CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Past studies pave the way for future research endeavors. An acquaintance with earlier pertinent studies has been felt necessary to develop better understanding of the present study and to formulate appropriate research methodology. Knowledge of existing and up-to date relevant literature related to the studies and their critical and comprehensive review helps a researcher to formulate research project on scientific lines. It guides the investigator to solve the researchable issues of the study based upon the techniques used in the past research and interpreting the results with special reference to the past studies. Keeping in view the objectives of the study, an attempt was made to review the literature which had meaningful relation to the study and are presented under the following sections.

2.1. Personal, socio-economic and socio psychological profile of members of Panchayati Raj Institutions.

2.2. Role perception and role performance of members of Panachayati Raj Institutions.

2.3. Constraints faced by the members of Panachayati Raj Institutions in implementation of the programmes on performing assigned roles.

2.1.1 Personal, socio-economic and socio psychological profile of members of Panchayati Raj Institutions.

Age

Krishnaswami and Guruswami (1970) revealed that 63.70 per cent of the Gram panchayat leaders were from the middle age group *i.e.*, 35 to 50 years. Patil (1971) found that 73.15 per cent of the local leaders were from the age group of 31 to 50 years.
Kubde et al. (1990) in their research project, “Background profiles of members of Gram panchayat and their opinion about the institution” observed that relatively younger generation was considered for leadership by the villagers. Majority of the panchayat members were in the age group of 30-35 years.

Shinde (1991) in his study entitled “A study of local leaders and their problems with reference to agricultural development activities in Ratnagiri district” reported that about three fifth (59.56%) of the rural local leaders were in the 'middle' age category, while 20.58 per cent of the leaders were in ‘old' age category and rest were in the ‘young’ age group.

Hiremath (1992) in her survey consisting of 40 women members of 10 village Panchayats found that the most of the women members were in the age group of 35-50 years.

Abraham (1993) in his study in ‘socio economic and political status of Panchayat’ observed that 12.60 per cent members were in the age group of 25-35 years, the age group between 45-55 years and above 56 years were equally distributed 21.10 per cent. Further, it was found that 36.50 per cent of the panchayat presidents in Kerala were in the age group of 36 to 40 years.

Wankhede (1994) reported in his study on “Role performance of elected members in Gram panchayat” observed that 79.16 per cent of members were in the age group of 35 to 45 years. The next age group of 46 and above years constituted 13.14 per cent and only 7.60 per cent of the members were below 34 years of age.

Mishra (1995) stated that in Madhya Pradesh, the election to the Panchayat Raj institutions were held in May-June, 1994 on non-party basis and he revealed that by the election result was that most of the newly elected representatives were of young generation with their age group ranging from 30-40 years.

Mahadik (1995) in his study on “Knowledge level of the members of the Panchayat Raj Institution about agricultural development programmes” noticed
that majority (67.65%) of the members were in ‘middle’ age category, while 17.64 per cent respondents belonged to ‘old’ age category and remaining (14.17%) members were in ‘young’ age category. The average age of the members of GP, PS and ZP was 38.57, 41.50 and 47.06 years, respectively.

Mondal and Ray (1996) in their study on socio-economic profile of Gram panchayat Pradhans revealed that 71.00 per cent of Gram panchayat Pradhans were ‘middle’ aged (36-55 years). About 14.00 per cent of Pradhans were ‘young’ that is upto 35 years of age and 15.00 per cent Pradhans belonged to ‘56 years and above’ age group.

Gajre (1997) in his study on “Role perception and performance of Gram panchayat member from Haveli taluka of Pune district”, found that 62.50 per cent Gram panchayat members were in the age group of 29-43 years followed by the age groups of upto 28 years and 44 and above years, (18.75% each) respectively.

Khare et al. (1998) in their study on “Role perception of village panchayat Sarpanchas in agricultural development revealed that majority (54.88%) of the respondents (Sarpanchos) belonged to ‘young’ age (upto 35 years) group followed by ‘middle’ (35 to 50 years) age (36.59%) and ‘old’ age (above 50 years) constitute 8.53 per cent in jabalpur block of Jabalpur district.

According to Misra and Singh (1998), reported that 46.4 per cent of the elected representatives were between 21-35 years of age which indicate that new leaders are very young, 35.7 per cent were in the age group of 36-45 years, while, 17.9 per cent were between46.55 years of age.

Santha (1999) found that majority (68.89%) of the elected women representatives were 40 years and above in Haryana and 52.70 per cent in Kerala. Whereas, in Tamil Nadu, 80.95 per cent of the elected women were less than 40 years of age.

Kalakanavar (1999) in her study on “Role performance and training need identification of Panchayat women members” reported that majority (68.00 per
cent) of the respondents belonged to age group between 35-55 years. Respondents above 55 years were 25.00 per cent and only 7.00 per cent of them belonged to below 35 years age group.

Rani (2000) in her study on “Impact of socio-economic status on the emergence of rural women leadership” indicated that 43.20 per cent of both the elected and defeated respondents belonged to the age group of 31-40 years, 36.40 per cent were from the age group of 21-30 years, 15.10 per cent were from the age group of 41-50 years and only 5.30 per cent came under the age group of 51-60 years.

Shanthasheela (2002) in her study on “Performance analysis of elected women presidents in Village Panchayat” observed that 34.25 per cent of the respondents belonged to young age group, 39.73 per cent belonged to middle age group and only 26.02 per cent belonged to old age group categories in coimbatore district of Tamil nadu.

Mankar (2003) found less than half of the male members (45.91%) belonged to middle age group, while almost equal number of them were from young (27.27%) and old (26.82%) aged groups. In case of female members, majority (83.16%) were in young age group and a few (9.47% and 7.37%) of them were in old and young age groups, respectively.

