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FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The present study has probed into the working of an administrative innovation in rural development. The origin of administrative innovation, its operational dynamics and its impact have been discussed and assessed. The innovation being adopted in the field of rural development administration and the process of institutionalisation exhibited in its operational dynamics are analysed. The DRDS - an administrative innovation in the realm of development and modernisation aiming at social equity and justice and standardisation is also discussed. The important findings of the study are as follows:

I. Administrative Innovations:

1. Administrative innovations are the result of discrepancy between the perceived and realised goals of an organisation, institution or programme. The performance gap or administrative lag invariably results in administrative improvements. Such improvements are facilitated by administrative reforms, innovations and institution-building.

2. The rationale for the creation of DRDS lies in the performance gap that existed in the previous administrative machinery, notably the SFDA. The SFDA and Other related schemes could
not achieve the desired goals effectively. This necessitated the administrative innovation, DRDS.

3. Administrative innovations are of different types depending upon their nature and purpose. The present administrative innovation-DRDS is an organisational innovation with the sole purpose of implementation of poverty-alleviation schemes.

4. Administrative innovations may be studied from different perspectives and in different frameworks. The framework adopted in the present study is one of combination of time continuum and the process of institutionalisation. The time continuum specifies the various stages of innovation commencing from need and culminating in termination. The process of institutionalisation delves into the aspects of stabilisation, standardisation, expansion, differentiation and integration.

II. The DRDS - Structure:

1. The DRDS - structure is grafted on the huge public bureaucracy. The public bureaucracy has a long chain. The hierarchy runs from Delhi to the village, passing through State headquarters and divisional organisations.
2. The DRDS structure has three principal features. They are bureaucracy, project organisation and matrix design. The strengths and weaknesses of these are also found in DRDS. Due to this combination, it has an added strength in delivering services to the rural clients. In a way it is standardising itself to become a unique organisation in rural development administration.

3. The DRDS organisational network is strong at the district level, whereas at the sub-district level it has no organisational unit of its own. It has to rely on the existing depleted block administration. Along with it, block level development functionaries form the supplementary field structure. In all, the field structure of development administration is desaggregated and disjointed in its import and significance. At the district level the DRDS structure is rather sound and problems are marginal.

4. The State Government only transmits the plans and programmes framed by the Centre along with its share of finance. The State Government also issues concurrent directions and clarifies the guidelines to the field staff. It supervises the execution process.

5. The Divisional Commissioner stands between the State head-quarters and the DRDS. He is made the Joint
Development Commissioner. He can play an effective role, but his existing role is negligible confined to the extent of paying courtesy visits to the district. He rarely involves himself heartily and committedly in the sphere of rural development.

6. The DRDS governing body is all comprehensive and has a flavour of a corporate body. This has an added advantage in pooling the knowledge and experiences of different functional experts under the supervision and direction of the Deputy Commissioner. The ex-officio membership in the form of associating M.P., M.L.A., M.L.C., and T.D.B., president provides an added status and effectiveness to the body. Likewise, the clients' interests are represented.

7. The DRDS directional wing is a project organisation with matrix design. It facilitated pooling of different functional specialists for the common cause. It is a coordinating and supervising body.

8. The block administration under the BDO is, too, a matrix organisation. This organisation is outdated and the weakest in the whole set-up of DRDS operations. The matrix weakness is fully exhibited in block organisation. Likewise the BDO's position has been gradually degraded by serious erosion of his powers and staff.
9. The Village Level Worker stands out as an important functionary in the DRDS development administration. Heavy responsibility has been laid on this functionary.

10. The structure being primarily bureaucratic with hierarchical organisation, the superior-subordinate relationship is very pronounced. Likewise, along with the conventional division of labour, the DRDS has adopted a programmatic division of labour linked to the stage of implementation. Rules form the nerves in the DRDS organisation. As such in DRDS they perform a multi-functional role.

11. Role specification of key functionaries has been delineated by job charts. Notable exclusion is the job charts of functional heads at district level. The role of district level functional heads is rather vague in the absence of a specific job chart regarding DRDS and its tasks.

