M.P.s (Political institutions) hold meetings of their members periodically. But in the dry area only 2(66.7%) M.P.s hold meetings periodically. It is clear that the percentage of the M.P.s holding meetings periodically is more in the wet area than in the dry area.

It is construed from table 2 that all the 15 (100.00%) economic co-operative institutions of the wet area hold meetings of their executive bodies periodically. But in the dry area only 7(70.%) economic co-operative institutions hold meetings of the executive bodies periodically. So it is evident that the economic co-operative institutions of the wet area hold meetings more periodically than the dry area institutions.

As displayed in table 2, in respect of socio-political institutions, 14 (87.5%) institutions of the wet area hold meetings of their board of directors periodically as against 4 (44.4%) institutions of dry area.

In all, 33(91.7%) institutions of the wet area hold meetings periodically. On the contrary in the dry area only 13(59.1%) institutions hold the meetings periodically.
TABLE - 2

The table shows the meetings of the executive body/board of directors held periodically

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No.</th>
<th>Kinds of institutions</th>
<th>No. of institutions</th>
<th>Meetings held periodically</th>
<th>Not held periodically</th>
<th>Sl.No.</th>
<th>Kinds of institutions</th>
<th>No. of institutions</th>
<th>Meetings held periodically</th>
<th>Not held periodically</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Political institutions</td>
<td>5 (13.9)</td>
<td>4 (80.0)</td>
<td>1 (20.0)</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Political institutions</td>
<td>3 (13.6)</td>
<td>2 (66.7)</td>
<td>1 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Economic co-operative institutions</td>
<td>15 (41.7)</td>
<td>15 (100.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Economic co-operative institutions</td>
<td>10 (45.5)</td>
<td>7 (70.0)</td>
<td>3 (30.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Socio-political institutions</td>
<td>16 (44.4)</td>
<td>14 (87.5)</td>
<td>2 (12.5)</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Socio-political institutions</td>
<td>9 (40.9)</td>
<td>4 (44.4)</td>
<td>5 (55.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36 (100.0)</td>
<td>33 (91.7)</td>
<td>3 (8.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22 (100.0)</td>
<td>13 (59.1)</td>
<td>9 (40.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Figures in the bracket indicate the percentage)
Therefore it can be said that the economic development of the wet area has politicised the members of the institutions and motivated them to hold meetings of the institutions periodically. In other words economic development of the wet area is responsible for the growth of the democratic spirit and attitude in the members of the institutions, which in turn has made them to run the institutions in a spirit of competition and punctuality. So the meetings of these institutions are held more periodically in the wet area than in the dry area.

The study found that regular attendance of the members of the board of directors of the various institutions is more in the wet area than in the dry area. Proof of the trend can be seen from table-3.

Table 3 reveals that in the wet area all the members of 3(60%) M.P.s (Political institutions) regularly attend all the meetings, whereas in the dry area in no political institution all the members regularly attended all the meetings. In the wet area, members of 2(40%) political institutions attend meetings frequently. In the dry area members of 2(66.7%) political institutions frequently attend the meetings and the members of 1(33.3%) institution attend the meetings rarely. The attendance, as observed by the researcher, is more in the
TABLE - 3

The table shows the attendance of the directors to the meetings of the democratic bodies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. Kinds of No. of institutes</th>
<th>No. of institutions</th>
<th>Attend regularly</th>
<th>Not attend at all</th>
<th>Rarely attend</th>
<th>Attend frequently</th>
<th>Sl. Kinds of No. of institutions</th>
<th>Attend regularly</th>
<th>Not attend at all</th>
<th>Rarely attend</th>
<th>Attend frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Political institutions</td>
<td>5 (13.9)</td>
<td>3 (60.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2 (40.0)</td>
<td>1. Political institutions</td>
<td>3 (13.6)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Economic co-op. institutions</td>
<td>15 (41.7)</td>
<td>11 (73.3)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (6.7)</td>
<td>3 (20.0)</td>
<td>2. Economic co-op. institutions</td>
<td>10 (45.5)</td>
<td>2 (20.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>5 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Socio-political institutions</td>
<td>16 (44.4)</td>
<td>11 (66.8)</td>
<td>1 (6.3)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4 (25.0)</td>
<td>3. Socio-political institutions</td>
<td>9 (40.9)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (11.1)</td>
<td>7 (77.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 36 (100.0) | 25 (69.4) | 1 (2.8) | 1 (2.8) | 9 (25.0) | Total | 22 (100.0) | 2 (9.1) | 1 (4.5) | 13 (59.1) | 6 (27.3) |

(Figures in the bracket indicate the percentage)
wet area than the in dry area. However, in the dry area all members attend only those crucial meetings where some decision is to be taken on the show of strength.

