

CHAPTER - IV

ROLE OF BUREAUCRACY AND PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION IN RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Section 4.1 Bureaucracy

In our preceding chapter we have shown that there is much to be done in Integrated Rural Development Programmes, (IRDP) in order to have wider impact, on the rural economy. For this peoples participation is sought and advocated.

People participation has been catchword for politician, economists and social reformers. It is corollary to popular participation democratic decentralisation and rural development. But the major problems underlying participation is in fact, that it is nearly impossible to determine what participation entails. It means different things to different investigator and the issue originates in different value system. "It is grounded in physiological, Sociological, economic, political and legal paradigm; it transcends, micro and macro issue regarding individuals, organisation, whole societies from individual motivation and ability consideration through leadership and group dynamic issue to variety of less intensive and more restricted participation schemes, which includes various form of indirect or representative participation"¹. Whereas Van Heck remarks that rural organisations are effective ... only if set-up in suitable forms based on the principle of self help and above all, run by the members themselves. He concurs the basic requirements of popular participation as that the members through their rural organisation should be able to:

(a) participate in the decision-making concerning their development.

(b) contribute effectively to development efforts.

(c) and to share equally in the benefit of development².

Mr. A.Z.M. Obaidullah points out that the present crisis in rural development, the deepening poverty, is not merely an unfortunate episode but an inevitable consequence of past intentions to exclude the rural majority from development planning and processes, to avoid institutional and structural reforms including agrarian reforms, and to concentrate normally on increasing production. He concludes that it is the policy makers, the bureaucrats, the technocrats who along with donors decide what is good for the rural people³. So it is essential that IRDP as other rural programmes should be able to abandon the above thinking and actions and operationalize the programme on the basis of maximum participation.

No doubt, Nepal a country pledged to a policy of maximising people's participation in the administration and development has taken up a tough task to apply this ideal. The constitution of Nepal cites : "Participation of the people in the process of economic development of the country" one of the economic objectives of the present political system⁴. Hence the Panchayat partyless system was the institution, from the national to the village level which incorporates peoples participation in planning, implementation and evaluation of all development activities. The eminent Nepalese economist Dr. Badriprasad Shrestha remarks that development is essentially a political process. He is confident that this Institution can be made more responsive to the people. "Probably this is the development model

which is most appropriate and which after years of experience will really be workable"⁵. Hence the Rasuwa/Nuwakot IRDP and Sagarmatha IRDP of our study, have also embraced this principle of participation; so we shall here, try to prove the hypothesis that (a) there is a relationship between rural participation and successful implementation of rural development. And (b) whether mass participation for development purpose is dependent on mobilisation capacity of the Panchas or such kind of leadership has got to be tested.

For this study we have taken up the interview of the Project Co-ordinator of Rasuwa/Nuwakot IRDP and Sagarmatha IRDPs. And the line agencies at the local level of our study area. Especially the role of Local Development Officer (LDO) and the Multipurpose Development worker (MPDW) at the District and Village Panchayat (VP) level, respectively have been studied. The role of the elected representative of the VP, Sajhas (Co-operatives) and User's Committee have been assessed. Finally the study entails participation of the respondents in the IRDPs.

The evaluation reports of Rasuwa/Nuwakot (R/N) project comments that, though the project co-ordinator (PC) was regarded as the kingpin of the project, he was mostly unsuccessful in performing his functions. The co-ordinator had not been able to "co-ordinate the activities of the participating ministries in a meaningful way"⁶. "While his duties required him to essentially orchestrate the inputs and policies of different line ministries, his image as an employee of a Ministry i.e. Ministry of Panchayat and Local Development did not give him necessary authority to make his suggestions and interventions acceptable to them. Consequently, the office was more or less

ignored by the rest of the ministries, which had decidedly negative effect on the pace and integrated nature of the project"⁷.