12. Uniformity of staff has been provided for both the districts. This, however, leads to problems such as inadequacy in a bigger district like Dharwad. Hence it raises another issue, that is, the reorganisation of districts on sound lines and viability.

13. The BDO's functioning is constrained by weak organisational structure and environmental pressures.
III. The DRDS - Functional Analysis:

14. The DRDS in its composition has ensured a balance between the specialised requirements of modern public administration and the representative character of a democratic government. This has been facilitated by having the official and non-official elements in its governing body. However, the official representation is more pronounced.

15. Attendance of members at the Governing body meeting is fairly good. There is an increasing tendency of delegating representatives to the meetings. This necessarily reduces the effectiveness of the body.

16. The discussion in the general body meetings reveals that in the initial years it was more on establishment and byelaws. This is a symptom of institutionalisation process. The meetings are mainly meant to review and monitor the implementation of development schemes. A review of sectoral programme is made. Meetings suggest the course of action to be initiated on a particular issue. Discussions were not in a true democratic spirit in view of heterogeneous status and position of members. It is also found that the governing body members who are also principal executors of DRDS schemes are not taking much interest in the DRDS programmes.
17. Powers given to implementing staff is inadequate. However, equal number of respondents felt, powers given are adequate.

18. It is opined by respondents that both the DC and the Project Director should have more powers. At block level the BDO must be vested with extensive powers.

19. The role performance of the Deputy Commissioner is constrained by his nature of activities, his background and ecological imperatives. The very nature of district administrative structure in the departmentalist psyche has created barriers to his effective functioning. In coordination of developmental activities it is mainly effected through his position and power rather than on the democratic team spirit.

20. The idea to have separate officer in the form of Project Director is justifiable and necessary to strengthen the district development administration. The proper understanding between the DC and the PD can bring lasting impact on rural development. Over the years the PD has become a powerful functionary wielding effective powers.

21. The BDO's role performance is highly constrained by the disaggregated organisation, lack of staff, over-burdened with work and his personal lack of motivation. The BDO is the
most neglected functionary in the whole network of development administration, but on him depends the real rural development.

22. The VLW is at the cutting edge of development administration. The VLW's effectiveness is marred by his wide jurisdiction, lack of promotional incentives and training. He, too, is over-burdened with numerous schemes and tasks.

23. The social system of DRDS is very weak. It is due to lack of promotional avenues for key developmental functionaries like the BDO and the VLW. There are no incentives for efficient and challenging work. The officials have some kind of job satisfaction which is an encouraging sign. The transfer policy should be based on administrative efficiency. The grievances of staff have to be redressed in the larger interests of State administration.

24. The generalist and specialist dichotomy is operating in a concealed manner.

25. The communication system adopted in DRDS is sound. This is facilitated mainly by informal organisation and communication.

26. Bureaucratic tendencies like rule orientation, periodic reporting prevail in DRDS.
27. The commitment of officials to the people is very high. In this way the development bureaucracy is committed to people.

28. Political interference is prevalent in the DRDS. This is at grass roots level for seeking benefits for certain groups.

29. The total finance of DRDS is derived by way of grants from State and Central Governments. The expenditures are mainly on programme and administration. The DRDS in both districts at times exceeded the limits of 7.5 per cent on the administrative expenses. The system of accounting is not efficient. This has been highlighted by the reports of Chartered Accountants. The audit suggestions are not carried out in either of the districts. The audit by the Accountant General is done after a lapse of many years. As a result, the purpose of the audit is nullified. The audit reports have highlighted the excess payments, work progress and in general financial accountability of the DRDS.

30. The purpose of DRDS is not fully achieved. The problem of the lapse of funds after the end of a financial year is avoided, but subsequent use of that fund is not within the easy reach of the DRDS. It has to seek fresh sanctions from the government. Thus, once again the old system is in vogue in a different manner.
IV. The DRDS - The System Of Linkages:

31. The DRDS has established vertical and horizontal linkages with functional departments. The DRDS linkage at the district level are sound and effective whereas the BDO's links with other horizontal units is very weak. The VLW being a crucial functionary is not directly linked with financing institutions. The DRDS linkage with the crucial revenue functionary, the village accountant is nil. This certainly hinders the effective implementation of schemes because on him depends the identification of the beneficiary. The beneficiary is not directly linked with the DRDS in the absence of its field staff. The potential beneficiaries are not aware of DRDS schemes and operation due to lack of publicity measures.

