Review of literature is an essential aspect for scientific presentation of any new investigation. A comprehensive review of literature is of paramount importance to any research endeavor. A broad range of reviews provide the base to the finding of the research and aid to choosing appropriate statistical/ econometric techniques which are applied in the research field. In-depth examination of different kinds of literature enables the researcher to appraise, encapsulate, compare & contrast, and correlate various studies that are directly related to the current research. In this line, accentuate is supposed to be made on the reliability of earlier findings as well as theoretical and methodological contributions to a particular topic and help to resolve the conflicts among seemingly paradoxical previous studies.

In a composing review of the literature, it is noteworthy that it does not account new or original experimental but rather a supportive argument for justifying and endorsing the research outcome. Therefore, present reviews of literature are compiled in a way to provide the general idea, conceptual framework and different approaches that would be considered depending upon kind of objectives underpinning the study. As the literature having a direct bearing on different aspects of the present study is limited, the references having little or indirect bearings are also reviewed. By and large, related frameworks of review of literature concerned with the objectives are mentioned here.

2.1 To study the personal and socio-economic profile of Heads of Panchayat Raj institutions.

2.2 To develop and standardize a scale to assess leadership behaviour of Heads of Panchayat Raj institutions.

2.3 To assess the extent of knowledge of Heads of Panchayat Raj institutions about agricultural development programmes.

2.4 To study the relationship between selected characteristics of Heads of Panchayat Raj institutions with their leadership behaviour.
2.5 To analyze the factors influencing leadership behaviour of Heads of Panchayat Raj institutions.

2.6 To find out the constraints faced by the Heads of Panchayat Raj institutions in implementation of agricultural development programmes.

2.7 To seek suggestions from Heads of Panchayat Raj institution to overcome the constraints in implementation of agricultural development programmes.

2.1 SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

2.1.1 Socio economic profile of the respondents.

2.1.1 Age

Mondal and Ray (1996) concluded that majority (71.00 per cent) of gram pradhans were middle aged (36-50 years) followed by old (15.00 per cent) and young (14.00 per cent).

Khare et al. (1998) in their study on ‘Role perception of village panchayat Sarpanchas’ in agricultural development’ revealed that majority (54.88 per cent) of the respondents (Sarapanches’) belonged to young age (up to 35 years) group, followed by middle (35 to 50 years) age group (36.59 per cent) and old age group (above 50 years) was constituting 8.53 per cent of the respondents.

Shrivastava (1999) reported that more than two-third (68.00 per cent) of the formal leaders belonged to middle age group (36 to 50 years) at grass root level.

Saiyad (2000) concluded that more than half i.e. 55.00 per cent of the woman sarpanches belonged to middle age group while 40.00 per cent and 5.00 per cent of them were from young age group and old age group, respectively.

Mohanty (2005) revealed that majority (60.00 per cent) of the leaders were in the category of young age group followed by middle (35.00 per cent) and young (5.00 per cent) age group.

Rathi (2005) observed that 48.13 per cent of the gram panchayat members were from middle age group followed by 28.12 per cent and 23.75 per cent of them who belonged to old and young age group, respectively.

Pujari (2006) in her study, ‘a study of training needs of the Panchayat member in the Ratnagiri district’, revealed that, majority (87.50 per cent) of Zilla Parishad members, 84.21 per cent Panchayat Samiti members and 64.14 per cent
Grampanchayat members were from ‘middle’ age category, followed by 18.57 per cent Grampanchayat and 12.50 per cent Zilla Parishad woman members were found in ‘young’ category, while 14.29 per cent Grampanchayat and 15.79 per cent Panchayat Samiti woman members represented ‘old’ age group.

Diwan (2007) indicated that two-third (66.67 percent) of the women sarpanches belonged to middle age group followed by old age group (37.33 per cent).

Belli (2008) observed that majority (52.69 per cent) of the respondents were in middle age category, whereas, over one-fourth (27.96 per cent) 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.

Kujur (2008) observed that an equal number (35.00 per cent) of elected representative belonged to young and middle age group, while 30.00 per cent of them were from old age group.

Kale (2009) observed that majority of Gram panchayat member (67.72 per cent) belonged to middle age group followed by 17.27 per cent in young group and only 15.54 per cent members were in old age category.

Jadhav et al. (2011) indicated that majority (68.66 per cent) of the gram panchayat members were from middle age group while only 16.00 per cent and 15.34 per cent of them were from old age and young age group, respectively.

Kanase (2012) reveled that, majority (61.60 per cent) of the respondents belonged to middle age category, while 20.54 per cent and 17.86 per cent of the respondents were in young age and old age category.

Mankar et. al (2012) observed that 44.13 per cent Gram Panchayat members belonged to young category (18 to 35 years) followed by middle aged (34.28 per cent). Nearly one fifth (21.59 per cent) belonged to old age (above 46 years) category.

2.1.2 Gender

Wankhede (1994) observed that 75.00 per cent of Gram panchayat members were male and 25.00 per cent were female.