Table 3 shows that in the wet area members of 11 (73.3%) economic co-operative institutions regularly attend all the meetings. But in the dry area the members of only 2 (20%) institutions attend all the meetings regularly. Members of 3 (20%) institutions in the wet area frequently attend the meetings and members of 1 (6.7%) institution rarely. In contrast, in the dry area members of the board of directors of 3 (30%) institutions attend the meetings frequently and members of 5 (50%) institutions rarely. The data presented in the table confirm that the percentage of regular attendance is more in the wet area than in the dry area.

The percentage of regular attendance of the members of the executive bodies of socio-political institutions is also more in the wet area than in the dry area. In the wet area members of 11 (68.8%) socio-political institutions regularly attend all the meetings. On the contrary, in the dry area, members of no institution regularly attend all the meetings. In the wet area members of 4 (25%) institutions frequently attend the meetings whereas in the dry area members of only one (11.1%) institution frequently attend the meetings.
the dry area members of 7(77.8%) institutions rarely attend the meetings. But members of one institution in the wet area and members of one institution in the dry area do not attend meetings and only the chairman takes decisions of the institution.

The total percentage of the whole area also upholds the higher level of regular attendance of the members of the wet area. In all, members of 25 (69.4%) institutions regularly attend all the meetings of the institutions in the wet area. In contrast, the members of only 2(9.1%) institutions attend meetings regularly in the dry area. In the wet area 9(25%) institutions witnessed frequent attendance of the members but in the dry area members of 6(27.3%) institutions attend meetings frequently. Rare attendance of the members is reported in 13(59.1%) institutions of the dry area whereas in the wet area the members of only one (2.8%) institution attend rarely. Regular attendance ultimately has made the institutions of the wet area work more punctually than the institutions of the dry area.

A strong opposition party in democratic institutions is an indicator of healthy democracy. As it checks the arbitrary acts of the ruling party, a strong opposition party or group is desirable in democratic institutions. The study found that
in 3(60%) political institutions of the wet area opposition is strong. But in the dry area no political institution has a strong opposition. In 2(40%) institutions of the wet area opposition is weak, but in the dry area in all the 3(100%) institutions opposition is weak.

Among the 15 economic co-operative institutions of the wet area, in 1(6.7%) institution opposition is strong and in 4(26.7%) institutions opposition is weak. But in the dry area in no institution opposition is strong. In 1(1.7%) institution opposition is weak. 90% institutions of dry area have no opposition. In the socio-political institutions of the wet area 2(12.5%) institutions have a strong opposition and 6(37.5%) institutions weak opposition. But in the dry area 1(11.1%) institution has a strong opposition and the remaining 8(88.9%) institutions have no opposition at all. This indicates that the opposition parties or groups are stronger in the institutions of the wet area than in the institutions of the dry area.

The study discovered some incidents of walkout in the institutions of the wet area. As a result of the existence of a strong opposition in the wet area, in 20% of the political institutions, the incidence of walk-out by the members of the opposition party or group takes place. But in the dry area no incidents of walkout are reported.
There have been incidents of walkout in 0.7% economic co-operative institutions of the wet area. But in the dry area no incidents of walkout are witnessed. In respect of socio-political institutions in 18.7% institutions of the wet area, and in 11.1% institutions of the dry area incidents of walkout are reported. Hence it can be said that members of the executive bodies of the wet area express their difference of opinion on certain issues explicitly in the form of walkouts. But such explicit political activity is not at all found in the political institutions and economic co-operative institutions of the dry area.

In the life of every democratic institution many proposals relating to the affairs of the institution are made by the members of the executive body. Such proposals are either accepted by all the members unanimously or by a majority of votes. But in some cases such proposals are rejected by members for one reason or the other. It is common in the institutions where opposition is strong. The present study found that in some of the institutions of the wet area some proposals are dropped because of opposition to the proposed bill by members of the executive body. But in the dry area no incidence of dropping any proposal is reported. It may be because of a weak opposition or the absence of an
opposition party or group in the institutions. In 407(40%) political institutions some proposals were dropped, because of opposition by the members. In 2(13.3%) economic co-operative institutions and in 2(12.5%) socio-political institutions some proposals made by the members were dropped on grounds of lack of availability of money or non-practicability of the proposal or party interest and so on. But in no institution of the dry area any proposal was dropped. It illustrates that unlike in the dry area, in the wet area the opposition party or group has a considerable voice in the process of decision making and their opinion and opposition is respected by the ruling party or group.