32. The control system of DRDS is too weak. It has no control over the field staff, as also on the functional heads at the district level. Likewise, the DRDS lacks control over the financing institutions. In the same fashion, the lead bank does not have control over financial institutions in the district.

33. Inter-departmental co-operation is solicited. More than 78 per cent of respondents feel that the co-operation from other departments is easily forthcoming. In the same manner, voluntary agencies also co-operate.
The coordination of different agencies and programmes is ensured through the system of committees at the State, district and block level. The governing body of DRDS itself acts as a coordinating body in its meeting proceedings. Apart from this, the District level Review Meeting, District Consultative Committee and Standing Committee of the DCC form the coordination machinery. In these meetings, performance of financing by banks in the rural development schemes is reviewed and bottlenecks are removed. In fact, these committees have really provided an effective machinery for coordinating other activities of different agencies and programmes. At the block level and taluk level consultative committees are formed which facilitate coordination between different sectoral departments. Unlike the DCC, the functioning of the TLCC is not regular and hence its effectiveness is not perceived properly.

Financing institutions have a great role in the implementation of DRDS schemes and programmes. Co-operatives have not played their meaningful role. This is rather discouraging. The co-operatives suffer from certain inherent diseases of their own. The commercial banks in Kolar have shouldered the heavy burden in rural financing. In Dharwad, it is both the commercial and regional rural banks that have taken up responsibility in this regard. The growth of Grameen Bank is marginal in Kolar. The RRBs need to be encouraged to shoulder the rural financing.
36. The role of PRIs is nil. Inspite of government initiative and interest, the PRIs have been utilised marginally. Only the Gram Sabha is exploited to identify the beneficiaries. Other higher units are almost bypassed. However, a majority of officials feel that the PRIs can be actively involved in the functioning of DRDS.

V. The DRDS - Task Management:

37. Planning in the true spirit is missing in DRDS. The Annual Action Plan and Block Plans are prepared in a bureaucratic fashion. There is a greater divergence between the theory and practice of planning as operationalised in the DRDS. The Annual Action Plans are mere fiscal budgets with disaggregated allocation and targets on block and sectorwise. The role of the district planning officer is almost nil. The block level planning exists only in name. This is because the DRDS neither has technical personnel at district and block level nor the requisite machinery. There is no inventory of data on the basis of which the plans can be formulated.

38. Clusters are formed for identifying the beneficiaries. The cluster approach has at times created problems especially in Kolar.
39. Household surveys are conducted but rigorous exercise is not made in this regard. The result is household surveys suffer from various drawbacks such as wrong identification, improper estimate of incomes, the likings of the beneficiary etc. In identification of beneficiaries the device of Gram Sabha is fully used in both the districts. It was found functionally useful.

40. As in most parts of the country, the family plan has not been prepared in both the districts. This is a serious constraint on the programme implementation.

41. The programme campaigning and publicity is far from satisfactory. The role of District Publicity Officer is almost nil. No proper use of mass media is made in this regard.

42. In the performance of subsidy adjustment, Dharwad district recorded 90 per cent and Kolar 51.3 per cent. In Dharwad district two taluks, Dharwad and Ranebennur, have exceeded the target. Kolar's performance is marginal except in two blocks, namely, Chintamaní and Gowribidanur. Programmewise animal husbandry, agriculture and minor irrigation account for the lion's share in subsidy and credit disbursement.

43. From the beneficiary perspective, the chain of administration of subsidy and credit is a long one encompassing several stages.
44. The implementing machinery has to shoulder the monitoring and follow up tasks. In DRDS the spirit of monitoring is completely missing. It is due to lack of staff. Secondly, because of the very nature of bureaucratic organisation. It means that in bureaucracy it is felt that once the credit is advanced the role of administration is over. This is because of the imperatives of regulatory administration in development administration.