Ghosh (1997) showed that the women members were the prey of gender-biasness. Though the total strength of women members was (33.65 per cent), but the
district-wise representation of women against the post of Karmadhyakshas was only (16.55 per cent).

Kamble (1998) revealed that 33.70 per cent of Gram panchayat members were female while rest of them was male.

Dak and Purohit (2008) in their study, empowerment of women through participation in Panchayati Raj institutions: some structural impediments and a training strategy revealed that out of 285 respondents 34 per cent were present women members in the selected panchayats,

Deka (2014) observed that in total of 65 gaon panchayats, the number of female representatives was 50.

Mondal et. al. (2014) in their study on participation of women in Panchayat Raj observed that, at zilla panchayat level there were 53.09 per cent of women representatives, and women’s representation at panchayat samiti and village panchayats was 48 per cent and 50 per cent, respectively.

Kumar (2017) in his study ‘Role of panchayati raj institutions in Haryana: Participation of women: A study of Rohtak district’ revealed that out of total sample of 139 respondents 56 were female respondents (40.28 per cent). No representative found transgender in Rohtak district.

2.1.3 Education

Mahadik (1995) in his study, ‘a study of the knowledge level of the members of the Panchayat Raj Institutions about agricultural development programmes’, observed that at over all level, 43.14 per cent of the respondents were educated upto ‘secondary school’ level, while 34.31 per cent of the 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’ level, 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 up to the secondary level, 18.40 per cent up to the primary level, 11.20 per cent up to diploma level, 7.80 per cent had studied up to college level, while 4.80 per cent were illiterates.
Doddhanumaiah (2005) revealed that education level of 57.00 per cent of elected women leaders was medium.

Mohanty (2005) revealed that 32.50 per cent of respondents studied up to intermediate / higher secondary, followed by 17.50 per cent studied high school, 5.00 per cent of them studied up to middle school, 2.50 per cent of them had primary education, whereas only 2.5 per cent of leaders were illiterates.

Shrivastava (1999) reported that more than one third (38.00 per cent) of the formal leaders possessed education up to primary level.

Rathi (2005) observed that 30.00 per cent of the respondents were educated up to primary level, followed by 21.88 per cent, 18.12 per cent, 17.50 per cent and 12.50 per cent of them had up to middle level, collage level and above high school level, higher secondary level and illiterate, respectively.

Pujari (2006) observed that out of total Grampanchayat members, 38.58 per cent were in ‘secondary’ education category, 24.28 per cent had ‘higher secondary and above’ followed by 20.00 per cent in ‘pre-secondary’ and 17.14 per cent ‘primary’ educated. In respect of Panchayat Samiti members, it was observed that 57.89 per cent were in ‘higher secondary and above’, followed by 31.39 per cent in ‘secondary’ education category. About Zillha Parishad members, 50.00 per cent each were in ‘secondary’ and ‘higher secondary and above’ category.

Belli (2008) reported that 36.56 per cent respondents studied up to primary education, followed by over one-fourth (26.88 per cent) who had studied up to high school education, while 17.20 per cent had middle school and 15.06 per cent were illiterate, whereas only 4.30 per cent had college education.

Kujur (2008) observed that slightly less than two fifth (38.33 per cent) of the respondents had secondary level of education, followed by 30.00 per cent and 18.33 per cent of them who had primary and higher secondary level of education, respectively, whereas, an equal number (6.67 per cent) of them were educated up to college level and illiterate.

Kale (2009) showed that, 30.00 per cent members were educated up to primary school, 23.63 per cent were having education up to SSC. The percentage of respondents educated up to HSC was 15.45, whereas 14.54 percent were illiterate,
11.81 per cent were educated up to 7th class and only the 4.54 per cent Gram panchayat members were educated up to college level.

Jadhav et al. (2011) studied that 76.00 per cent of the gram panchayat members were educated up to medium level followed by 17.34 per cent and 6.66 per cent of them who had low level and high level of education, respectively.

Kanase (2012) observed that, the respondents in the category of pre-primary education were 7.00 per cent, while 26.00 per cent respondents were in the category of primary education. More than one-third of the respondents (38.4 per cent) were in the category of secondary education, while 12.50 per cent and 16.10 per cent respondents had higher secondary and college level education.

Mankar et al. (2012) reported that, a sizeable number of the respondents (42.86 per cent ) were educated up to high school level. Nearly one third (31.43 per cent) were educated up to middle school and 12.70 per cent were educated up to higher secondary

2.1.4 Type of family:

Yadav (1990) revealed that 70 per cent leaders were from joint family.

Khare (1995) reported that 68.30 per cent sarpanches belonged to nuclear family.

Choudhary (1998) observed that "54.76 per cent women panchayat leaders had nuclear family.

Shrivastava (2003) revealed that 63.11 per cent village panchayat leaders belonged to nuclear family.

Debnath (2005) found that majority (60 per cent) panchayat representatives had nuclear family and 40 per cent had joint family.

Tomar et al. (2007) reported that 63.64 per cent panchayat leaders belonged to single family and 36.36 per cent belonged to joint family.

