

The Socio-Economic and Political Status of the Respondents in Panchayat Raj Institutions -A Case Study of YSR Kadapa District of Andhra Pradesh

K. Yegeswara Reddy¹, Prof. C. Basavaiah (Retd)²

¹Research Scholar, (Part Time) & Lecture in Junior College, Pulivendula, YSR Kadapa District, Andhra Pradesh, India.

²Dept. of Economics, S. V University, Tirupati, Andhra Pradesh, India

Abstract

The paper presents the socio-economic status of respondents in Panchayati raj Institutions. It also highlights the social composition of respondents their participation in the decision making process in PRIs. Liberal Democracy is one of the basic features of the Indian Constitution. Mahatma Gandhi advocated Panchayat Raj even before Independence. The further of the Nation felt that as issues at the village levels must be addressed by the people only under self-governance and the State or the Central Governments only facilitate such self-rule through grants and by conferring autonomy on them. The study examine people Perception of Panchayat Raj Institution in YSR Kadapa District of Andhra Pradesh, six mandals were selected for study. The Random Sampling method was adopted. The Primary data was collected from respondents in PRIs in selected mandals. From each mandals 100 respondents were selected total samples size 600.

Key words: Socio-economic profile, self-reliance, Villages Panchayats and Rural development.

Date of Submission: 31-10-2020

Date of Acceptance: 12-11-2020

I. INTRODUCTION

Gandhi advocated the self-reliant village economy and the self-reliant village community and stressed that local resources should be fully utilized for development purposes. The villages have their basic needs - food, clothing, shelter, education, health, etc. related to. In some respects, inter-dependency is also required. No village can be fully self-sufficient, but it strives to achieve that goal. The main responsibility of the Panchayati Raj Institutions is to accelerate the pace of development and involve all people in this process so that the felt needs of the people and their development aspirations are fulfilled. The decentralized planning is a multi-level planning process. It will have to start from lower level (Gram Panchayat), intermediate level (Mandal Parishad) and higher level (Zilla Parishad).

Objective of the Study:

The important objectives of the study may be stated as follows:

- 1) To study the Socio-economic and political conditions of respondents in the study area.
- 2) The study the decentralization in rural development implemented through Panchayat Raj Institutions which determine the scope for people participation.
- 3) The participatory development helps to improve the quality of rural government in PRIs.
- 4) To study participatory development process through PRIs in YSR Kadapa district at ZPTCs, MPTCs and GPs.

Hypotheses of the Study:

1. There is significance different between different level education and different mandals.
2. There is significance different between different occupation and different mandals.
3. There is significance different between different level and different mandals.

II. METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in YSR Kadapa District of Andhra Pradesh state. YSR Kadapa district has three Divisions such as Kadapa, Rajampeta and Jammalamadugu. The study was covered Kadapa Division six mandals selected for study i.e., CK. Dinne, Chakarayapeta, Galividu, Lakkireddypalli, Ramapuram and Rayachti mandals. The Random Sampling method was adopted. primary data was collected from respondents

PRIs in six selected mandals. From each mandals 100 respondents were selected total samples size 600. The primary data was collected from respondents in the year 2019-20.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The education wise distribution of the rural respondents may be very briefly stated as under: Of this sample Ramapuram mandal 32 percent represent lowest number of rural respondents with primary education followed by 40 percent in CK Dinne [Table: 1 (A)], 45 percent in Galividu, 50 percent in Chakrayapet, 55 percent in both mandals i.e., Raychoti and Lakkireddipalli. While about 38 percent of rural respondents from a total number of 600 sample, have had high school level education. 11 percent of rural respondents found to have studied upto pre-university level. 3 percent of rural respondents had studied upto degree level and 1.8 percent of respondents have studied upto post graduate level. The interesting distribution of rural respondents is that a large majority of them go to primary and higher secondary level of schooling and the number of rural respondents decline rapidly beyond PU level upto post graduate level.