45. As regards evaluation, too, the DRDS has neglected it. Even though a person designated as Project Evaluation Officer is functioning, he is more of an executive worker, than an evaluator. It is felt that corrective measures are initiated on the basis of evaluation.

46. The misutilisation of assets is one of the big problems in the implementation of rural development programmes by the DRDS. Misutilisation is due to defective assets, trend of waiving of loan, lack of monitoring and general lack of motivation in beneficiaries.

47. The problem of recovery is very serious. In selected districts it is around 50 per cent. Many reasons are attributed to this phenomenon. Misutilisation of assets, deliberate non-payment, instigation by local leaders, trend of loan waiving,
drought, unproductive assets, loss due to faulty management and so on are some of the factors hindering effective recovery of credit.

48. The delivery system is a diffused one. The result is the beneficiary has to move from pillar to post.

VI. The DRDS - Project Appraisal And Clientele Dimension:

49. In the DPAP sector in Dharwad funds were not fully utilised in minor irrigation, ground water development and fisheries. In Kolar, too, under minor irrigation and soil conservation the allotted funds were not fully utilised. In the physical progress of DPAP a transformation from beneficiary orientation to area development is visible. Most of the earmarked funds were spent on recurring expenditure like maintenance activities.

50. The expenditure on animal husbandry is excessively high in IRDP. This scheme was most popular. Along with it, agriculture also predominated in the expenditure table. In physical progress, too, the same trend is visible. The heavy emphasis on animal husbandry scheme resulted in shortage of good breed animals. It has also resulted in excessive escalation of cattle prices. The supportive facilities like veterinary services also had problems. Schemes in
horticulture, fisheries and sericulture did not attract the poor beneficiaries due to their general apathy to these non-traditional occupations. The DRDS has reduced the heavy concentration on agriculture and it is now slowly shifting to other fields via animal husbandry. This is a real success of the DRDS.

51. Under the category-wise beneficiaries, the small farmers have dominated the scene. Agricultural labour has been marginalised. This type of concentration of benefits on one section will naturally result in the emergence of another class in the rural area. The big farmers by dividing their holdings have been able to claim the benefits under this sector. The DRDS has failed to cover 30 per cent of SC/ST population in the coverage of beneficiaries.

53. The selected beneficiaries represent the true picture of the rural poor strata. A majority of respondents were in the middle-age group. The SC predominance is noticeable. Literacy was highest in two villages of Dharwad (69%) and Kolar (60%) respectively. Occupation-wise agriculture and agricultural labour were the main occupations of the selected beneficiaries. Majority of respondents belonged to the income group of Rs.1500/-2000/- per annum. The selected respondents had big families with 5-6 children. The
overwhelming majority of selected respondents were not members of any political or social organisation. As regards the land holding pattern, most of the sample beneficiaries belong to 2-4 acres group. The selected beneficiaries mostly availed themselves of animal husbandry and agriculture schemes.

53. The animals provided to the beneficiaries were to be maintained by spending a minimum of Rs.2-4 a day. On an average the cattle yielded 4 litres of milk a day. It reveals that 25 per cent respondents reached the income around the poverty line. In Kolar around 48 per cent and in Dharwad 5 per cent have increased their income so as to come above the poverty line. In Dharwad 15.4 per cent beneficiaries to whom the assistance was rendered had regressive trend due to poor quality of animals. On an average Rs.1914/- annual income is generated in the farm sector. The DRDS's role in making the target population members of co-operatives is marginal.

54. The knowledge of DRDS and schemes is through the bank. The role of officials and mass media is negligible. However, the VLW has played his role, but marginally.

55. There was lack of aftercare assistance to the beneficiaries. This was due to lack of monitoring and follow-up. Extension
Officers were not visiting the villages. This is a common complaint in both the districts.

56. Official behaviour with villagers was polite as expressed by the beneficiaries.

57. The beneficiaries liked the banks as institutions for funding. Bank staff was cordial and helpful to the villagers. The beneficiaries had not much confidence in officials, whereas they liked to meet the neighbours, influential members and well-wishers in case of problems. The DRDS has not been able to penetrate the core sections of rural poor populace.