Our interview with the two Project Co-ordinators also voiced similar views. While enquiring to the role of this office, the PCs pointed out, existence of number of problems as the cause. To them the reimbursement problem and no direct authority to catch the default contractors, the interference of local and political leaders were greatest headache. It may be observed that within the project's initial period and our survey period (1985) three P.C. in R/N and four P.C. in Sagarmatha IRDPs were changed. The inference that we can draw from this is that such frequent transfers, the insecurity of the project staff, the non-training facility (as reported by the PC) and the tight situation of the P.C. all culminated in less or negative participation in the two IRDPs.

The participating role of the Local Development Officer (LDO) in the district is similarly constrained as that of the P.C. at the project level. He is the responsible body for local development and is a link between the district and village panchayats and between the centre and the district. His upgraded post from the panchayat Development Officer (PDO) makes him equivalent to the post of the Chief District Officer but it is doubted that he can be as effective as the Chief District Officer (CDO equal to Magistrate). This is because works of development move faster on the command of those who have power, to arrest and punish, than those, who have only resources, as that of the LDO. This holds true especially in a country like Nepal. Again since he is the Chief of the district Panchayat secretariat he has also the responsibility to co-ordinate the different

line agencies at the district level. But the problem is that though all the district line agencies come under the administrative control of the LDO, "in practice they follow instructions from their own line agencies". These line ministries take the IRDP as "outside activities. Some departments have centralized administration as such in agriculture centrally controlled decisions have little relevance to field situations"⁸. So, it is natural that conflict will arise between the LDO and the local-level officers of the line agencies⁹.

Further his position as a Secretary to the district panchayat has somewhat clipped his wings for effective role in implementation of programmes. It seems he has to appease two masters - the panchayat officials and his higher level officials. His dual role has sometimes put him in a difficult position while making important decisions. Therefore the LDO in the context of IRDP is, according to Bharat Bhadur Pradhan "as little effective"¹⁰.

The evaluation reports, and our impression from field study, shows many shortcomings for effective Integrated Rural development Programmes. The responsible line agencies as agriculture, extension services, health extension services, overseers etc. and supportive agencies, as banks, co-operatives etc. face many problems such as, limited delegation of authority, heavy work, frequent turnover of heads and technical staff. As for example, the agriculture extension workers of Chaugadha Panchayat was transferred, but no replacement was sent since four months. Likewise the post of veterinary assistant was vacant from its initial days in Chaugadha. The district planning officials especially of Saptari district were so much vexed with the local political interference that they did not want to stay at

the district. Not unoften, as a result, the post was vacant. All these short comings of the bureaucratic institution, hampered their participation in IRDP. This in turn hindered rural participation.

The Multipurpose village Development Worker is the lowest bureaucratic administrative representative of the Ministry of Panchayat and Local Development. He is the link between the villagers and works, as the subject matter specialist at the village level. The MPWDW acts also as the Secretary of the village panchayat. Thus he is responsible for helping the V.P. in formulation and implementation of development projects at the village level. There is no doubt that he can play an important and effective role in operationalizing agent for IRDP. But the MPDW has not been able to play this role satisfactorily. What can we expect from a simply matriculate person with just two weeks training. He is supposed to collect information and keep records of the Village Panchayat. But we found that there exists wide discrepancy between MPDW expected role/action and the actual role/action. This may be explained by low level moral favouritism, nepotism, red tapism, absentism etc. , all common ~~days~~ functionalities of administrative bureaucracy. Low pay no/or little facilities and insufficient training may also be added to the above.

We learnt from our interrogation that in the ten village panchayats, the MPDWs are quite popular figure among the rural mass. In our survey period we found that six MPDWs were present in their respective panchayats. And out of them three had maintained records of the panchayat income source and expenditure outlets. It has been found that where the village pradhan panchs were comparatively better educated (to the village standard) they dominated in the decisions for local development and vice-versa was the cases, where the pradhan

was less educated. That is, it seemed that the servant (MPDW) was the master of the village affairs and the master (Pradhan) the servant, of those panchayats where the pradhans were docile and less qualified. There were covert complains that some MPDW were in collusion with the pradhans in the misappropriation of development funds. And some pradhans complained about the MPDW regular absence from their stationed villages. All in all we can conclude that MPDW can be a powerful agent to initiate change at the village level. Hence it may be suggested that the post should be made more attractive; regular surveillance and evaluation of MPDW's work is essential. If it is so done it would be possible to bring about effective participation in local development work.