About 61.33 percent of respondents are engaged in agriculture activity, [Table - 1 (B)] around 12.34 percent of respondents are self employed; 18.33 percent respondents are rural wage labourers and 8 percent of respondents are casual wage earners in urban areas in the Kadaba district.

IV. PARTICIPATION BY PEOPLES IN PRI'S IN YSR KADAPA DISTRICT

Table - 1 (A) Education Level of Respondents in the Study area

Education Level	Mandals												Total	
	CK Dinne		Chakrayapet		Galividu		Lakkireddipalli		Ramapuram		Raychoti			
	No.of Resp	%	No.of Resp	%	No.of Resp	%	No.of Resp	%	No.of Resp	%	No.of Resp	%	No.of Resp	%
Primary	40	40	50	50	45	45	55	55	32	32	55	55	277	46.16
High school	44	44	34	34	37	37	35	35	44	44	34	34	228	38
Intermediate	10	10	8	8	12	12	9	9	17	17	10	10	66	11
Degree	4	4	5	5	3	3	1	1	4	4	1	1	18	3
Post Graduate	2	2	3	3	3	3	-	-	3	3	-	-	11	1.84
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	600	100
1. (B) Occupations of the Respondents														
Agriculture	60	60	58	58	66	66	61	61	55	55	66	66	366	61
Self employees	9	9	16	16	12	12	10	10	15	15	12	12	74	12.34
Wage labour rural	21	21	16	16	18	18	20	20	14	14	18	18	107	17.83
Wage labour urban	10	10	10	10	4	4	9	9	16	16	4	4	53	8.83
1. (C) Annual Income of the Respondents														
30-40 thousand	25	25	23	23	22	22	26	26	19	19	24	24	139	23.18
40-50 thousand	46	46	41	41	46	46	50	50	36	36	40	40	257	42.83
50-60 thousand	29	29	32	32	26	26	24	24	40	40	33	33	184	30.66
Above 60 thousand	-	-	4	4	6	6	-	-	7	7	3	3	20	3.33

Source: Primary Data.

We have made annual income estimates of all the 600 rural respondents in the study area. About 43.16 percent of respondents are found to earn 40 to 50 thousand rupees per annum, Table - 1 (C) nearly 30.4 percent of rural respondents were earned 50 to 60 thousand rupees per annum. These two income groups do belong to small and marginal farmers as well as self employed persons. Further our survey reveals that about 23.16 percent of rural respondents are found to earn Rs. 30 to 40 thousand rupees per annum.

The Majority of (31.34%) respondents have said that their participation in GP meetings help to know in detail about the modus operandi of various RDPs. [Table 2 (A)] While, nearly 19 percent of rural respondents have reported that their participation in GP meetings enable them to understand the mechanism of development as well as democratic decentralization. The reasons for participation in G P meeting in the study area [Table 2 (D)], nearly 31.34 percent of respondents have said that their participation in GP meetings help to know in detail about the modus operandi of various RDPs. About 13 percent of respondents have said that their not participation in GP meeting it is dirty politics. (Table 2(B).

The Table 2 (C) shows that currently the highest number of beneficiaries under rural sanitation 33.33 percent of respondents, about 32 percent of rural respondents have beneficiaries under rural housing, 16

percent of respondents are selected for obtaining crop subsidies under agriculture. Followed by 8 percent of beneficiaries selected under minor irrigations, 6 beneficiaries under sericulture and the remaining 3.8 percent of beneficiaries are selected for setting up of village industries and handicrafts manufacturing units in rural areas for which subsidies and tax concessions are provided.

The majority of (38%) respondents have expressed that the performance of their GPS has been good; [Table 2 (D)] about 25 percent of respondents have rated their GPs as good, 22.66 percent of respondents have said that the GPs which they represent are performing on an average basis.