58. Client participation in DRDS is limited to receiving benefit as passive actor. Neither in decision-making, nor in planning and in implementing are the clients associated effectively. Whatever non-official element is found in the DRDS is more a symbolic element than any meaningful client participation, hence, popular participation in the DRDS is a myth.

Recommendations And Policy Prescriptions:

1. The role of the State government in the field of rural development must be redefined keeping in view the true spirit of the Indian federation. The Centre's position is
predominant, with the result the local variations and infrastructure inadequacy are completely overlooked. If the State government is given an appropriate role, the problem of regional and local grievances can be effectively tackled ensuring the smooth implementation of rural development schemes.

2. The office of the Divisional Commissioner can be effectively utilised in the sphere of rural development. Presently he is mainly confined to revenue administration and so some kind of passivity is there with regard to rural development. His role must be clearly spelt out ensuring effective utilisation of his position, knowledge and experience.

3. The sub-district level field administration for rural development must be strengthened. This is an urgent need. Unless and until this is effected, any scheme of rural development will not yield optimum results. In this connection the following actions must be initiated.

(a) The position of BDO must be upgraded to the level of Junior Group A (Class I) Officer. This will give added strength in the horizontal coordination of functional departments.

(b) BDO's recruitment and promotion policy must be redesigned keeping in view his new role as an implementor of
target-oriented schemes. He should be provided with adequate promotional avenues.

(c) This necessitates the creation of Rural Development Directorate with separate cadres. This is a long-standing demand required in the sphere of rural development administration. Setting up of a directorate will obviously eliminate some of the vexed problems concerned with the staffing of rural development administration.

(d) Posting of purely revenue officials as BDO's must be avoided. On the other hand, new recruits of IAS and experienced IAS personnel can be effectively made use of. Debureaucratization can be effected through the prolonged field assignments for higher and senior bureaucrats irrespective of their ranks.

(e) The extension team of BDO is presently a depleted in nature. It must be strengthened by additional posts. Necessary orientations and attitudes must be created by regular in-service training in reputed institutions. In this connection, research institutions like the NIRD, IIM, ISEC, ASC, and the like must be fully used. Training in terms of quality and quantity is very much neglected, which needs to be given serious thought.
(f) Most sufferers in rural development administration are village level workers. Neither in quantity nor in quality is there sufficiency of VLWs. The entire policy regarding the VLWs needs to be overhauled. The recruitment, promotion, transfers and training policies need to be restructured keeping in view the new and additional responsibilities. The VLWs were earlier primarily agricultural workers but today they are not doing much of this work. On the other hand, they are handling numerous rural development activities meant for rural poor sections. The number of VLWs in a block must be increased. Necessary training must be given to them before asking them to shoulder new schemes.

(g) The role of revenue functionaries like Assistant Commissioner and Tahsildar must be spelt out in unambiguous terms. The Village Accountants job chart must include certain items in rural development such as providing the land records promptly and timely.

(h) Organic link between the block administration and the block level functional departments must be created. Likewise, links with the financial institutions like banks must be established.

4. At the district level, the role of functional heads with regard to DRDS schemes must be clearly spelt and the same should be
incorporated in their job chart. This will ensure effective coordination by the Project Director and the Deputy Commissioner.

5. Uniform staff for all districts must be reconsidered. The staff strength should be stretched as per the population, area of operation and extent of development activities. Rationalisation of the size of a district must be initiated immediately.

6. The non-official strength of the DRDS governing body must be enhanced to give democratic tone to the bureaucratic styles of development administration.

7. The discussion in the governing body must be carried on in a true democratic spirit. Presently they have become monologues like school classes. By creating a free atmosphere and infusing team spirit among members such a participative atmosphere can be created. The DC being the Chairman must take up these initiatives as every functionary is an equal partner in rural development.

8. Adequate powers must be delegated to the field staff to take up monitoring and corrective steps.

9. The ritual of meetings and periodic reporting must be reduced substantially so as to allow ample time to field level
development functionaries fulfilling the felt needs of the rural clients.