The meetings of the political institutions, economic co-operative institutions and socio-political institutions in both areas are usually confined to the members of the board of directors and their officials. As the researcher observed the meetings of the political institutions and economic co-operative institutions of the wet area are held in a formal manner. But in the dry area, the meetings of many institutions are conducted in an informal manner. However, in both areas, the heads of the institutions who usually preside over the meetings read out the agenda of the meetings. Generally the agenda contains routine items and sometimes special proposals. In the wet area, most of the members
actively participate in the proceedings of the meetings. But in the institutions of the dry area only some members actively participate. In the meetings heated and not so heated arguments are common. In the meetings of the wet area institutions, where opposition is strong, many proposals are opposed strongly by the members of the opposition party. Sometimes, the members who disagree with the proposals leave the meeting hall.

As displayed in table 4 the decisions in the meetings of 60% political institutions of the wet area are taken unanimously by the members. But in the dry area in all the political institutions decisions are taken unanimously. In the wet area in 40% of the institutions, decisions are taken on the basis of majority of votes. In 66.7% economic co-operative institutions of the wet area decisions are taken by the members unanimously, whereas in dry area in 90% of the co-operative economic institutions decisions are taken unanimously. In 33.3% institutions of the wet area decisions are taken on the basis of the majority of votes of the members attending the meetings. But in the dry area only in 10% institutions decisions are taken on the basis of the majority of the members attended.

Similarly, in the wet area, in 75% socio-political institutions decisions are taken unanimously. In the dry
The table shows the method of decisions taken in the meetings in wet and dry areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Kinds of institutions</th>
<th>No. of institutions</th>
<th>Decisions taken unanimously</th>
<th>By majority of votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Political institutions</td>
<td>5 (13.9)</td>
<td>3 (60.0)</td>
<td>2 (40.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Economic co-operative institutions</td>
<td>15 (41.7)</td>
<td>10 (66.7)</td>
<td>5 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Socio-political institutions</td>
<td>16 (44.4)</td>
<td>12 (75.0)</td>
<td>3 (18.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>36 (100.0)</td>
<td>25 (69.4)</td>
<td>10 (27.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Kinds of institutions</th>
<th>No. of institutions</th>
<th>Decisions taken unanimously</th>
<th>By majority of votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Political institutions</td>
<td>3 (13.6)</td>
<td>3 (100.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Economic co-operative institutions</td>
<td>10 (45.5)</td>
<td>9 (90.0)</td>
<td>1 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Socio-political institutions</td>
<td>9 (40.9)</td>
<td>6 (86.7)</td>
<td>2 (22.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 (100.0)</td>
<td>18 (81.8)</td>
<td>3 (13.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Figures in the bracket indicate the percentage)
area, in 66.7% institutions decisions are taken unanimously by the board of directors. In the wet area in 18.7% institutions decisions are taken by majority of votes. In the dry area this method is followed in 22.2% institutions. As an exception, in one institution of each area the meetings of the socio-political institutions are not at all held and only the chairmen of the institutions take the decisions.

It can be construed from table 4 that the percentage of the decisions taken on the basis of majority of votes is more in the political institutions and economic co-operative institutions of the wet area than in the dry area. In other words more competition in the process of decision making is found among the members of the board of directors of the wet area than among the members of the dry area.

The study discovered that in both areas the board of directors of all the political institutions and economic co-operative institutions are responsible for all the acts of omission and commission to their respective general bodies. Similarly the board of directors of all the socio-political institutions of the wet area are responsible to their general bodies for the acts of omission and commission. But it is known from the responses of the respondents that the board of directors of 2(22.2%) socio-political institutions of the dry
area are not responsible to their general bodies for their acts of omission and commission. It means that in the dry area 2 institutions are not controlled and directed by the general body but by the board of directors.

It is found that as a result of economic development in the wet area the financial position of most of its institutions is stronger than the institutions of the dry area. The financial position of 80% political institutions, 75.3% economic co-operative institutions and 25% socio-political institutions of the wet area is sound. In contrast, in the dry area, the financial position of 66.7% political institutions, 60% economic co-operative institutions and 27.2% socio-political institutions is sound. In the wet area the financial position of 1 (20%) political institution is weak, while in the dry area the financial position of 1 (3.3%) institution is balanced.

In the wet area the financial position of 2 (33.3%) economic co-operative institutions is balanced and the remaining 2 (13.3%) institutions have weak financial positions. But in the dry area 3 (30%) economic co-operative institutions have a balanced financial position and 1 (10%) institution has a weak financial position. The financial position of the 7 (43.8%) socio-political institutions of the wet area is
balanced and 5(25%) institutions have a weak financial position. In the dry area 1 (11.1%) socio-political institution has a balanced position and the financial position of 6(66.7%) socio-political institutions is weak.