About 14.67 percent of respondents have said that the GP level functionaries and elected representatives are efficient; [Table 2 (E)] , some 18.5 percent of respondents reported that this functionaries are non discriminatory, while, another 17 percent of respondents have reported that the GP functionaries and elected representatives are non corrupt 23 percent of respondents had said that the GP functionaries and representatives are non partisan.

Table 2 (F) reveals that the performance rating of the GP functionaries in the opinion of rural respondents. About 42.34 percent of respondents have rated the GP functionaries as very efficient and regular to the office. Nearly 18.16 percent of respondents had complained that the GP functionaries are irregular and inefficient in their work. 22 percent of respondents had said that the GP functionaries in their villages are fairly non-discriminatory and non corrupt and 89 respondents had expressed that the GP functionaries had joined the rural elites and land owners to protect the interests of their own lobbies. That means out of 500 total number of respondents, whereas the remaining 17.66 percent if respondents had termed the GP officials as inefficient and irregular on one hand and involving themselves with the local elites and land lords.

The table 2. (G) indicate the factors facilitating people participation in rural development process. About 30.34 percent of respondents had reported that with every improvement in the quality and level of education and income of the rural people, their concern for good and efficient for rural governance also grew. Across the six five sample mandals taluks a minimum of 25 in CK Dinne mandal and a maximum of 43 respondents from Ramapuram mandal had contributed to this view. About 30.16 percent of respondents have expressed the view that they are able to acquire the better knowledge of working of PRI Act. According to them this has enabled them to participate regularly in the GP meetings and also in the discussions held in GP meetings. The participation in the meetings of the PRI's enable them to properly understand the dynamics of rural economy and society. This view was expressed by 39.5 percent of respondents spread over in 6 sample mandals.

The majority of (33%) of respondents have reported that extremely low literacy and total illiteracy, [Table 3 (A)] , 27 percent of respondents are low income and more poverty and 11.34 percent of respondents have low caste status, caste rivalry (19. percent) and some 10.16 percent of respondents have dominance of feudal forces are responsible for ineffective and inefficiency problems in the implementation.

Table – 2 (A) Reasons for Participation in GP Meetings

Reasons	Mandals												Total	
	CK Dinne		Chakrayapaet		Galividu		Lakkireddypalli		Ramapuram		Raychoti			
	No.of Resp	%	No.of Resp	%	No.of Resp	%	No.of Resp	%	No.of Resp	%	No.of Resp	%	No.of Resp	%
It helps to know about RD programmes	22	22	37	37	29	29	32	32	39	39	29	29	188	31.3
Learning about working of the GP Sabha	20	20	13	13	25	25	13	13	19	19	24	24	114	19
To know about the beneficiaries selected	58	58	50	50	46	46	55	55	42	42	47	47	299	49.7
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	601	100

Table: 2 (B) Reasons for non participation in GP Meetings

a) Not interested it is dirty politics	19	19	12	12	10	10	16	16	10	10	10	10	77	12.85
b) Village development problems do not find answers	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	27	4.5
c) Line dept officers do not attend	4	4	3	3	3	3	6	6	3	3	4	4	23	3.8
d) Villagers	11	11	8	8	7	7	10	10	5	5	8	8	49	8.19