10. Audit must become part and parcel of development administration. It must be conducted regularly and the executive staff should give proper attention to audit observations. The style of audit must be changed keeping in view development in techniques and management.

11. The control system of DRDS must be redesigned. As already suggested, the creation of rural development of directorate will solve this type of critical problems.

12. The operation of coordination committee at block is irregular. It must be restructured and given prominence in the block development administration. This should become a regular feature.

13. The co-operative institutions must be revitalised to play a meaningful and effective role in the field of rural development. Necessary statutory changes must be initiated in this connection.

14. Regional rural banks must be spread throughout the district. They should be given the prime role in rural financing.
15. The PRIs must be organically linked with the DRDS. They should be given a positive role. The Social Justice Committee of PRIs at village and district level must be fully used in the DRDS exercises.

16. Planning exercise in terms of perspective plans, annual plans, and block plans is far from satisfactory. The planning machinery at the district and the block level must be strengthened by necessary personnel with requisite aptitude. The District Planning Officer must be made responsible for all planning exercise. In the planning process the Universities, research institutes and other such active organisations must be fully made use of by coopting members from them. Necessary autonomy must be accorded to the DRDS and district authorities to frame their planning. Likewise, the block authorities should be accorded autonomy in their sphere. The resource inventory and benchmark surveys must be made.

17. The household surveys must be scientifically conducted. In this task the research investigators of Universities and research institutions must be made use of.

18. The beneficiaries' family plan must be invariably prepared.

19. Publicity of rural development programme and schemes must be effectively organised. The District Information and Publicity
Officer must be made responsible for proper flow of information. If needed, an officer under him must be assigned this work completely. At block level, too, the District Officer with his staff must take up the publicity exercise.

20. The single window delivery system is an urgent necessity to relieve the rural poor from moving from pillar to post.

21. In order to curb the trend of misutilisation of assets, an educative drive must be made to appraise the worthiness and the intentions of the schemes.

22. Loan-waiving trends must be completely curbed. In the recovery of loans the revenue officer must be made responsible for this task.

23. A skewness in development expenditure must be avoided. Uniformity must be maintained in implementing all sectoral schemes without concentrating on any one or a few schemes.

24. A skewness in beneficiaries also must be deliberately reduced. Concentration on any one type of beneficiary like small farmer will jeopardise the purpose of schemes. It becomes counter-productive and a new class will emerge.
25. Necessary supportive and infrastructural facilities must be provided by establishing backward and forward linkages. Appropriate market conditions are a must for the success of the special economic programmes.

26. Follow up assistance to the beneficiaries must be invariably provided in order to see that they cross the poverty line. Extension officers must be made responsible for this task.

27. The DRDS should adopt an aggressive policy so as to penetrate the core of rural poor population. Till now it is untouched.

28. The client participation must be enlisted in the DRDS working. The client participation at planning, implementation and follow-up should be clearly specified and enlisted. This will give legitimacy and coherence to the DRDS functioning. This necessarily demands conscientization of clients.

**Conclusion:**

Rural development is a complex process engrossing different dimensions. Two principal ingredients of rural development are: programme and development administration. The rural development programme must be viewed in three dimensions namely, its context, content and operational activities. The context refers to the appropriateness of the programme in terms of need and ecological
requisites. The content invariably presuppose the strategy and operational activities are nothing but actual exercises carried out. In terms of IRDP its contextuality is appropriate. Keeping in view the high magnitude of rural poverty and backwardness such a programme for uplifting the poor stands out. Its strategy is aimed at building employment generating assets thereby enhancing their income. In this way they are enabled to cross over the poverty line. Its activities is mainly concerned with providing assets like animals and other assistances in the form of inputs and knowledge. The contextuality is appropriate whereas its strategy and the operational dynamics lack an effective penetration into the core of rural poverty. They only touched the periphery of rural poverty structure. Doubts have been cast on the IRDP's strategic operationality. Its basic philosophy of asset creation and thereby increasing the income and employment has been questioned. Alternatively a wage strategy has been advocated since the poor lack appropriate motivation, skill, managerial and enterprising capacity, it is not possible for them to productively exploit the asset created. Since independence the philosophy and practice of rural development is one of charity and benevolence within the existing structural parameters. This has not really changed the course of life of the rural poor, on the other hand the vested interests remain where they were. Social justice and equity were the planks of national development but distributive justice was not built into the developmental model and exercise. On the other hand, the emphasis was on mere populistic rhetoric aiming at symbolic and emotional development. There is a lack of culture of development denoting the holistic approach, whereas in India one finds sheer...
economics of development. In essence, development in purely economic notions and terms (such as national incomes, gross national products percentage of growth etc.) has been conceived, without looking into the development of human beings as creative source in a society.