2.1.5 Size of family:

Jain (1987) reported that slightly more than three fourth of the respondents (78.33 per cent) belonged to large sized family.
Roy (1995) found that 33.7 per cent of the panchayat leaders have family size of 3-4 members, followed by 26 per cent having 5-6 members. Panchayat leaders with more than 6 members were 22.9 per cent and 16.6 per cent were having 3 members only.

Choudhary (1998) reported that majority (61.90 per cent) respondents had big family size.

Saiyad (2000) observed that majority (86.25 per cent) of the woman sarpanches had big size of family, only 13.75 per cent of the woman sarpanches had small size of family.

Shrivastava (2003) revealed that 54.43 per cent panchayat leaders belonged to large family size.

Rathi (2005) observed that exactly half (50.00 per cent) of gram panchayat members had six to ten member in their family whereas 41.25 per cent of them had up to five members; only 8.75 per cent of them had more than ten members in their family.

Pachouri (2007) revealed that 40 per cent women panchayat leaders had small family size.

Tiwari (2007) reported that maximum percentage (40.86 per cent) of village panchayat leaders had medium family size.

Kalliguddi (1993) observed that three-fourth (75.00 per cent) of opinion leaders had large sized family and the remaining one-fourth of them (25.00 per cent) had small sized family.

Kujur (2008) observed that majority (56.67 per cent) of sarpanches had 5 to 8 member in their family, followed by 33.33 per cent and 10.00 per cent of them who had above 8 members and below 5 members in their family, respectively.

2.1.6 Land holding

Reddy (1972) concluded that economic security plays a pivotal role in the emergence of leaders in Indian villages and generally this economic security in rural areas is provided by land. Majority of the successful members of gram panchayats had land holding of above 30 acres.
Roy (1995) revealed that 28.00 per cent of panchayat members own land between 2.5 to 5.0 acres, 18.90 per cent members were landless 15.40 per cent of them had 1.2 to 50.0 acres land followed by 10 to 15 acres (10.30 per cent).

Garje (1997) observed that majority of the Gram panchayat members (70.31 per cent) were having land holding from 0.44 hectares to 2.61 hectares followed by those (17.97 per cent) having small land holding up to 0.43 hectares. It was further observed that only 11.72 per cent of the respondents were possessing more than 2.61 hectares of land.

Kamble (1998), in his study entitled, ‘a study of characteristics of Grampanchayat members and their role towards village development activities’, observed that 50.45 per cent of the Grampanchayat members were having ‘small’ operational land holding, followed by 41.44 per cent having ‘medium’ operational land holding and only 8.11 per cent had ‘big’ operational land holding.

Shanthasheela (2002) reported that the majority of the respondents (58.90 per cent) owned more than 10 acres of land, 20.54 per cent of them were landless. Nearly 14.00 per cent were medium farmers and only 6.86 per cent hold 2.5 acres of land holdings.

Mankar (2003) reported that, 57.14 per cent of the respondents were having marginal land holdings, 22.86 per cent of them possessed small farm size. Almost equal percentage of members had medium size holdings (8.57 per cent) and remaining (8.89 per cent) were landless.

2.1.7 Annual income

Mahadik (1995) indicated that majority (71.57 per cent) of the respondents were having medium annual income. One-fifth (20.59 per cent) and 7.84 per cent of the respondents were having low and high annual income, respectively. The average annual income of Gram Panchayat, Panchayat Samiti and Zilla Parishad members was Rs. 17,982, Rs. 38,757 and Rs. 70,125, respectively while average annual income of the respondents was Rs. 31,864.

Shivaramu and Channegowda, (1992), in their study, ‘perceived problems of members of Mandal Panchayat’, reported that 34.98 per cent members were having
‘low’ income, while 41.00 per cent and 24.20 per cent members were having ‘medium’ and ‘high’ level income, respectively.

Shanthasheela (2002) reported that 60.27 per cent of the respondents had an annual income of Rs. 50,000 and above, of which, 30.14 per cent belonged to annual income group of Rs. 50,000 to Rs. 1,00,000. More than one fifth (20.55 per cent) belonged to Rs. 1,00,001 to Rs. 2,00,000 while 4.10 per cent belonged to Rs. 2,00,000 to Rs. 3,00,000 and only 5.48 per cent had an annual income of more than Rs. 3,00,000. It was observed that 27.40 per cent of the respondents belonged to the annual income group of less than Rs. 25,000 and only 12.33 per cent belonged to Rs. 25,000 to Rs. 50,000.

Mankar (2003) observed that majority (46.98 per cent) of the respondents were from medium (Rs. 21,001 – Rs. 50,000) income group, followed by low (28.89 per cent) up to Rs. 21,000 income, whereas 21.43 per cent of respondents were having high income of Rs. 50,001 and above.

Diwan (2007) reported that majority (66.67 per cent) of woman sarpanches had annual income in the ranging of Rs. 50001/- to Rs. 100000/- followed by 30.67 per cent and 2.66 per cent of them who had up to Rs. 50000/- and above Rs. 100000/- annual income, respectively.