simply quarrel in GP meetings														
e) Participated	61	61	73	73	76	76	63	63	78	78	73	73	424	70.66
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	600	100
Table : 2 (C) RD Programmes -- the Beneficiaries are selected at the GP level														
Agriculture- Crop subsidies	12	12	17	17	16	16	12	12	22	22	16	16	95	15.84
Sericulture	4	4	10	10	-	-	3	3	13	13	9	9	39	6.5
Village Industries	3	3	5	5	6	6	4	4	4	4	6	6	28	4.66
Minor Irrigation	6	6	8	8	5	5	10	10	11	11	7	7	47	7.83
Rural Housing	34	34	33	33	31	31	32	32	28	28	33	33	191	31.84
Rural Sanitation	41	41	27	27	42	42	39	39	22	22	29	29	200	33.33
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	600	100
Ratings	Table: 2 (D) Rating of the Working of Gram Panchayats in Selected Mandals in the study area													
Very good	22	22	27	27	24	24	19	19	34	34	24	24	150	25
Good	39	39	41	41	35	35	35	35	44	44	34	34	228	38
Average	24	24	20	20	24	24	31	31	12	14	25	14	136	22.66
Bad	15	15	12	12	17	17	15	15	10	10	17	10	86	14.34
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	600	100
Table : 2 (E) GP Secretary/Elected Representatives														
Efficient	13	13	16	16	17	17	11	11	20	20	11	11	88	14.67
Non - Discriminatory	21	21	20	20	19	19	13	13	25	25	13	13	111	18.5
Non - Corrupt	14	14	18	18	21	21	15	15	20	20	14	14	102	17
Non partisan	29	29	28	28	24	24	19	19	19	19	18	18	137	22.83
Non of the above	23	23	18	18	19	19	42	42	16	16	44	44	162	27
are applicable														
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	600	100
Table – 2 (F) Rating of the GP Fun														
Regular to the office and efficient	40	40	46	46	36	36	35	35	51	51	46	46	254	42.34
Irregular and inefficient	24	24	14	14	18	18	20	20	17	17	16	16	109	18.16
Fairly non discriminatory and non corrupt	22	22	22	22	24	24	17	17	25	25	21	21	131	21.84
Collides with the rural elites and lead owners	14	14	18	18	22	22	28	28	7	7	17	17	106	17.66
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	600	100
Table 2 : (G) Factors Facilitating People Participation in Rural Development Process														
More Education and Income	25	25	32	32	31	31	25	25	43	43	26	26	182	30.34
Better knowledge of PRI Act	32	32	35	35	28	28	27	27	34	34	25	25	181	30.16
Proper understanding of the dynamics of rural economy and society	43	43	33	33	41	41	48	48	23	23	49	49	237	39.5
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	600	100

Source: Primary Data

Table 3 (A) Factors Responsible for Distorted People Participation in RD Programmes.

Sl. NO	Factors	Mandals												Total	
		CK Dinne		Chakrayapaet		Galividu		Lakkireddypalli		Ramapuram		Raychoti			
		No.of Resp	%	No.of Resp	%	No.of Resp	%	No.of Resp	%	No.of Resp	%	No.of Resp	%	No.of Resp	%
1	Low literacy/ more illiteracy	31	31	33	33	30	30	33	33	37	37	33	33	197	32.84
2	Low Income/ more poverty	25	25	26	26	29	29	30	30	20	20	31	31	161	26.83
3	Low caste status	11	11	15	15	8	8	10	10	15	15	9	9	68	11.34
4	Caste rivalry	21	21	19	19	20	20	16	16	20	20	17	17	113	18.83
5	Dominance of feeder	12	12	7	7	13	13	11	11	8	8	10	10	61	10.16
	Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	600	100
	Types of Responses	Table : 3 (B) Rate of the Quality of GP level leadership of the elected representatives													
1	Very good	14	14	13	13	12	12	9	9	21	21	21	21	90	15
2	Good	32	32	42	42	40	40	25	25	43	43	42	42	224	37.33
3	Average	28	28	32	32	28	28	38	38	22	22	22	22	170	28.33
4	Bad	26	26	13	13	20	20	28	28	14	14	15	15	116	19.34
	Types of Responses	Table : 3 (C) Respondents' Satisfaction Levels on the selection of Beneficiaries for Rural Development Schemes													
1	Satisfactory	72	75	75	73	73	72	72	70	70	72	72	434	72.33	72
2	Not Satisfactory	20	20	20	22	22	25	25	20	20	21	20	128	21.34	20
3	No response	8	5	5	5	5	3	3	10	10	7	8	38	6.33	8
	Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
	Types of Responses	Table : 3 (D) Respondents views on the Utility of Development Schemes													
1	Satisfactory	53	53	50	50	55	55	56	56	54	54	55	55	323	53.83
2	Not Satisfactory	35	35	40	40	35	35	35	35	40	40	30	30	215	35.83
3	No response	12	12	10	10	10	10	9	9	6	6	15	15	62	10.34
	Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	600	100.00

Source: Primary Data.