Development administration forms the strategic organisation for implementing poverty alleviation schemes. In this mammoth exercise the DRDS as an administrative innovation has been initiated and introduced in the arena of rural development. Administrative innovations are necessary to sustain the process of national development. The public in whose name public administration is conducted demands higher quality performance and better service. Every year more people must be served with greater variety of activities to a high standard. The human well-being in developing nations depend to a great extent on administrative innovation. In the absence of such a device, the exercise in development and modernisation becomes barren and sterile. To give strength and vitality to the exercises in rural development, the administrative apparatus and personnel should be restructured, remoulded and reoriented with the instrumentality of administrative innovations.

The legitimacy of a given administrative innovation depends to a large degree on its effectiveness and usefulness over a period of time. The DRDS being an organisational innovation tried to deliver the goods in the form of implementation of poverty alleviation schemes. The structure and management were designed but not in tune with the goals of the
programme. The more ambitious the goal the larger will be the organisation needed to achieve it. The poverty alleviation schemes are highly ambitious and of high magnitude in its thrust and objectives. Their aim is to penetrate the core sections of the rural poor and lift them above the rut of poverty. The administrative innovation adopted in the form of DRDS is only a catalyst organisation at district level thus leaving the vast sub-district field untouched. The programmatic goals needed a holistic organisation of a great magnitude whereas the innovative DRDS fulfilled its requirements only partially. This has its effect on the performance of the programme in terms of lifting the poor above the poverty line. The administrative innovation, that is, the DRDS was sheerly incremental innovation in nature. It has not touched the entire fabric of attenuated rural development administration.

Except DRDS the other structure and procedure of development administration remains the legacy of community development. No improvements have been so far initiated or introduced in it, thus making it a most depleted aspect of development administration. Block administration, the nucleus of rural grass roots development administration has been totally neglected. The frustrated BDO, and his team of extension officers and the most degraded and degenerated VLWs are the key development functionaries on whom depends the development of rural people. It is ironical that the functionaries involved in effecting social justice and equity are denied of the same in their career in the government bureaucracy.
The intermediary organisations like panchayats, cooperatives and other voluntary agencies have not been effectively associated, thus making the poverty alleviation programmes a purely bureaucratic exercise and experiment. This is because the intermediary organisations have inherent drawbacks and they have not been able to affect meaningfully the basic socio-economic structure. The result is, in the words of Gunnar Myrdal: "Efforts to create machinery for self-Government, co-operation, and popular participation without changing the basic social and economic structure are essentially attempts to bypass the equality issue". Moreover, they are controlled by the small upper strata and they see that the policies averse to their interests are not put into effect or turned to the benefit of themselves or their dependable 'clients' alone. Along with these basic weaknesses, the leadership being charismatic underrated the role of intermediary structures. In essence, the poverty eradication effort has become solely a bureaucratic exercise and thereby clients participation in their well-being efforts is marginalised.

A given administrative innovation to sustain its role must institutionalise and thereby attain legitimacy. The institutionalisation requires effective performance. The performance as an ingredient of institutionalisation ensures the attainment of legitimacy. In the case of the DRDS, it has not been given a fair chance. It is because in the wake of newer politico administrative innovations like the Zilla Parishad and Mandal Panchayats since 1983, the DRDS worked under pressure of
losing their identity. Ultimately it lost in view of their amalgamation in Zilla Parishads in 1987. In such a contingent situation, the DRDS could not attain legitimacy. This indicates the imbalance between political and administrative institutionalisation and the relative weakness of the administrative structure.