Belli (2008) revealed that majority (38.70 per cent) of the respondents were from low (up to Rs. 71,444) income group followed by 35.50 per cent in medium income group (Rs. 71,445 – Rs. 1, 23,997) and 25.80 per cent in high income group (Rs. 1, 23,997), respectively.

Kujur (2008) observed that majority (56.67 per cent) of sarpanches had a annual income in between Rs. 50,000/- to Rs. 100000/-, followed by 25.00 per cent and 18.33 per cent of them who had above Rs. 1,00,000/- and up to Rs. 50,000/- of annual income, respectively.

Jadhav et. al. (2011) observed that majority (87.17 per cent) of gram panchayat members had annual income between Rs. 56000/- to Rs. 97000/- only 9.40 per cent and 3.43 per cent of them had up to Rs. 56000/- and above Rs. 97000/- of annual income, respectively.
Kanase (2012) revealed that, majority (77.68 per cent) of the respondents were having medium annual income, while 12.50 per cent and 9.82 per cent of the respondents had high and low annual income, respectively.

2.1.8 Major occupation

Mahadik (1995) revealed that one-half (50.00 per cent) of the respondents, at overall level, were mainly engaged in farming, while 31.38 per cent of the respondents were mainly engaged in business. Nearly one-tenth, that is 9.80 per cent and 8.82 per cent of the respondents were engaged in service and independent profession respectively.

Mondal and Ray (1996) concluded that majority (58.00 per cent) of the respondents was predominantly service holders, 32 per cent of respondents were depending on farming and only 5 per cent of them had no occupation.

Patil (1999) in his study entitled, ‘a study of role performance of women members in Panchayat Raj Institutions in Ratnagiri district’ revealed that majority (59.30 per cent) of Grampanchayat members, 50.00 per cent of Panchayat Samiti members and 46.16 per cent of Zilla Parishad members were mainly engaged in ‘farming’. In case of 23.36 per cent of Grampanchayat members, 12.50 per cent of Panchayat Samiti members and 38.46 per cent of members Zilla Parishad members, ‘service’ was the major occupation. One-fourth 25.00 per cent of the Panchayat Samiti members and 9.30 per cent of the Grampanchayat members had ‘independent profession’, whereas ‘business’ was the major occupation of 15.38 per cent Zilla Parishad members, 12.50 per cent Panchayat Samiti members and only 8.14 per cent Grampanchayat members.

Pujari (2006) revealed that, at overall level, 24.14 per cent respondents had ‘business’ as major occupation, 15.14 per cent were engaged in ‘independent profession’, majority (40.22 per cent) had ‘farming’ as major occupation and remaining 20.60 per cent were having ‘service’ as major occupation.

Shanthasheela (2002) revealed that more than half of the respondents (56.16 per cent) were involved in helping their husbands in their agricultural land while 19.18 per cent were typical housewives. Less than twenty per cent (16.44 per cent) were wage earners and 5.48 per cent were involved in both agriculture and business.
Mankar (2003) revealed that the major occupation of the respondents was farming (55.24 per cent), followed by business (20.63 per cent) and service (18.10 per cent). Further, analysis revealed that farming was the major occupation of male respondents (61.82 per cent) and female respondents (40.00 per cent), followed by business (21.36 per cent) in case of male respondents and service (28.42 per cent) in case of female respondents.

Diwan (2007) concluded that 34.67 per cent of woman sarpanch’s and 42.66 per cent of man sarpanch’s were dependent on animal husbandry.

Belli (2008) revealed that the major occupation of the respondents was farming (64.52 per cent) followed by business (18.28 per cent). While, only 17.20 per cent of respondents were wage earners.

Kanase (2012) revealed that, maximum number (41.96 per cent) respondents had farming as major occupation of family, while 28.57 per cent of the respondents had service as major occupation. Among the other respondents, 22.32 per cent were having business as major occupation and remaining 4.47 per cent were labour and 2.68 per cent had caste occupation as major occupation of their family.

2.1.9 Political Background

Kaushik (1997) conducted a study on the women Panches of Haryana where she found that majority of them were married and illiterate and One fourth of them have relatives in politics.

Panda (1997) conducted a study on the socio-economic background of participants and their performance in PRIs of Orissa. The main findings of the study were that majority of the women participants belong to non-political family background and were from the lower caste groups. The study also revealed that higher caste women generally do not come to PRI politics. Among the higher caste women 75 percent were housewives.

Buch (2000) has made a study in Maharashtra, where the author found that, in the post 73rd amendment majority of women representatives of panchayats were comparatively younger than the earlier entrants and were predominantly first generation entrants to the public political life indicating they were not having any family political background.
Singla (2007) in her study on the women members of Panchayats of Haryana found that a good number of women have been elected from the younger age group of between 25-35 and 35-45 and majority of them have entered the field of politics for the first time as no one from their families ever held a political position in the past.