Mohanty (2005) revealed that majority (60.00%) of the leaders were in the category of young age group followed by middle (35.00%) and young (5.00%) age group. Bheemappa (2006) in his study on knowledge level of gram Panchayat members about Sampoor na Grameena rozgar yozana in Raichur District of Karnataka revealed that majority of the members (57.50%) belonged to middle age group followed by young (25.00%) and old (17.50%) age group.

Belly (2008) in his study “Leaership Behaviour of Presidents Of Panchayati Raj Institution” revealed that majority (52.69%) of the respondents were in middle age category, whereas over one-fourth (27.96%) belonged to young age group and only 19.35 per cent belonged to old age group. This indicates that 80.63 per cent of the respondents belonged to young and middle age group.
2.1.2. Education

Chandrasekhar and Inbanathan (1991) found that among ZP members, 51.30 per cent respondents had education upto ‘secondary’ level, 25.8 per cent had ‘higher secondary and above’ education, while ‘primary’ category was represented by 19.70 per cent respondents. Only 3.2 per cent ZP members were ‘illiterate’. In case of Mandal Panchayat members, 37.20 per cent members were ‘illiterate’ and 30.10 per cent members had education up to ‘primary’ school. Whereas, 29.00 per cent respondents had education up to ‘secondary’ school. Only 3.00 per cent respondents were found in ‘higher secondary and above’ category.

Bhargava and Vaidya (1992) observed that out of every 10 women members, one was graduate, four were middle school educated and five members were educated up to primary level. The women representatives lag behind men representatives in their education level.

Ray and Mondal (1993) observed that the Gram panchayat Pradhans were, in general, well educated. Thirty-two per cent had high school level education and 43.00 per cent were graduate and above middle level pass Pradhans were 23.00 per cent. There was not a single illiterate person working as Pradhan.

Abraham (1993) conducted a study on socio economic and political status of Panchayat and the structure of panchayat Raj leadership in Kerala. He revealed that all the panchayat presidents were literate and further, he concluded that the rural populations in Kerala opted for highly educated youngsters as presidents of panchayats.

Wankhede (1994) in his study on “Role performance of elected members in Gram panchayat” revealed that 27.50 per cent members had education upto primary level and 20.84 per cent had upto middle school level. Similarly, 12.50 per cent and 4.16 per cent of the members had education upto high school and college level respectively. It was also observed that 15.84 per cent of the members were illiterate and 19.16 per cent could read only.
Mahadik (1995) in his study found that at overall level, 43.14 per cent of respondents were educated upto ‘secondary school’ level, while 34.31 per cent respondents were educated upto ‘primary school’ level. It was also noticed that 14.71 per cent and 7.84 per cent respondents were educated upto 'higher secondary and above' and pre-primary school levels respectively.

Ghosh (1996) in his study entitled, “Panchayats and rural development in West Bengal” observed that 44.94 per cent of the members had an educational exposure upto ‘primary level’, 42.46 per cent up to ‘secondary level’, 9.5 per cent were ‘graduates’ and only 2.18 per cent were post-graduates.

Ramaparvathy (1996) revealed the educational level of women representatives in which 29.00 per cent of respondents had higher secondary school education, 24.00 per cent had primary school education and 8.00 per cent had collegiate education.

Gajre (1997) observed that majority of the Gram panchayat members (67.19%) had schooling from 5th - 12th standard followed by 19.53 per cent of them had higher formal education of more than 12th standard, followed by 10.94 per cent of them undergoing education between ‘1st-4th standards’ whereas, 2.34 per cent of them had ‘no education’ at all.

Vidya (1997) noted that 8.06 per cent of women panchayat members had not been to school at all, 20.98 per cent had lower primary school education, 25.80 per cent had upper primary education, 38.70 per cent had recorded upto SSLC, 3.23 per cent each had reached pre-university and bachelor degree in arts.

Misra and Singh (1998) studied the rural leaders and revealed that 25.00 per cent of the representatives had ‘no formal schooling’, while 28.00 per cent had studied only ‘upto primary school’. Graduates account for 10.70 per cent of the representatives while professionals constitute 0.71 per cent.

Kalakanavar (1999) noted that higher percentage i.e., 66.00 per cent of GP members were ‘illiterate’, followed by ‘primary and middle school’ education i.e.,
21.00 per cent and 8.00 per cent respectively. Only 4.00 per cent and 1.00 per cent respondents were educated ‘upto high-school’ and ‘college and above’ respectively.

Rani (2000) classified the women representatives according to their levels of education, out of the 206 respondents, 57.80 per cent were found to have studied upto the secondary level, 18.40 per cent upto the primary level, 11.20 per cent upto diploma level, 7.80 per cent had studied upto college level, while 4.80 per cent were illiterates.

Shantha Sheela (2002) indicated that 31.51 per cent of the family heads of the respondents were educated ‘upto secondary education’, 20.55 per cent ‘upto primary education’, 9.58 per cent had ‘college education’ and only 6.85 per cent were ‘illiterate’. From the studies reviewed above, it is quite interesting to find that equal number of respondents were educated up to secondary and higher secondary level of education.

Jadhav (2002) observed that 36.36 per cent of Gram panchayats had education upto pre-primary level and 23.86 per cent of them had primary level education. Doddahanumaiah (2005) revealed that education level of 57.00 per cent of elected women leaders was ‘medium.’

Mohanty (2005) revealed that 52.50 percent of respondents studied upto graduate, followed by 27.40 per cent studied high school, 12.60 per cent of them middle school, 5.25 per cent of them are primary, whereas only 2.25 per cent of leaders were illiterates.