The inadequacies in the programme as well as development administration emanate from the structural constraints and the nature of the polity. The rural socio-economic structure is still in favour of haves thus leaving the havenots to their fate. Since feudal overtones and hangover, and a capitalist ethos are the operating principles in the rural arena any proposal meant for the rural poor will be nullified, by this structural constraints. In essence, the poverty alleviation schemes will not be able to go to the roots of poverty at most only the periphery. The programming for the rural poor necessarily should take cognizance of this persisting reality. Without such a direction any programme meant for the rural poor will be nullified. The wrong conception of development is the principal cause for this state of affairs.

Development essentially entails structural changes in favour of the disadvantaged sections of the society. This will obviously enable them to make a tryst with destiny. This is because development, in the words of Dudley Seers, stands for (a) elimination of mass poverty, (b) eradication of large scale unemployment, (c) abolition of extreme inequalities and (d) promotion of economic self-reliance. In the same fashion the UN General
Assembly advocates a holistic approach to development encompassing structural as well as functional changes in the socio-economic field. Thus it lists the following ingredients of development.

(a) To leave no section of the population outside the scope of change and development.

(b) To effect structural change which favours national development and activates all sectors of population to participate in the development process.

(c) To aim at social equity including the achievement of an equitable distribution of income and wealth in the nation.

(d) To give high priority to the development of human potential.

It suffices to state that development on these lines involve basic structural changes in the society in favour of hitherto disadvantaged populace. In essence, the development strategy essentially aims at structural changes purposefully undertaken in order to find a consistent and enduring solution to a problem which is faced and perceived by the particular society. Hence, any scheme in rural development must first aim at structural change in favour of the rural poor.

The nature and thrust of the politico-administrative structure and system determine the course, intensity, magnitude and effectiveness of
rural development endeavours and exercises. Indian polity over the years has exhibited two distinct tendencies and trends. The authoritarianism in its latent and manifest functions and operations is pronounced. Authoritarianism has over the years creeped into the politico-administrative machinery making it more unresponsive to the real needs of the mass in general and rural poor in particular. This is evident from the purely bureaucratic approaches to ameliorate mass poverty. The authoritarian cult covertly protected the interests of the haves. This is manifested in creation of organisations as well as programmes.

Another distinct trend is the emergence of 'Soft State'. The 'Soft State' denotes the passivity of citizenry and the low level of social discipline. The people as a whole are required not to do much towards their obligations to the polity, society and particularly for themselves. This has resulted in disorganisation of the rural populace in general and the poor in particular. Due to this unorganisation of the poor, they are unable to exert pressure either on the polity or on development administration to seek power and benefits of varied nature. Thus, as a consequence organisations operating in rural areas are catering to the needs of rural upper strata either consciously or unconsciously.

It is evident that innovations are needed not merely in public administration. It is believed that unless civic culture, particularly political culture, is modified, administrative innovations will have no optimum effect and results. "Reform in public administration is bound to remain only marginally effective without reform to the political system,
and reform in both these spheres is not really possible without a simultaneous reform in the country's economic system as well. Equally vital are the lobbies and watchdog organisations whose task should be to keep the country's public administration under surveillance, suggest suitable changes and mobilise support in favour of their demands. Hence innovations in every sphere of human life are the necessity of the day. The economic structure needs interventions on a large magnitude, society requires innovations to organise and energise the downtrodden and disadvantageous sections, polity demands innovations to aggregate and deliberate on the genuine demands of the rural poor, and lastly administrative innovations are expected to operationalise and execute the innovations in all spheres of human endeavour. Administration must improvise in its performance and at the same time develop indigenous administrative system and culture. Thus a total reform encompassing socio-economic and political system is of utmost necessity.

In sum, it is hoped that the findings, recommendations and conclusions of this study will prove useful to policy makers in government and others interested in rural development administration with special reference to the DRDS in Dharwad and Kolar districts of Karnataka State.
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