2.1.10 Social participation

Mahadik (1995) noticed that a large majority (85.29 per cent) of the respondents, at overall level, had medium organizational participation, while remaining 14.71 per cent respondents had high organizational participation.

Jayasree (1996) revealed that majority (70.00 per cent) of the women sarpanch had medium social participation, while 23.34 per cent had low social participation and 6.66 per cent had high social participation.

Mondal 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.

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.

Patil (1999) found that 47.67 per cent of the Gram panchayat members were in low category, 40.70 per cent in medium and 11.63 per cent in high social participation category, whereas the percentage of Panchayat Samiti members belonging to these categories was 37.50, 37.50 and 25.00, respectively. Also the social participation of Zilla Parishad members brought out that there were 53.84 per cent members in high category, followed by 23.08 per cent each in medium and low categories.

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

Pachouri (2007) reported that highest percentage of women Panchayat leaders were members in one organization.

Belli (2008) revealed that 39.79 per cent of the respondents had medium social participation followed by 35.48 per cent and 24.73 per cent were categorized under high and low social participation, respectively.
Kale (2009) reported that, 34.54 per cent members had high participation, 30.00 per cent members had no participation, whereas 20.90 per cent having low participation and 14.54 per cent had medium participation.

Kanase (2012) revealed that, majority (54.65 per cent) of women members had low social participation followed by 34.67 per cent had medium and 10.68 per cent had high level of social participation.

2.1.11 Trainings undergone

Jeyapaul and Dravidamani (1997) reported that all the respondents have attended the training programs on panchayat raj uniformly only for two days.

Gurjar (2002) reported that the majority (70.17 per cent) of panchayat members obtained training and 29.88 per cent member had no training.

Yadav et al. (2002) reported that only a small minority (16.67 per cent) of the sarpanches attended training while the duration has been less than one week and also found that majority (75.00 per cent) of sarpanchs perceived they have sufficient knowledge on panchayat raj and therefore were not much inclined to take more training. Furthermore cent per cent of respondents preferred training in the village itself rather than in BDO’s office or training institute.

Shrivastava (2003) concluded that most of the village panchayat leaders (81.55 per cent) were untrained and hence training must be imparted to age panchayat leaders for better role performance.

Bedekar (2007) revealed that, two-third (66.67 per cent) of the respondents had completed up to ‘one and above’ training programmes, while one third (33.33 per cent) of the respondents did not received ‘any training’.

Pachouri (2007) concluded that majority (64.45 per cent) of women panchayat leader were untrained.

Shelar et al. (2007) found that majority (56.66 per cent) of the dealers had ‘not received’ any training of one to three days duration.

Sachchidananda (2007) revealed that majority (65.50 per cent) of the panchayat members had one day’s orientation training and the rest of them did not have any training. And also concluded that among those who undergone training, just
above one forth (27.40 per cent) of the respondents found the training was useful and satisfactory.

Tiwari (2007) concluded that majority (79.13 per cent) of village panchayat leaders were trained for carrying out village development activities.

Thodase (2010) observed that majority (65.33 per cent) of the respondents from Konkan region and over half (53.33 per cent) of the respondents from Vidarbha region had not received any training about fertilizer use. Over one-third (34.67 per cent) of the respondents from Konkan region and 46.67 per cent of the respondents from Vidarbha region had received training on various aspects related to fertilizers and their use.

Thorat and Bhujbal (2010) revealed that majority of the respondents (85.00 per cent) had not received training of any kind, while 8.75 per cent of the respondents had short duration training. Further, 6.25 per cent respondents had received up to 2 training.

2.1.12 Extension participation

Mankar (2003) reported that more than half of the respondents (53.33 per cent) had medium extension participation followed by high (28.89 per cent) and low (13.65 per cent), while (4.13 per cent) of them were found in no participation category. The extension participation was higher in case of female respondents (58.95 per cent) as compared to male respondents (50.91 per cent) in medium category. In case of high category, male and female respondents were 35.91 per cent and 12.63 per cent, while 9.54 per cent of male and almost one-fourth 23.16 per cent of female respondents had low extension participation.

Mohanty (2005) revealed that majority (55.00 per cent) of the respondents belonged to high mass media exposure category followed by 42.50 per cent of them belonged to medium level, whereas only 2.50 per cent of leaders belonged to low mass media exposure category.

Belli (2008) stated that cent per cent respondents subscribed to News papers and 70.96 per cent of them were reading regularly followed by 96.77 per cent of respondents owning television and 67.74 per cent of them were viewing television programmes occasionally, 86.02 per cent of respondents subscribed to
weekly/monthly magazines and 53.76 per cent read the magazines occasionally. Further, 32.25 per cent respondents possessed radio and 41.93 per cent of them listened to radio programmes occasionally.

### 2.1.13 Attitude towards agriculture

Choudhary (1998) reported that 41.67 per cent women panchayat leaders had low attitude towards agriculture development and 38.10 per cent of them had medium attitude. He also concluded that attitude towards agricultural development does not play an important role in performance of women panchayat leaders.