2.1.3 Social participation

Thombare (1976) reported that on an average Panchayat members participation was not found in more than two social organizations.

Ponnannan (1982) concluded that majority of the beneficiaries (44.30%) had medium level of social participation, whereas, 32.80 and 22.90 per cent had low and high level of social participation, respectively.
Shinde (1991) found that about 58.00 per cent of the leaders had ‘low’ social participation, while 41.91 per cent of them had ‘high’ social participation.

Mandal and Ray (1996) found that 40.54 per cent of the Gram panchayat pradhans were office bearers in two organizations while 28.83 per cent of pradhans were members of four organizations.

Bipate (1997) found that 41.43 per cent of the Gram panchayat members were the members of more than one organizations, while 34.28 per cent of them were office bearers.

Gajre (1997) revealed that 78.91 per cent of the Gram panchayat members had low social participation, while 21.09 per cent of them had high social participation.

Jadhav (2002) observed that more than two-third (69.32%) of Sarpanchas had medium level of social participation.

Shanthasheela (2002) observed that 26.03 per cent of respondents were members of cooperative milk societies, 21.92 per cent were members of political parties, 20.55 per cent were members of self help groups, 17.81 per cent were members of TANWA and cooperative banks and 1.37 were members in Nehru Yuva Kendra.

Mankar (2003) reported that about half (49.84%) of the respondents belonged to high social participation category. In case of male respondents, high social participation was observed among 54.55 per cent while it was reverse in case of female respondents who mostly had no social participation (54.74%).

Mohanty (2005) revealed that 52.50 per cent of respondents had membership of only one organization, followed by 22.50 per cent leaders were office bearers in any organization and only 12.50 per cent of them had membership of more than one organization.

Belly (2008) in his study “Leadership Behaviour of Presidents of Panchayati Raj Institution” revealed Presidents mostly involved in all kinds of social
activities. The results indicated that 57.32 per cent were members and 42.68 per cent were office bearers in various social organisations. Regarding extent of participation 59.14 per cent of the presidents participated regularly and 33.33 per cent of them occasionally in the organisations like co-operative society, youth club, mahila mandal, self help groups etc. The above findings reflected the high rate of involvement and participation in the formal organisations which is due to their high social status and position in the village or keeping an eye over the local self government they were actively involved in various social organisations in the village. This might have helped them to become presidents of panchayats. In addition the findings indicated overall social participation of the respondents, which revealed that majority (39.78%) were in medium social participation followed by 35.48 per cent were in high social participation category.

2.1.4 Caste

Kubde et al. (1990) in their study on background profiles of members of Gram panchayats and their opinion about the institution revealed that most of the Panchayats the majority of members came from other backward class.

Bhargava and Vidya (1992) found that in the Panchayat Raj Institution on the whole, in Karnataka, women representatives of Vokkaliga and Lingayat caste groups constitute 60.00 per cent.

Shivaramu and Channegowda (1992) found that 44.10 per cent are of SC and ST members and 55.90 per cent members are from other castes.

Ray and Mondal (1993) observed that 43.24, 15.32, 9.91 and 31.53 per cent of the representative belongs to agriculture farmer, scheduled caste, artisan and higher caste, respectively.

Wankhede (1994) observed that the majority of the members i.e., 60 per cent were from the higher castes, which included Maratha, Brahmin and Marwadi. Middle caste and lower caste constituted 20 per cent each.
Mahadik (1995) noticed in his study that, 43.14 per cent of the respondents were ‘upper’ caste Hindus, while 5.88 per cent and 0.98 per cent were from ‘Mohammedans’ and ‘Christians’ respectively. And two-fifth (40.20%) and 9.80 per cent of the respondents belonged to ‘middle’ and ‘lower’ castes.

Roy (1995) indicated that 48.57 per cent panchayat members/presidents were from SC, while 26.29 per cent and 21.14 per cent respondents belonged to most backward and less backward castes, respectively.

Singh et al. (1995) observed that 65.52 per cent respondents belonged to higher caste, followed by backward caste (20.69%) and scheduled caste (13.79%).

Ghosh (1996) indicated that majority (55.10%) of them belonged to other castes, while scheduled castes and scheduled tribes were 35.80 per cent and 9.10 per cent, respectively.

Ramaparvathy (1996) disclosed that 86.00 per cent of women representatives belong to backward community, eight per cent scheduled caste and scheduled tribe and only six percent belong to forward community.

Bhosale (1997) observed that among the women Gram panchayat members studied, 51.77 per cent belonged to lower castes i.e., SC, ST and OBC while remaining belonged to upper castes.

Kuraria et al. (1997) revealed that 44.17 per cent panchayat members belonged to general caste category, while OBC, SC and ST were 30.83, 15.00 and 3.33 per cent, respectively.

Mishra and Singh (1998) stated that 60.7 per cent of elected representatives of Haryana Panchayat Raj belonged to upper castes. Of these, 46.4 per cent were male representatives and 14.3 per cent were female representatives. Scheduled caste constitute 28.6 per cent while, 10.7 per cent of the respondents belonged to backward classes.
Kalakanavar (1999) revealed that higher percentages of the Gram panchayat members were in the category of SC/ST (42.00%), followed by ‘upper caste’ (40%) and others 18.00%.

Rani (2000) indicated that 63.10 per cent of the elected and defeated respondents belonged to the backward communities, 24.30 per cent hailed from SC/ST communities, 12.00 per cent were from most backward communities and only 0.50 per cent were from forward communities.

Shantha Sheela (2002) revealed that 98.64 per cent of the respondents were the Hindus and 1.36 per cent had Christianity.