Further, the rating of quality of the GP level leadership in sample GPs of the district. About 15 percent of respondents have said that the GP leadership has been very good,

[Table 3 (B)], around 37.33 percent of respondents said that the quality of political and development leadership of the GP level is good, about 28.33 percent of respondents had said that the quality of the leadership of elected representatives at GP level is very average. Remaining only 19.34 percent of respondents had said that the quality of political and development leadership at the GP level as very bad. Nearly about 53.83 percent of respondents have expressed satisfaction over the selection of beneficiaries for various development programmes. [Table 3(C)] To be precise about 34 per cent have expressed dissatisfaction, while, only about the rest 10.34 per cent have expressed neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction. Nearly 72.33 per cent of the respondents considered that rural development programmes are essential for the development of rural areas. About 21.34 respondents expressed negative impact of these programmes and 6.33 percent of respondents had not responded.

V. FINDINGS:

1. The Majority of (61.33%) respondents are engaged in agriculture activity.
2. Nearly 43.16 percent of respondents are found to earn 40 to 50 thousand rupees per annum.
3. The Majority of (31.34%) respondents have said that their participation in GP meetings help to know in detail about the modus operandi of various RDPs.
4. About 13 percent of respondents have said that their not participation in GP meeting it is dirty politics.

5. The majority of (38%) respondents have said that the performance of their GPS has been good.
6. The Majority of respondents have said that the GP level functionaries and elected representatives are efficient.
7. The majority of respondents had said that the quality of the leadership of respondents representatives at GP level is very average.

VI. CONCLUSION

From the observations and analysis study and conclusion. The majority of (61.33%) respondents are engaged in agriculture activity. Nearly 43.16 percent of respondents are found to earn 40 to 50 thousand rupees per annum. About 27 percent of respondents are low income and more poverty and 11.34 percent of respondents have low caste status, caste rivalry (19%) and some 10.16 percent of respondents have dominance of feudal forces are responsible for ineffective and inefficiency problems in the implementation. The most of respondents have said that their participation in GP meetings help to know in detail about the modus operandi of various RDPs. The people participation at the PRI level provide an opportunity for ascertaining the local needs aspiration and perceptions of the local people regarding the rural development and the empowerment of the rural weaker sections of the society. Thus, the present three tier structure of the PRs is more people friendly and the people-centered.

REFERENCE

- [1]. Bhatnagar S "Panchayati Raj in Kangra District" Orient Longman Ltd New Delhi 1974. PP 21-94.
- [2]. Bhargava B.S "Politico administrative Dynamics in the Panchayati Raj System" A Ashish Publishing house New Delhi 1978. PP32-57.
- [3]. Jathar R.V "Evolution of Panchayati Raj in India J.S.S. Institute of Economic Research, Dharwar, 1964. PP 46.
- [4]. Kumar, J. (1987). Integrated Rural Development: Perspectives and Prospects, 1952- 82. Mittal Publications.
- [5]. Odeyar D. Heggde, "Making PR Institutions financial Viable: Kursukshetra Volume 39, No11, Aug 1991, PP 16
- [6]. Verma, B. M. (2002). Social Justice and Panchayati Raj. Mittal Publications
- [7]. District Hand Book, YSR Kadapa District, Annual Report 2019-20.

K. Yegeswara Reddy, et. al. "PRI representatives The Socio-Economic and Political Status of the Respondents in Panchayat Raj Institutions -A Case Study Of YSR Kadapa District Of Andhra Pradesh." *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 25(11), 2020, pp. 17-22.