Shrivastava (2003) reported that most of the respondents had favorable attitude towards rural development through panchayati raj and also inferred that attitude play an important role in job performance of village panchayat leaders.

Kadam (2006) revealed that majority (74.61 per cent) of the respondents were found in ‘favourable’ category of attitude towards commercial mango production technology, while nearly equal number, that is 13.99 per cent and 11.40 per cent of the respondents were in ‘less favorable’ and ‘most favorable’ category of attitude.

Tiwari (2007) reported that 66.09 per cent of the respondents had less favorable attitude towards rural development and 33.91 per cent had more favorable attitude towards rural development.

Verma (2010) concluded that majority of the village panchayat leaders (64.74 per cent) were found to possessed moderately favorable attitude towards Panchayati Raj institutions, 17.95 per cent village panchayat leaders were found to have unfavorable attitude towards Panchayati Raj institutions. The remaining 17.31 per cent of village panchayat leaders showed their favorable attitude towards Panchayati Raj institutions.

Magarvadiya and Patel (2013) in their study entitled, ‘knowledge and attitude of farmers regarding biofertilizers in arid and semi-arid area’ revealed that majority (79.17 per cent) of the farmers possessed moderately to less favorable attitude regarding biofertilizers.
2.1.14 Cosmopoliteness

Mahadik (1995) observed that less than two-third (64.71 per cent) of the respondents had medium cosmopoliteness. It was also seen that, 20.59 per cent and 14.70 per cent of the respondents had low and high cosmopoliteness, respectively.

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.

Belli (2008) revealed that majority (61.30 per cent) of the presidents of Panchayat Raj institutions were highly cosmopolite followed by nearly one-third (32.25 per cent) with medium cosmopolite and only 6.45 per cent were low cosmopolite.

Verma (2010) revealed that the majority of the village panchayat leaders (76.28 per cent) had medium levels of cosmopoliteness; followed by 12.82 per cent of the village panchayat leaders had low levels of cosmopoliteness. While, remaining 10.90 per cent of the village panchayat leaders were found in high level of cosmopoliteness category.

Kanase (2012) observed that majority of the respondents (70.54 per cent) had medium cosmopoliteness. It is also seen that 19.64 per cent and 9.82 per cent of respondents had low and high cosmopoliteness, respectively.

2.1.15 Self confidence

Hardikar (1998) in their study entitled ‘perception of development programme and benefits derived by women beneficiaries of Ratnagiri district’ noticed that, 63.89 per cent beneficiaries of IRDP and 59.79 per cent of DWCRA beneficiaries had medium level of self confidence. However, 25.92 per cent beneficiaries of IRDP and 17.53 per cent DWCRA beneficiaries had high level of self confidence.

Patil (1999) showed that equal numbers (22.09 per cent) of Gram panchayat member were found in low and high category of self confidence, while the remaining belonged to medium category. The analysis with respect to Panchayat Samiti members brought out that one-half (50.00 per cent) of the respondents had medium self confidence followed by 37.50 per cent in high and 12.50 per cent in low category of self confidence. None of the Zilla Parishad members was found in low category,
while 61.54 per cent were observed in medium category and rest in high self confidence category.

Sachchidananda (2007) reported that the majority of the panchayat members gained self confidence after being elected and only 21 per cent of the respondents did not experience any change in their level of self confidence.

Mankar et al. (2012) reported that majority (59.37 per cent) of the respondents had medium level of self confidence, followed by 23.17 per cent in high and 17.46 per cent in low category of self confidence.

2.1.16 Risk orientation

Goleman (1995) reported that leaders were taking calculated risk while facing tough situations, whatsoever the nature of the risk may be which indicates the higher risk bearing capacity of the leaders in comparison to non-leaders.

Venkataramalu (2003) reported that majority of the farmers had medium level of risk bearing (73.33 per cent) capacity.

Shashidhar (2004) revealed that majority of the farmers (70.83 per cent) had medium level of risk bearing ability and low (15.00 per cent) level of risk orientation.

Belli (2008) revealed that majority (44.09 per cent) of respondents had high risk orientation followed by 43.01 per cent of them had medium risk orientation where as only 12.90 per cent had low risk orientation.

2.2 Dependant variables

2.2.1 Leadership behaviour of Heads of Panchayat Raj institutions

Kaleel (1993) reported that nine factors such as strong drive, intellectual honesty, positive attitude, human relation skills, research facilitation, visionary ability, communication behavior etc. found to affect the leadership style and treated as leadership traits that influence the leadership function.

Muthiah and Somasundaram (1993) reported in their study conducted in Coimbatore district of Tamil Nadu, that significant difference was observed between effective and less effective farm leaders in respect of their contact with extension agency, leader follower communication, liberal and cosmopolite value orientation, self-reliance, attitude towards agricultural development programme, and knowledge
about agricultural development programmes. These traits were found to be more pronounced amongst the effective farm leaders than the less effective farm leaders.

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.