4.2 Co-operatives and Users Committee

So far we have delineated the participation of the administrative agents. Now we shall analyse the respondents participation in the form of institutions as the co-operative (named as Sajha) Users Committee and the village panchayat. And in the form of direct participation of the respondents, of our concerned ten villages panchayats.

The Ex Finance Minister Bharat Bahadur Pradhan stated at the Local Aid Group Meeting held in January 18 (1990) that "Nepal is fully committed to decentralization as an important strategy of development and H.M.G. (His Majesty's Government) believes that administrative decentralisation, user's Group participation and the involvement of local representative institutions would foster cost effective and self-sustaining people oriented rural development"¹¹. Hence we find that an important local representative institution as Sajhas were established at the local level. These Sajhas have been regarded as

an integral part of the economic philosophy of the Panchayat political System by the constitution of Nepal¹². The main objectives of these co-operatives has been to bring about social and economic upliftment of the poor by pooling land labour and capital. The management of such societies are supervised by the Agriculture Development Bank/ Nepal. And they are governed by the Sajha Executive Board, with the Pradhan Pancha and up-pradhan pancha as its Chairman and Vice Chairman respectively. For the formation of a Sajha at least 25 members should be associated but they need not belong from the same village panchayat. The functions of these societies are to supply agricultural inputs as credit, fertilizers, insecticides, HYV seeds etc. and consumer goods such as Kerosene, Salt, Sugar etc. They are also to provide credit and raw materials for cottage industries. Further they function as agents for their members in marketing and developing their activities.

There are 711 Sajha Societies with 10,700 members, covering 67 districts (out of 75 district) of the country¹³. The CIRDAP paper states that Sajha are the vehicle for implementation of IRDP at the village level. These societies are used for effective implementation of programmes as IRDP¹⁴. The two IRDPs Rasuwa/Nuwakot and Sagarmatha project of our study area has altogether 76 Sajha societies (until 1985)¹⁵. All these societies provided credit and input facilities. While only Sajhas of Saptari and Rasuwa district provided consumer goods also¹⁶. In our study area we came across 5 Sajha societies. We found that these societies though constrained by financial problems and shortage of administrative staff, were quite resourceful to villagers.

Table 4.2

District-wise Sajha Societies (Year 1985)

District	No.	Total member
Siraha	23	39999
Saptari	23	56613
Udaipur	11	19155
Nuwakot	13	8795
Rasuwa	6	4321
Total	76	130883

According to the above table the highest number of membership in Sajha is reported in Saptari. In fact respondents of Kalyanpur of Saptari districts noted that greater amount of benefits were received in the form of loans, seeds and fertilizers from Sajha.

About 90 percent of our respondents buy input from these institutions. Our interrogation with societies officials, found that the middle and small farmers benefitted more than big farmers. Only in Kalyanpur panchayat, the benefit was enjoyed by big farmers. Among the 5 Sajha it was the Sree Sajha Sansthan Sukhipur, the Sree Sajha Sansthan Katari and Jan Kalyan Sajha Sansthan Chaugadha were running successfully. Therefore the membership of these societies have also increased. The Sukhipur Sajha covering four other V.P. had the highest membership amounting to 6892. These societies had not only successfully supplied credit, ferlizers and insecticides but

were also increasing the sale of their member's production. Further the Sajha of Katari, Chaugadha and Kalyanpur also sold consumer goods as sugar, kerosene oil, salt and soap. The managers of these societies were of the view, that for more effective and profitable running of Sajhas, the scope of selling agricultural and consumer goods should be increased. More trained staff and more financial support should also be provided. The Katari and Kalyanpur Sajha staff complained, that they were very lowly paid (less than the government scale) and had no job guarantee. If such state continues, it is likely to kill the incentive of the staff, who have come from towns (place of comfort) to live and work at the village level.