Mohanty (2005) revealed that majority (95.00%) of the respondents belong to general caste category, followed by only 5.00 per cent leaders were from SC/ST category.

Bheemappa (2006) in his study on knowledge level of gram Panchayat members about Sampoorna Grameena Rozgar Yozana indicated that 40.84 per cent of the respondents belonged to general category followed by SC/ST category (30.00%) and backward class category (29.16%).

Belly (2008) in his study “Leadership Behaviour of Presidents of Panchayati Raj Institution” indicated that the respondents based on caste have been categorized in to three groups. The results revealed that equal number of respondents (34.40%) each belonged to other backward communities and SC/ST castes, respectively and 31.20 per cent of them belonged to general category.

3.7.2.5. Family Type

Joseph (1987) noticed that 82.50 per cent of the beneficiaries belonged to nuclear type of family followed by 17.50 per cent from joint families.

Grover et al. (1991) found that majority of the respondents belonged to ‘nuclear’ family.
Kalliguddi (1993) revealed that majority of the opinion leaders (57.14%) belonged to ‘nuclear’ families, while 42.86 per cent of them were from ‘Joint’ families.

Ramaparvathy (1996) found that 84.00 per cent of the women representatives had shifted from the traditional joint family to nuclear family. Further, 46.00 per cent of them belong to small family ranging between 1-3 members, 49.00 per cent belonged to 4-6 members and only meager 5.00 per cent had large family size 7-8 members.

Kalakanavar (1999) observed that, majority of the respondents belonged to the ‘joint’ family (56.00%) and 44.00 per cent of them to ‘nuclear’ family.

Santha (1999) observed that in Haryana, of the 45 elected representatives, 30 representatives (66.67%) were from joint families. In Kerala, of the 74 women representatives, 52 (70.27%) were from nuclear families and in Tamil Nadu, of the 84 representatives, 45 (53.57%) were from joint families.

Shantha Sheela (2002) inferred that majority (76.71%) of the respondents belonged to ‘nuclear’ family and only 23.29 per cent of them to ‘joint’ family.

Mankar (2003) indicated that at overall level, nearly equal percentage of panchayat members came from nuclear (50.48%) and joint (49.50%) families. The male members were distributed equally in joint and nuclear families, while in case of female members, 51.58 and 48.42 per cent belonged to nuclear and joint families, respectively.

Doddahanumaiah (2005) revealed that majority (78.00%) of women leaders belonged to nuclear type of family followed by 22.00 per cent respondent’s belonged to joint family.

Bheemappa (2006) revealed that at overall level, the high percentage of Gram panchayat members came from joint (65.00%) and nuclear (35.00%) families.
Belly (2008) in his study revealed that majority (66.67%) of respondents came from nuclear family and only 33.33% per cent of the respondents were from joint family.

2.1.5. Leadership Behaviour of members of Panchayati Raj Institution

Sen (1967) reports that since the inception of panchayati raj the cadres of rural leaders have got a new face-lift. Panchayats and block level politicians provide the new leadership and government provides incentives to this pattern of new leaders of the villages. More often such leaders hold positions in panchayat and cooperatives. They have an open mind for change. They are involved in political activities to influence the individual and groups to accept through persuasion.

Muthayya (1971) in his study covering 353 elected village leaders from sixteen states of Indian union, reported that 51.50 per cent of the village leaders were autocratic and 43.30 per cent were democratic in their characteristic, but they had faith in people. So he inferred that these autocratic leaders may be characterized as benevolent autocrats.

Chaudhary (1981) brought a broad conclusion from the study that there was an appreciable change in the traditional pattern of rural leadership after the introduction of the three tier Panchayati Raj scheme for democratic decentralization. Though younger leadership is emerging and their educational level has significantly improved, still it needs much more qualitative improvement. Although leaders showed great signs of an appreciation for modernization in the Panchayati Raj era, but the political power at the grass root level was still concentrated in the hands of the rich peasantry and higher caste society which had transition in social status, wealth and many other strong points that influence the leadership pattern.

Mishra (1992) revealed that rural leadership is crucial to the effective functioning of community development programmes. He focused on leaders’ personal characteristics and defined their interactive relationship with strategies adopted by them under different situations. Mass orientation, which means strong belief in the power of the people, emerged as a dominant characteristic of effective leaders.
Leaders are mobilizers and/or dedicators. As mobilizers they try to involve the people in order to strengthen their own position and as dedicators try to nurture the people and orient them to participate in development processes. They are usually quite righteous in their outlook and approach.

Bhatt (1994) argued that the task of rural development rests with the democratically elected political leaders at the grass-roots level and the emerging leadership pattern in rural India was socially important, that better defined the nature and role of the political leaders in Panchayati Raj systems. Later he concluded that there was decreasing importance of caste in determining the leadership pattern in Panchayat Raj, while education, membership of a political party, and economic status were becoming, or still were, important factors.

Mahadik (1995) indicated that, majority of the respondents (82.35%) had ‘medium’ leadership experience and remaining respondents (17.65%) had ‘high’ leadership experience.

Hooja and Jain (1997) highlighted the need of training for the Panchayat Raj leaders/functionaries and emphasized upon the realistic expectations that could be derived from training. Of course, continuous and repeated trainings covering a wide range of topics could be used to influence the panchayat leaders and functionaries to build up a skill for utilising the locally available resources that could help to achieve the objectives of panchayat for development purpose.

Kuaria et al. (1997) underlined in their findings that majority of the elected representatives from all three levels of Panchayat viz. Village Panchayat, Janapad Panchayat and Zilla Panchayat belong to the category of middle age, illiterate, general caste, medium group annual income, small size landholding, no membership in any social organizations affiliated to any political party and trained category.