Greger and Peterson (2000) revealed the nature of leadership in the context of development and agreed that a leader needs to develop a vision, communicate successfully and empower the followers through large-scale exposure, training and orientation towards innovativeness, respectively; so that he/she acts as an engine for rural upliftment.

Belli (2008) reported that, 34.41 per cent and 52.69 per cent of respondent had participative and consultative democratic leadership pattern while, 8.60 per cent and 4.30 per cent respondents had autocratic and laissez faire in non-democratic leadership pattern.

Khade (2014) reported that more than half (54.00 per cent) of Heads of Panchayat Raj institutions belonged to medium leadership pattern (110 to 145 score), followed by 24.00 per cent and 22.00 per cent high and low leadership pattern, respectively.

### 2.2.2 Knowledge level of Heads of Panchayat Raj institutions about agriculture development programmes

Mahadik (1995) observed that majority of Gram panchayat members (86.21 per cent) had medium knowledge level, followed by low (10.34 per cent) and high (3.45 per cent) knowledge level about agricultural development programmes.

Jayasree (1996) reported that majority (50.00 per cent) of women sarpanch had medium knowledge about developmental activities, while 30 per cent had low knowledge and the rest 20 per cent had high knowledge.
Khare et al. (1998) observed that 58.53 per cent respondents were belonged to high knowledge level. The medium and low knowledge level was observed by 29.27 per cent and 12.20 per cent about agricultural development.

Belli (2008) revealed that overall knowledge about horticulture development, over half (56.98 per cent) of the respondents had medium knowledge level, followed by nearly one-fourth (24.72 per cent) of them with high knowledge level, whereas only 18.30 per cent of the presidents had low knowledge level about horticulture development aspects.

Verma (2010) showed that 68.59 per cent village panchayat leaders had medium level of knowledge; followed by low level of knowledge with 17.30 per cent of village panchayat leaders and 14.11 per cent village panchayat leaders had high level of knowledge about rural development activities in their villages. The majority of the village panchayat leaders were found to possess medium level of knowledge about rural development activities.

Mankar et al. (2012) reported that that majority (69.84 per cent) of the respondents possessed ‘medium’ level of knowledge, while 15.87 percent and 14.29 percent of the respondents had ‘low’ and ‘high’ knowledge level respectively. The average knowledge level score of the respondents was 27.96.

Khade (2014) revealed that majority (58.00 per cent) of the respondents had medium knowledge level, followed by one-fourth (25.00 per cent) of them had low knowledge level and 17.00 per cent had high knowledge about agriculture development programmes.

2.3. Relationship between selected characteristics of Heads of Panchayat Raj institutions with their leadership behaviour

Mahadik (1995) in his study found that the personal and socio-economic characteristics namely, educational level, annual income, organizational participation, mass media exposure, cosmopolitaness and political awareness had significant relationship with the knowledge level of the members of the Panchayat Raj institutions about various agricultural development programmes.

Mondal and Ray (1996) reported that the socio-personal-economic characteristics like education, caste, occupation, land holding, social participation etc.
had positive and significant associationship with the leadership whereas, age, annual income were independent of leadership.

Bhambu (1997) revealed that age, family type, land holdings, caste, material possession, average monthly income and source of information had significant correlation with knowledge of respondents towards participation in Panchayat Raj system.

Kuraria et al. (1997) observed that except landholding and annual income, all the socio-economic factors like age, education, caste, social participation, political contact and training obtained were having significant association with the role performance of the elected representatives of Panchayat Raj, which affected the working efficiency of the Panchayat Raj leaders.

Choudhary (1998) inferred that age does not play an important role in performing various roles of women panchayat leaders but education is one of the major contributing factors in role performance whereas, family type, family size and occupation did not play an important role in role performance of women panchayat leaders. Social Participation, size of land holding, contact with development agencies and training received played a vital role in role performance of women panchayat leaders.

Patil (1999) in his study on ‘Role performance of women members in Panchayat Raj institutions in Ratnagiri district’ found that the characteristics namely, age, own education, family education status, family size, family income, social participation, mass media exposure, leadership ability, self confidence, political awareness and tenure of membership in PRI’s had significant relationship with the role performance of women members in Panchayat Raj institution.

Pachouri (2007) found that age was not associated with role performance of women panchayat leaders whereas; education, social participation, training received and contact with development agencies had an effect on extent of role performance of women panchayat leaders in connection to village panchayat activities. It was also concluded that family type, family size, occupation, size of land holding, annual income does not play any important role in governing the role performance of women panchayat leaders.
Khade (2014) reported education, training received, cosmopolitanism, attitude towards agriculture, self confidence, risk preference and achievement motivation were positively significant to the leadership pattern of Heads of Panchayat Raj institutions where as age, caste, marital status, family type, major occupation, annual income, social participation and information seeking behaviour were found non-significant.

2.4 **Constraints faced by the Heads of Panchayat raj institutions in agriculture development**

Subha (1995) mentioned that the problems faced by women panchayat members were poverty, illiteracy and castism.