As a whole we can conclude that Sajha societies participation has been quite successful. Traditional money lenders are the major source for providing loans to the respondents. But some change has ushered in, for the respondents are realising the benefit of Sajhas. As for example the Rais (Tribal caste) of Chaugadha now feel that the trend to sell their lands to pay off debt has stopped with the availability of official (Sajha and Banks) credit source¹⁷.

4.3. Village Panchayats

The village panchayat is the lowest tier of the panchayat pyramidal structure of Nepal. From time memorial the tradition to mobilize local resources for village development existed in Nepal. The panchas formed by the local people were leaders and the responsible body of the V.P. It was because of this, that the staunch followers of the panchayat government, ~~retorically~~ boast, that it was best suited for the country. And no other system can work better in Nepal's soil. With the dawn of the system in 1960. V.P. were formed throughout

the country. A Village Panchayat ~~has~~ an executive body known as the panchayat and a legislative body known as the village Assembly. It was composed of all adult members of the village. There are about 4100 village panchayat in Nepal¹⁸. Ignoring the drawbacks of the system, "it had at least given some identifiable forum in the village where the villagers can voice their opinions and ask for redress for the conditions of the villagers"¹⁹.

Similar to the line agencies representative of the central administrative set up, the District Panchayat and Village Panchayat of elected representative worked as responsible bodies for local development. Our study covers specifically the village panchayat; for its viability is the root cause of any successful local programmes as IRDP. In our discussion of the planning process of IRDP we have cited the role of the village panchayat Institution. Here we shall therefore analyse the role of village panchayat members i.e. their participation. And how they have been successful leaders to initiate participation of the mass, for self betterment.

It has been realised that the administrative machinery by itself cannot fulfil the tasks of local development since it lacks popular support. Hence democratic decentralization had to be introduced so as to provide leadership at various levels with a matching support of administrative, technical and financial resources from above. Without support guidance and supervision from above it would lead to debility. So decentralization is not abdication of responsibility²⁰. As such the leadership at various level operate as a linkage between the centre and the village level, between the administration and the general mass. These linkage connects the political

structure with the economic and social goals set, before the nation.

"It was the realisation of the importance of local participation and local leadership, that had initiated the establishment of community development programme and panchayati raj in Indian states. The panchayati raj has as its aim, the association of democratically elected representatives to a greater degree than the traditional leaders in societies journey from traditionality to modernity"²¹. Thus the success of development programmes as IRDP largely depends on the role of leaders whether they be formal or informal. Because they are the engines of society which can mobilize the mass in development activities. Emergence of mass initiative cannot be spontaneous in societies where there has been systematic exploitation of the masses and a sort of dependence on the elite group has stayed over the years. Hence a strong leader is a requisite to break their non-communicative and passive shell and make them participate in programmes of rural regeneration. It also requires that the leadership systematically educates the masses and through their critical examination and continuous dialogue get educated in return, so that the ideas of the masses form an organic part of the thought process of leadership itself²².

It is well established that personal quality, educational status, caste, race and wealth status of leaders play important roles, in motivating participation. It is these traits that strongly influence the masses to follow the leader. In a village society a man's status is measured by his property (land) and by his caste. A village that is more enclosed from outward influence, will have a greater impact of such thinking. Hence it is seen that the traditional

leaders of such villages were those men who were economically or socially at the top.

The village panchayat leaders that represented the ten panchayats showed that among the twenty two panchas, seven were Khatriyas, Five Tharus and Three Brahmins. The table 4.3 shows that caste composition of the interviewed panchas. It was noted that cast majority overshadows caste superiority. In other words it means that which ever cast predominates, it will be chosen as the panchayat leader. Thus caste feeling was pronounced in the Nepalese villages. However we must not overlook stray examples where the pradhan ~~Powals~~ or ward panchas came from the minority caste as in Govindpur and Katari panchayats.

Another similarity between the traditional leader and our village leaders was that comparatively all were economically well off. The disclosed annual income table 4.4 of points out that 7 of them had income above NRs 50,000 only 3 persons had income below NRs 10,000. The word 'disclosed' annual income is mentioned here because the observer found majority of the leaders ~~had~~ suppressed their real income.