Patil (1999) revealed that 39.53 per cent of the Gram panchayat members belonged to category of ‘medium’ leadership ability, followed by ‘high’ (33.73%) and ‘low’ (26.74%), respectively.
Bheemappa (2006) brought to the light that more than half of the respondents (62.50%) had medium leadership ability, whereas 20.00 and 17.50 per cent of them high and low leadership ability, respectively.

Belly (2008) in his study indicated that majority (52.69%) of the respondents under democratic pattern were “consultative type” followed by only 34.41 per cent of them were “participative”. Likewise under Non democratic leadership pattern 8.60 per cent of the respondents were autocratic in nature followed by only 4.30 per cent under laissez-faire type.

2.1.6. Extension Participation

Rogers and Carpenter (1965) studied the personal characteristics of agricultural leaders communication behaviour and their farmerss behaviour by direct and indirect exposure through extension contacts found that very few were reached by indirect contacts.

Gajre (1997) observed that majority of the respondents (93.75%) thought agricultural extension officer is the most credible source of information. The next important source of information used by them were Gram Sevak and Progressive Farmers with 90.62 per cent each.

Kalakanavar (1999) revealed that extension contact of women members shows that majority of women belonged to the category of ‘medium’ extension contact (67.25%) followed by ‘high’ (15.30%) and low (17.45%), respectively.

Sagar and Singh (1999) stated that attitude towards extension participation and contacts of opinion leadership affected the productivity of crops in one way or other.

Mankar (2003) reported that more than half of the respondents (71.33%) had medium extension participation followed by high (15.89%) and low (12.78%), while the extension participation was higher in case of female respondents (58.95%) as compared to male respondents (50.91%) in medium category. In case of
high category, male and female respondents were 35.91 and 12.63 per cent, while 9.54 per cent of male and almost one-fourth (23.16%) of female respondents had low extension participation.

### 2.1.7. Decision Making Ability

Abel (1952) reported that the role played by farm women in cooperation with their husbands in making decisions and judgments affected not only the home, but also the farm business.

Wilkening (1952) reported that a curvilinear relationship between farm income and ‘joint’ involvement of ‘husband and wife’ in major decisions. Both the low and high income groups tended to be characterized by low “joint decision making”.

Sharma and Singh (1970) found that women’s participation in decision making associated with the socio personal characteristics such as age, education, occupation, type of family, family size, size of holding farming, experience, income and information seeking behaviour.

Singh and Ramachand (1984) stated that men and women usually discussed matters with each other. The final decision was taken by man in consultation with women only.

Ponnusamy *et al.* (1990) indicated that farm women were found to have taken majority of decisions either independently or jointly in various areas of farming.

Bhargava and Vidya (1992) stated that the women representatives of Panchayat Raj Institutions on the whole lag behind men representatives in their educational level. Lack of education manifests itself in their relatively low degree of involvement in the decision-making process.

Pal (1994) indicated the main reason for women's development not picking up has been non-involvement and participation of women in decision-making.
Vidya (1997) observed the fact that women had poor representation at the parliament and state legislature level. Since independence the women representation at both the levels has been fluctuating around five per cent. This low representation of women indicate the low participation of women in political decision-making. But, at the level of Panchayat Raj Institutions also, hardly any progress could be noticed. This is mainly because of the uninterrupted and undisturbed dominance of rural elites mainly male ones over the rural power structure. It has been observed that women had an unimpressive role to play in these institutions since their voice was almost unheard and unnoticed.

2.1.8. Cosmopoliteness

Rogers (1962) pointed out that leaders differed from their followers in cosmo politeness and information source consultancy pattern.

Sen (1969) concluded that opinion leaders were much more in contact with outside world through visits to urban centres.

Sen and Roy (1971) in their nationwide survey reported that leaders were more cosmopolite than non-leaders.

Dubey and Dwivedi (1972) reported that leaders in the field of agriculture were more cosmopolite than non leaders.

Satyanarayanan (1983) Found that opinion leaders possessed more cosmopoliteness orientation than non opinion leaders.

Gajre (1997) observed that 53.12 per cent of the Gram panchayat members had low level of cosmopoliteness while 46.88 per cent of them had high level of cosmopoliteness.

Jadhav (2002) found that nearly three-fourth (71.79%) of the Sarapanchas had medium level of cosmopoliteness.
2.1.9 Review of literature on personality

Child’s (1968) description of personality characteristics as more or less stable, internal factors that make one person’s behavior consistent from one time to another and also from one situation to another and different from the behavior and reaction other people would manifest in comparable situations. Therefore, it is expected that any given individual will behave in a reasonably consistent manner on different occasions.

Edwards (1968) “A Cybernetic Model of Stress” indicated that performance of an individual is influenced by three classes of elements. The first consists of the physical and social environment and the individual’s individual characteristics. The physical environment includes objective features of the environments, such as working conditions and geographic location, whereas the social environment involves the people, interpersonal relationships, social arrangements in the social environment. Personal characteristics refer to the individual’s own features, such as skills, abilities, and physical appearance. Both the physical and social environment and the individual’s personal characteristics re filtered by perceptual processes. In the Edwards’ model, work stress were affected by a number of interacting elements, including age, gender, education, marital status, having children, children number, working hours, position, function and personality characteristics.

According to Wright & Taylor (1970), “Personality refers to those relatively stable and enduring aspects of the individual which distinguish him from other people and at the same time, form the basis of our predictions concerning his future behavior”.

Costa et al. (1986) identified some adjectives defining the factor of normal personality for neuroticism are divided into high and low scores. The high scorers are defined as worrying, nervous, emotional, insecure, inadequate, whereas the lowscorers are defined as calm, relaxed, unemotional, hardy, secure, self-satisfied.