In all, 52.8% institutions of the wet area have sound financial positions as against 45.5% institutions of the dry area. In the wet area the financial position of only 22.2% institutions is weak. But in the dry area 31.8% institutions have weak financial positions.

The study exposed that the extent of working of the institutions to meet the needs of the members of the institutions is more satisfactory in the wet area than in the dry area. As shown in table 5, in the wet area 80% political institutions, 73.3% economic co-operative institutions and 68.8% socio-political institutions are working quite satisfactorily to meet the needs of the members, whereas in the dry area 66.7% political institutions, and 30% economic co-operative institutions are working quite satisfactorily. And in the dry area no socio-political institution is working satisfactorily to meet the needs of the members.

20% political institutions, 20% economic co-operative institutions and 31.3% socio-political institutions of the wet area are working satisfactorily to some extent. In the dry
TABLE - 5

The table shows the extent of working of the various democratic bodies in wet and dry areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Kinds of Institutions</th>
<th>No. of Institutions</th>
<th>Wet Area</th>
<th>Quite Satisfactorily</th>
<th>To Some Extent Satisfactorily</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Dry Area</th>
<th>No. of Institutions</th>
<th>Quite Satisfactorily</th>
<th>To Some Extent Satisfactorily</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Political Institutions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(80.0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(13.6)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(33.3)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Economic Co-op.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(73.3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(45.5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(40.0)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Socio-political</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(68.8)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(40.9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(22.7)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Figures in the bracket indicate the percentage)
area 33.3% political institutions, 40% economic co-operative institutions and 22.2% socio-political institutions are to some extent working satisfactorily. 6.7% economic co-operative institutions of the wet area rarely work satisfactorily. On the contrary, in the dry area 30% economic co-operative institutions and 33.3% socio-political institutions rarely work satisfactorily. It is important to note that in the dry area, 44.4% socio-political institutions do not at all function. But in the wet area every institution works quite satisfactorily or to some extent satisfactorily or rarely work satisfactorily.

Data projected in table 5 shows that totally 72.2% institutions of the wet area work quite satisfactorily, while in the dry area only 22.7% institutions work quite satisfactorily. The higher percentage of the institutions in the wet area are working quite satisfactorily so as to meet the needs of the members of the institution, it may be due to the economic development of the area, sound financial positions of the institutions and the competitive nature of the members of the institutions. But these factors are rarely found in the dry area.

To know whether leadership is provided by the institutions or not, a question was put to the chairman or
vice-chairman of the institution as the case may be. In response to the question, whether the institution has helped him to become a leader, all the 5 (100%) pradhanas of political institutions of the wet area and 2 (66.7%) pradhanas of the dry area replied that the position held by them helped them to become leaders. In the same way 13 (86.7%) heads of economic co-operative institutions of the wet area and 8 (80%) heads of the economic co-operative institutions of the dry area have admitted that they have become leaders by virtue of the positions they held. The heads of 13 (86.7%) socio-political institutions of the wet area and 6 (66.7%) institutions of the dry area said that the positions held by them helped them to become leaders. However, 1 (6.2%) head of a socio-political institution of the wet area and 1 (10%) head of an economic co-operative institution of the dry area answered that the positions they held has helped them to some extent to become leaders.

These figures reveal that most of the heads of the institutions, by virtue of the positions they hold, have become leaders or that the positions they have held has helped them to become leaders. Anyhow the percentage of the institutions which have helped the heads of the institutions to become leaders is more in the wet area than in the dry area. Almost all heads of the institutions have generally mentioned
three factors which have helped them to become leaders. They are (1) by the virtue of the position they held their public relations improved, (2) the position they held enhanced their prestige in the society and (3) the position they held helped them to develop leadership qualities. Therefore it can be said that the grass root level institutions provide a number of new leaders to the society. And as there are more number of institutions in the wet area, more number of new leaders are likely to come up in the wet area than in the dry area.

After a careful study of the impact of economic development on the growth and democratic working of the various institutions functioning in wet and dry areas it is found that, the economic development has brought changes in the number of institutions and the democratic working of the institutions of the wet area. The comparative study of the various institutions of the wet and dry areas reveals that the economic development of the wet area has caused an increase in the number of institutions. And compared to the wet area institutions, the growth of institutions and the number of membership in the institutions is slow in the dry area. Economic development is responsible for the more effective participation by members of the institutions of the wet area. Ultimately, economic development of the wet area
has sufficiently influenced the working of the institutions and made them to work satisfactorily in a spirit of competition. In short as a result of economic development, the institutions of the wet area have become more punctual and they are working more democratically than the institutions of the dry area.
REFERENCES