Besides caste and income age and education factors were also taken up for our observation. It is generally understood that caste and income superiority may have a negative effect on the attitude of a person, while education and age may have a positive effect. Further age and education are more propelling forces of participation of the village community. As for example caste and income may increase selfishness of the leader. Possibility is more that blinded by it, he

Table 4.3

Caste Composition of the leaders

<u>V.P</u> <u>Caste</u>	Sukhiapur	Govindpur	Kalyanpur	Khojpur	Katari	Risku	Dhaibung	Ramche	Chaughadha	Gane- sthan	Total
Brahmin	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	3
Kshetrya	1	2	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	7
Tharu	1	-	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
Teli	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Kulwar	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Magar	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Danuwar	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	3
Tamang	-	-	-	-	-	-	.	1	-	-	1
	3	5	4	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	22

Table 4.4

Annual Income of the Leaders

Income Group	Below 10,000	10,000- 20,000	20,000- 30,000	30,000- 40,000	40,000-50,000	50,000 above	Total
Govindpur	3	-	-	-	-	2	5
Sukhipur	-	-	-	-	1	2	3
Kalyanpur	-	-	-	1	1	2	4
Khojpur	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Katari	-	1	-	1	-	-	2
Risku	-	1	1	-	-	-	2
Dhaibung	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Ranche	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Chaughada	-	-	2	-	-	-	2
Ganesthan	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Total	3	3	4	3	2	7	22

may not be capable for performing his duties expected from him. Whereas person coming from younger age, and educated group are likely to be more susceptible to change (change for the better). They may not be prejudiced to development.

Table 4.5

Age composition of Leaders (Panchas)

Age (years)	Number
Below 25	Nil
25-35	3
35-45	7
45-55	9
55 to above	3
Total	22

The above table depicts the age composition of the 22 panchas. It shows that among the 22 panchas 9 come from the middle age group. While the younger and older generation represent equally. Our study reveals that there was no positive correlation between age and susceptibility to change. Since some panchas who came from older age group were more development oriented than the younger age group, as of Kalyanpur pancha. But there existed a direct correlation between motivating participation and age factor. In Govindpur and Katari both pradhan panchas, came from the younger group, and were better educated

than the older or middle age groups, they were, however, less successful to motivate participation of the villagers. Nevertheless education played a vital role in the thinking and actions of the leaders. Let us review the table below showing the educational status according to panchayat distribution.

Table 4.6

Educational status of leaders

Village panchayat	Illite- rate	Primary	Lower Sec- ondary	Secondary	Higher	Total
Dhaibung	-	1	-	-	-	1
Ramche	-	1	-	-	-	1
Chaugadha	-	2	-	-	-	2
Ganesthan	-	1	-	-	-	1
Sukhipur	-	2	1	-	-	3
Govindpur	-	2	-	1	2	5
Katari	-	1	-	-	1	2
Risku	-	2	-	-	-	2
Kalyanpur	-	3	-	-	-	3
Kojpur	-	1	-	1	-	2
Total	-	16	1	2	3	22

The table presents that none of the leaders were illiterate, even though majority were educated at primary standard. It is followed by leaders who come from the higher educated group. These educated

come from the young age group of our sample. Thus pointing out the positive trend that may take place in the villages in the future. Our interrogation of these leaders showed that the more educated were comparatively enthusiastic. They were more acquainted with the problems of their locality. The more educated panchas dominated the line agencies in decision making and implementation of IRDP. Comparatively programmes implementation was less delayed in these villages than in those villages where the leaders were less educated.