Costa et al. (1986) indicated several adjectives describing the extraversion factor of normal personality are divided into a high and low scorer. The
high scorer adjectives are sociable, active, talkative, person-oriented, optimistic, fun-loving, and affectionate. In addition, the low-scorers are reserved, sober, aloof, task-oriented, retiring, and quiet.

McCrae & Costa, (1986) indicated that the five-factor model of personality represents a structure of traits, developed and elaborated over the last five decades. Factors are defined by groups of intercorrelated traits, which are referred to as facets. The five factor model of personality as measured by the Neo-Personality Inventory Revised (NEO-PI-R) includes Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness.

Digman et al. (1990) supported theoretical basis for trait psychology is the five-factor model (FFM), which provides the taxonomy of five personality traits, proven by independent research teams to have validity at a broad level, that is, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness to experience.

Hough et al. (1990) indicated that Neuroticism is a dimension of normal personality indicating the general tendency to experience negative affects such as fear, sadness, embarrassment, anger, guilt and disgust. High scorers may be at risk of some kinds of psychiatric problems. A high Neuroticism score indicates that a person is prone to having irrational ideas, being less able to control impulses, and coping poorly with stress. A low Neuroticism score is indicative of emotional stability. These people are usually calm, even-tempered, relaxed and able to face stressful situations without becoming ups et al.

Barrick and Mount (1991) and Salgado (1997) found that conscientiousness is one of the best predictors of job performance in the United States of America and Europe. Conscientiousness refers to self-control and the active process of planning, organising and carrying out tasks.

Borman et al. (1991) the conscientious person is purposeful, strong-willed and determined. Conscientiousness is manifested in achievement orientation (hardworking and persistent), dependability (responsible and careful) and orderliness
(planful and organised). On the negative side, high Conscientiousness may lead to annoying fastidiousness, compulsive neatness or workaholic behaviour. Low scorers may not necessarily lack moral principles, but they are less exacting in applying them.

According to Tett et al. (1991), Agreeableness is a significant predictor of job performance. An agreeable person is fundamentally altruistic, sympathetic to others and eager to help them, and in return believes that others will be equally helpful. The disagreeable/antagonistic person is egocentric, sceptical of others’ intentions and competitive rather than co-operative.

McCrae and John, (1992) revealed that extraversion is distinguished by its breadth of con-tent. In their review, they identified six components of extraversion -venturesomeness, affiliation, positive affectivity, energy, ascendance, and ambition. Individuals low in extraversion can be described as quiet, reserved, retiring, shy, silent and withdrawn.

McCrae et al. (1992) revealed that the five-factor model of personality is a hierarchical organization of personality traits in terms of five basic dimensions: Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness to Experience. Research using both natural language adjectives and theoretically based personality questionnaires supports the comprehensiveness of the model and its applicability across observers and cultures.

Dunn et al. (1995) showed that emotional stability (the opposite of Neuroticism) is the second most important characteristic that affects the employability of candidates.

According to Sackett et al. (1996) the relationship between Conscientiousness and job performance could be attributed to the conceptual relationship between Conscientiousness and integrity.

According to (Clark & Watson, 1996) Extraversion includes traits such as sociability, assertiveness, activity and talkativeness. Extraverts are energetic and
optimistic. Introverts are reserved rather than unfriendly, independent rather than followers, even-paced rather than sluggish. Extraversion is characterised by positive feelings and experiences and is therefore seen as a positive affect.

‘O’ Brien and DeLongis, (1996) agreeableness has been described as the opposite side of antagonism. It reflects a proclivity to be good-natured, acquiescent, courteous, helpful, and trusting. Agreeableness is associated with cooperative, caring and appealing. Altruism, nurturance, and caring in contrast to hostility, indifferent towards others, independent and noncompliance, characterizes agreeableness.

Johnson (1997) found a positive relationship between Extraversion and job performance of police personnel and explained this relationship in terms of the high level of interaction in the police service.

Salgado (1997) found that Agreeableness is related to training success. The co-operative nature of agreeable individuals may lead to success in occupations where teamwork and customer service are relevant.

Rabins et al. (2001) in their studies reporting strong positive relationships between self-esteem and neuroticism, moderate positive relationships between self-esteem and extraversion and conscientiousness and relatively weak positive relationships between self-esteem and agreeableness and openness. They examined the relationship between self-esteem and the Big Five personality dimensions. Although their study is limited by its use of a single item self-esteem measure, they found that self-esteem was associated with Emotional Stability reverse neuroticism; \( r = 0.50 \), Extraversion \( r=0.38 \), Conscientiousness \( r= 0.24 \), Openness to Experience \( r = 0.17 \) and Agreeableness \( r= 0.13 \).

Cunningham B. J, et al. (2004) have linked conscientiousness with self-discipline, achievement striving, compliance and competence. The conscientious individual’s persistency and self-discipline will probably also lead a person to finish tasks and to achieve things. Conscientiousness is naturally related to job performance. It is linked with persistence, dependability and good organization skills.
Korkmaz M et al. (2004) described Conscientiousness as the opposite pole of undirectedness. The adjectives describing the factor of normal personality for Conscientiousness are divided into the high and low scorer. The high scorer adjectives are organized, reliable, hard-working, self-disciplined, punctual, scrupulous, neat, ambitious. The low-scorers are aimless, unreliable, lazy, careless, lax, negligent, weakwilled.

Burke et al. (2006) revealed that Neuroticism is linked with instability, stress proneness, personal insecurity and depression. Individuals scoring higher on Neuroticism are more likely to experience negative moods and physical symptoms, to be more strongly affected by negative life events, and to have their negative moods last longer.