Jayalaxmi (1997) reported that voluntary organizations have listed some of the problems faced by women members. They were traditional bindings, lack of knowledge about panchayat activities, less contact with the people, patriarchy system, illiteracy and dependency on others.

Kiranmayee (1997) in his study entitled ‘A study of characteristics and role performance of leaders working under Podupulakshmi scheme in Nellore district of Andhra Pradesh’ observed that ‘lack of co-operation among members’, ‘irregularities in repaying the loans’, ‘insufficient loans due to more members in group’, ‘difficulty in explaining the accounts to illiterate beneficiaries’, ‘lack of proper marketing facilities’, ‘lack of proper knowledge about Podupulakshmi scheme to the members’, ‘delay in sanction of expenses made by the leaders to attend meeting’ were the problems perceived by the leaders.

Patil (1999) reported that the problems faced by the women members were economic problems, social problems, situational problems and technological problems.

Upadhyay *et al.* (2003) revealed that most of the respondents 52-67 per cent complained the problem of non consultation by male members for different proposals, compulsion to sign approved proposals, monopoly of male members in decision making and lack of information about financial matters.

Chaudhary *et al.* (2004) concluded from the study that majority of the women members of gram panchayat lacked the role performance in some sectors which are of vital importance for the welfare and development of the village. It was interesting to
note that groupism among the members acted as prominent hurdle in the role performance of leaders followed by lack of cooperation from villagers and others.

Mankar et al. (2012) reported that most important problem perceived by the respondents was 'no knowledge about agricultural technology' (93.65 per cent), inadequate staff (68.57 per cent) was the second major problem. An equal percentage of respondents (64.76 per cent) 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 per cent) and 'lack of marketing facilities' (51.74 per cent). Under psychological problems, 'lethargy among the farmers' (46.03 per cent) was the major problem followed by 'lack of risk bearing ability on the part of people' (36.19 per cent). There were many situational problems like, 'lack of irrigation facilities' (44.76 per cent), 'lack of input supply centers' (42.53 per cent), 'lack of co-operative societies' (36.19 per cent) and 'lack of cottage industries' (29.52 per cent). 'Lack of cooperation from the villagers' (40.95 per cent) was the major problems under social problems. 'Insufficient furniture' and 'lack of telephone facilities' were the problems for 31.11 per cent of the respondents.

2.5 Suggestions from Heads for better performance in Panchayat Raj institutions

Mukharji (1994) opined that the state level politicians and bureaucrats are generally regarded as the main obstacles in the way of decentralized governance. Panchayat must have the power to recruit and control their own staff, until they are in a position to exercise this power, all existing state employees need to be placed at their disposal on deputation.

Gajre (1997) reported that all the respondents suggested for financial support by the government, increasing taxes on weekly bazaar and active participation by the extension agencies. The next important suggestions were 'timely and adequate cooperation by Zilla Parishad and Panchayat Samiti (97.65 per cent) and co-operation by villagers in various activities (93.75 per cent).

Kiranmayee (1997) suggested that the non co-operative members should be suspended, the groups should be divided into small groups, members should be educated and awareness about development scheme should be created, and marketing facilities should be improved.
Kanase (2012) revealed that majority of the respondents (55.35 per cent each) suggested that ‘Government schemes may be communicated to the people through mass media like T.V., radio, newspaper ’ as well as, ‘Experts /SMS / officers and leaders may give more communication time to PRI members’. This was followed by ‘PRI woman members may get acquainted and use more personal cosmopolite sources of information’ (53.57 per cent). ‘Meetings / visits of PRI officials may be arranged more in numbers’ suggested by 51.79 per cent respondents. ‘Number of trainings may be increased for PRI woman members’ was suggested by 42.85 per cent respondents. ‘Experts / SMS may guide as per needs of PRI members’ was suggested by 40.17 per cent respondents. One-third (33.92 per cent) of respondents suggested ‘Pre-intimation regarding upcoming exhibitions, rallies, field visits be provided promptly’, while 32.14 per cent respondents suggested that, ‘magazines, books on schemes may be provided in time.’ Computer, internet handling trainings may be given to PRI woman members’ (28.57 per cent).

Mankar et al. (2012) reported that half of the respondents gave suggestions to overcome the technological problems (49.84 per cent) and development of marketing facilities (50.47 per cent). Other important suggestions were’ processing units should be established on co-operative basis’ (38.41 per cent), ‘creation of transportation facilities’ (37.77 per cent) and ‘elected representatives and local leaders should motivate people for co-operation’ (36.50 per cent). An equal percentage of the panchayat members (36.19 per cent) had suggested, ‘establishing co-operative societies in agriculture’ and the number of input supplying and distributing organization should be increased. About one-third of the respondent suggested, ‘to organize farmers trips to progressive farmer’s field’ (33.96 per cent) and an equal percentage of the panchayat members (31.11 per cent) emphasized the requirement of the telephone sets and furniture in the office. The most important suggestions offered by the panchayat members were to provide independent staff and sufficient and regular funds. The other suggestions were extension workers should give timely guidance and training facilities on improved farming and allied fields should be made available in village itself.