While comparing the nature of the new emerging leadership with the traditional leadership there exists very slight difference. It was revealed that the panchayat membership was the monopoly of persons who were economically better-off, advanced in age and come from higher castes and ethnic majority despite changes in the polity and government policy. Similar conclusions were drawn by Vijaya Shrestha (1980:98), Chandra Gurung (1987:20), A.L. Pradhan and P.B. Chhetry (1981:39). Again case studies of local leadership in Nepal conducted by Centre for Economic Development and Administration, Tribhuvan University (CEDA) of four panchayats showed a high correlation between socio-economic status and political power. The poorer section of the society, the landless labourers and low castes are still outside the political circle. Another case study of CEDA, conducted by Prof. B.C. Malla of Suayambhu Area (Kathmandu) in 1986 gives the following findings: First, the local panchas (ward chairmans) did not care about the development and public welfare. Secondly, there was misappropriation of development budgets. Thirdly, "most of the local panchas were more post and business oriented". Fourthly, there was evidence of groupism with their antagonistic feeling among the

panchas. He concludes that this nature of leadership was causing ineffectiveness in the development plan and programmes in the area²³. The panchas (leaders) of our study area were similar. It is perhaps these unhealthy traits of leadership, that is the root cause of failure of development programmes, and also the failure to mobilize the mass for effective participation. The related studies of new leaders in India presented totally a mixed picture. In Rajasthan the leaders who dominated the panchayats were farmers relatively well off compared to the needy majority. But to-day they are enthusiastic men willing to devote time and energy to rural development. In Maharashtra V.M. Sirsikar observed that local political system remained under the leadership of richer peasantry. In Sikkim, Sita Ram Shah points that panchayat has failed to become agents of growth (1987: 198). Whereas in West Bengal Arun Ghosh points out that a new type of leadership has come to dominate in the system of political devolution. Poor peasants and agriculture labourers, and scheduled castes and tribes have come to the forefront (1988). However as Dr. D. Bhowmick remarks that the "new leadership is not prone to accept modernization requirements; it has not yet been able to understand its vital role as agents of social change"²⁴.

In Nepal we can say that change in the nature and composition of the panchayat leaders has emerged. Our findings though small prove this. We found as a whole, that except in Khojpur, Risku and Ganesthan panchayats, the leaders were somewhat successful in motivating the participation of the villagers, in development works. Interestingly, it was almost impossible to get any information from the respondents, unless these leaders gave their consent. Even the backward caste as

the Tamangs were stirred up by the village panchayat institution to participate in local development. The case studies by writers on Nepal as Mark Cobat (1971), Martin Edward D (1986), Himal (1988), Vijaya Shrestha (1988) are in agreement, that these leaders are interested in local development and are also somewhat actively participating in it.

In regarding the leaders view point, specifically, of our concern (IRDP) we found that in greater number the leaders voiced, that for effective participation, IRDP should invest more on irrigation, transport and market. The second priority was on health, animal husbandry and flood control. And lastly for technical knowhow, loan, cottage industry and horticulture. The related other recommendations that the local leaders suggested were as such : (1) Plans for rural development as IRDP should be a continuous process. (2) Evaluation and supervision of the programmes should be regular. The officials responsible for such programmes should not visit places of convenience only. (3) Quick punishment should be given to the defaulters of funds for village development. (4) Local resources should be utilized for IRDP, but payment should not be delayed. (5) The leaders of Ganesthan panchayat specifically denounced the policy of IRDP's direct payment to the contractors of rural works. He adds, this policy has lessened the participation of the local people since the outsiders do the work, they do not care. This results to wastage of investment, because the observer also saw the constructed works were of very low standard. The leaders conclude that what is the point of investing in our areas, when it will collapse before the project ends, or if when it requires high amount of maintenance payment. (6) Lastly they complain that the

development materials supplied are of low quality. They remark that by the same money one could get a better material, perhaps cheaper from Indian markets.

Programmes like IRDP requires the cordial relation between the peoples representatives (local leaders) and the government representative (line agencies) working in the district and village panchayats. Our interrogation with both these agents of change, gave us the view that there exists wide gap between the two. Each blaming the other for the failure of development works. As for example, the answer to the question of effectiveness of the role of panchayat Ministry for IRDP was vehemently criticised by the panchas. The panchas remarked that the ministry had not been able to play its co-ordinating role effectively, but the line agencies claimed its role effective. Similarly to the problem faced by IRDP beneficiaries, the leaders unanimously replied that there was a lack of co-ordination at all levels. In other words, the line agencies were of the view that the panchas and the local people lacked the knowledge of the programme. However, some of the officials were affirmative that there was a lack of co-ordination between them. Likewise some of the leaders as of the pradhan of Katari panchayat numbly agreed that they were unable to grasp the exact detail of benefits that their panchayats were to receive and hence faulty sites for market complex were choosen. For the delay and failure of programme implementation, these parties agreed, the delay in release of fund was responsible.