Bakker et al. (2006) revealed that in general, individuals who are high in neuroticism have the tendency to set extremely high goals for themselves and tend to underestimate their own performance. People high in neuroticism seem to use avoiding and distracting strategies-such as denying, wishful thinking, and self-criticism-rather than more approaching strategies-such as problem-solving and proactive behavior to deal with issues. Moreover, neuroticism seems to be linked with strong emotional reactions to stressful situations, finally leading to physical illness, and with a higher risk of the development of psychopathology. Some of the features that classify this dimension are fearfulness, irritability, low self-esteem, social anxiety, poor inhibition of impulses, and helplessness.

Bakker et al. (2006) revealed that Extraverts show positive emotions, higher frequency and intensity of personal interactions and a higher need for incentive. In addition, extraversion is, in general, linked with a tendency to be optimistic and a tendency to reevaluate the problems positively.

Tokar et al. (2007) completed an analysis of the relationship between the four traits, using studies from the ten psychology journals most likely to include trait pairs. Their analysis of 127 articles revealed the following estimated, population level correlations between the traits.
* Self-esteem–locus of control, $p = 0.52$.
* Self-esteem–emotional stability, $p = 0.64$.
* Self-esteem–generalized self-efficacy, $p = 0.85$.
* Locus of control–emotional stability, $p = 0.40$.
* Locus of control–generalized self-efficacy, $p = 0.56$.
* Emotional stability–generalized self-efficacy, $p = 0.62$.

The average (absolute) correlation among the traits is 0.60. As can be seen in the list above, the relationships involving locus of control are the weakest. Indeed, without locus of control, the average inter correlation is 0.70, providing evidence of substantial overlap in the personality space assessed by measures of the four traits.

2.2. Review on role perception and role performance

Reddy and Muley (1972) found that in both the progressive and non progressive villages, there were differences in role perception of leaders as seen by themselves and non-leaders. In the progressive villages there was no agreement between leaders and non-leaders on the performance of various roles by leaders whereas in the less progressive villages there were agreement between the leaders and non leaders on the roles performed by leaders.

Reddy and Reddy (1974) stated that officials and non officials had better idea and image of agricultural development progammes than the general villagers. Similar differences existed between villagers of nearest village to block head quarters and those of distant villages from block head quarters. The difference was also found between men and women in the same village.

Rajaram et al. (1975), showed that overall participation of panchayat presidents in planning and execution of three agricultural production programmes i.e. implement pogrammes, fruit plant programmes and hybrid cropping programmes, was above half (52.23%) of the total participation expected out of them.
Samasundaram (1975) found that agricultural leaders performed their expected roles in popularizing of ammonium phosphate in the following order as: adviser (79.20%) innovator (65.80%), group teacher (64%). There was a significant difference in the performance of role as a group teacher, adviser, innovator for two selected agricultural extension programmes.

Mahipal and Rai (1978) found that the role performance of the leaders of the multipurpose co-operative societies was significantly better than the non-efficient societies in regard to all the four agricultural roles, namely planning, supply and service, farm business and education.

Singh (1979) showed that Block Development and Panchayat Officers (BDPOS) correctly perceived their roles in agricultural development. The various position groups in the role set (except AEOs) were also agreed to their role perception for the BDPOs.

There was low consensus among the AEO’s in regard to their expectation of the BDPOs in agricultural development.

Intodia et al. (1980) found that the following roles were poorly performed by members of PRI’s, namely

i) Promotion of co-operative farming

ii) Establishment of model farm within the jurisdiction of the panchayat circle.

iii) Construction of godown.

iv) Technical advice on improving agriculture.

v) Establishment and management of nurseries.

vi) Exploring the possibilities of increasing minor irrigation facilities.

Manikyamba (1990) studied the role performance of women presidents in case of Mandal Praja Parishads in terms of their ability to lead and guide, capacity to conduct the proceedings, awareness of rules and the local needs, capacity to ensure co-ordination & understanding, commitment and articulating abilities.
Singh et al. (1993) who stated that considerable percentage of respondents were not satisfied with the overall role performance of the panchayat leaders and the role performance was low in the field of agriculture and education.

Rajendra (1994) showed that village panchayats performed well in supply and distribution of improved seeds, initiative through co-operative or individual efforts or kitchen gardening, but “preparation of agricultural plan” was the most neglected activity of village panchayats.

Govinda Gowda et al. (1996) observed that the majority (52%) of women members in the study area had medium level of developmental role in their Mandal Panchayats. Almost an equal percentage the sample women members had high and low developmental role level.

Panda (1997) reported that women members of Gram panchayat and Panchayat Samiti’s had amazingly improved their outlook, political consciousness and role perception during the course of a year political orientation were the party, the village committees, their education and family.

Kamble (1998) observed the role performance of Gram panchayat members was high in the fields of dairy development, social welfare and public health. The role performance was low in the field of agriculture and education. At overall level, 56.76 per cent of the Gram panchayat members were having medium role performance, followed by 74.32 and 18.92 percent belonging to high and low role performance, respectively.

Sudhaker (2002) discusses the role of new panchayat in the rural development. He explains that democratic decentralisation, reoriented as panchayati raj, is an innovative mechanism to bridge the yawning gap between the decision making centres and the centres of action. In his view the new panchayati system will enable the public to discharge their functions in a responsible manner and thereby it enhances the effectiveness of the development programmes. He concludes with the observation that the panchayati raj system encourages local initiative, local technologies, local skills and local entrepreneurial abilities.
Mankar et al. (2011) in his study indicated that 29.20 per cent of the respondents performed the role about provisions of health service to livestock, hybridization of local breeds and information to veterinary doctor about disease occurred in villages and possession of knowledge about common disease of livestock. A few per cent (5.71%) of the panchayat members were performed the role regarding conservation of manurial resources, preparing compost and sale of manure. Very few panchayat preserved the forest land improvements and regulations of the use of village forest and grazing land, organized tree planting programmes in the villages. Co-operative management of Government land and co-operative were the important roles performed by only 1.90 per cent gram panchayats.

2.3. Constraints faced by PRI members on performing assigned roles

Adisehiah (1989) found that Panchayati Raj today suffer from two basic maladies, first the lack of political will on the part of state governments and legislature to decentralize power in favour of the people and their representative at the local and village level and secondly, the financial anemia from which they are made to suffer. Of those two ills, the resource crunch is second in importance, as it can be corrected by vesting the Panchayat Raj with power to tax, in addition to earmaking their rightful share of state and union funds.

Shivaramu and Channegowda (1992) found that as many as 93.30 per cent of the members of Mandal Panchayat perceived ‘inadequate financial support to Mandal Panchayat from the officials of Government of Karnataka’ was perceived as the most important problem. Inadequate support to Mandal Panchayat from the officials of Government of Karnataka was perceived as the second most important problem. ‘Inadequate staff, bias of ruling political party of Mandal panchayat’, ‘large population of Mandal Panchayat’ and ‘lack of support from people’ and ‘non-availability of full time secretary of Mandal Panchayat’ were perceived as the problems by the members of Mandal Panchayat in this order.

Pushpakumari (1993) indicated that 45.00 per cent of women respondents were finding ‘no time’ to attend meetings and transport difficulties. Gajre
(1997) revealed that, inadequate finance by the Government was shown priority by 97.66% of them followed by lack of co-operation from the villagers (93.75%) and factionalism (62.50%).

Mahadik (1995) stated that lack of training facilities, lack of marketing facilities, lack of knowledge about credit facilities, lack of cooperation among staff and lack of cooperative factories were major problems.

Gajre (1997) revealed that inadequate finance by the Government was major problem followed by lack of cooperation from the villagers.

Swarnkar et al. (1997) the nature of the problems experienced by the panchayat members in performing their roles, the problems were classified under suitable heads. The most important problem perceived by the respondents was ‘no knowledge about agricultural technology’ (93.65%), inadequate staff (68.57%) was the second major problem. An equal percentage of respondents (64.76%) perceived the problems like, inadequate and irregular supply of funds to Panchayat and ‘lack of timely and adequate guidance’, followed by ‘lack of training facilities’ (63.49%) and ‘lack of marketing facilities’ (51.74%). Under psychological problems, ‘lethargy among the farmers’ (46.03 %) was the major followed by ‘lack of risk bearing ability on the part of people’ (36.19 %). There were many situational problems like, ‘lack of irrigation facilities’ (44.76 %), ‘lack of input supply centers’ (42.53 %), ‘lack of co-operative societies’ (36.19 %) and ‘lack of cottage industries’ (29.52 %). ‘Lack of cooperation from the villagers’ (40.95 %) were the major problems under social problems. ‘Insufficient furniture’ and ‘lack of telephone facilities’ were the problems for 31.11 per cent of the respondents.

Kamble (1998) observed that, the inadequate governmental assistance was a major problem expressed by almost all the Gram panchayat members (97.66%) for achieving the progress, followed by lack of co-operation by villagers and Gram panchayat members (93.75%), factionalism (62.50%), negligence by Government agencies (43.24%), rigid casteism (41.44%), mass poverty (31.53%), geographical situation of the village (19.80%) and human lethargy and mental frustrations (15.3%).
Muttalib (2001) took up the study pertaining to role of clarity of functionaries Aurangabad district in Maharashtra and Nizambad district in Andhra Pradesh. He found that the development functionaries both at the block and district levels were not clear about their roles in the development work. It was suggested that there should be proper demarcation of functions between the officials and non-officials in the matter of implementation of developmental programmes.

Acharya et al. (2002) examine the issues of second generation panchayats and traces out some of the problems of PRIs like bureaucratic and institutional barriers, lack of co-operation from the departments in the devolution of functions and powers, reluctance among the departments to transfer their schemes, growing tendency among the centre and states to introduce programmes to be implemented by parallel organizations, etc.

Bheemappa, A. (2006) revealed that major problems faced by the Gram Panchayat members were delaying in sanction of fund (86.66%), lack of training facilities (75.83%), less honorarium to the panchayat members (74.17%), lack of co-operation from the villagers (68.33%) and non availability of proper building to panchayat (65.00%).

Boruah, (2013) identified some constraints faced by PRI members on performing assigned roles,

1. Lack of awareness of the people in Panchayat activities and absence of favourable environment of people’s participation.
2. Gaon Sabhas are not constituted properly and not held its meeting timely.
3. Consious voters are not interested in local affairs.
4. Elected body not accountable to the voters in real sense of the terms.
5. Party organization always tried to influence the Panchayat bodies.
6. Gaon Sabha has no role in annual planning and budget preparation of the Panchayats.
7. The Panchayats have lost its self-governmental character. Besides, it has became implementing agency of the government Schemes.

8. Lack of sufficient staff in the Panchayats and even only one Secretary has been functioning for more than one Panchayat.

9. Lack of proper circulation and information of the different schemes of the government to the common people.

10. There is no proper coordination between common people and the government officials.

11. Elected members are only interested to satisfy their higher level political leaders than the voters.

12. The official formalities and red-tapism has dissatisfied the poor people.

13. The beneficiaries are selected for different schemes from amongst the close relatives of the elected members and from the party men of the ruling party.