The undercurrent enomity between these two responsible agents is an obstacle for mobilizing participation of the villagers. One

interesting episode was noted here. In a district Assembly meeting (Village Panchas are its member) the minister (Representative in the district) advised that there should be good co-ordination between panchas and administration, which is so essential for the implementation of the rural development. But in every panchayat there had been presence of cold war between the two. In Rasuwa district, while interviewing a line official, a ward chairman was grumbling, accusing the government in delaying the supply of raw materials. He had come from a distant village several times for the material. The officer coolly answered him "It is your purse", the pancha fired back angrily "but its your hand that opens it". So it is found that leaders (national or local) by the use of their political rhetoric amply proved that they acted inconsistent with the purposes of the rural development programmes.

Finally let us analyse the viewpoint of the respondents in assessing the role played by the leadership in their respective places. Interestingly, their observations are important though they are illiterate largely. The table below shows this.

Table 4.7Respondents' view on Panchas of development works

Panchayats	Active	Responsible	Efficient
Khojpur	28	14	1
Kalyanpur	26	8	2
Govindpur	29	1	-
Sukhipur	31	11	5
Risku	3	6	3
Katari	19	27	-
Ganesthan	2	6	-
Chougadha	34	10	4
Ramche	11	1	-
Dhaibung	28	-	-
Total	211 (45.86%)	84 (18.26%)	13 (3.91%) 100

The respondents were inquired about their respective village Panchas role, in the development of the villages. Three possible traits of the leaders - namely activeness, responsible and efficient towards development were put forward, in order to assess the respondents views. By active we mean that the Pancha-realises the problem and takes action to solve it . And he is responsible person when he supervises development works and sees it is completed. While efficiency means that he has knowledge about the development works and can give advice on it. In contrast to high response for the active role of the leaders, low responses were given by the respondents

for the responsible and efficiency of the leaders. This clearly demonstrates that some of these panchas were not responsible and efficient agents for development, they were less successful to initiate greater participation. While questioning some of the respondents complained that there were also leaders who misappropriated the development funds.

It is seen that highest percentage of respondents i.e. 45.86 percent were of the view that the leaders were active. We found however, that many of them said it because they did not want to antagonise the leaders. They wanted to be in their (leader) good books. Further it was found that the post of pancha was not only source of power but also a good source of gaining benefits economically and socially. Hence the post of the pancha in the elections has been observed to be a tough war between the better off persons.

4.4. An Emperical Study

Again and again, it is repeatedly voiced in the national and international forums to ensure maximum participation of the local people in all round development programmes under integrated Rural Development. But even after three decades of planning where do we stand? Our planners and politicians are still searching for the panecea of mass poverty. The rural people are still in slumber, and generally no policies have been significant so as to arouse them to create a viable self-sustaining society. What is the mistake? Is it because, what is planned or preached is not practised? Or is it because we have forgotten that self-sufficient village community existed, and exists even to-day. Such types of questions can go on

continuously, misled. What we want to drive through at the outset of our analysis, is that participation in whichever form, should be practically applicable and organic in nature. What is lacking in the programmes as IRDP is well conveyed by Bharat Prasad Pradhan. In his words, "Another fundamental problem is the confusion about people's participation while there is some consensus about its meaning - participation in plan formulation implementation, evaluation and benefit, sharings there is lack of clear thinking in its practical application ..."²⁵. Again "The introduction of the local rural institutions as experienced has shown, does not necessarily imply capacity of these institutions to plan and implement development activities"²⁶. Without developing necessary capacity for the different phases of participation at the local (district as well as village) level "peoples participation will remain a rhetoric"²⁷.

Our contention is that, somehow from somewhere the link has been disrupted. Participation generally has been conceived or centred round 'Saramdan' meaning voluntary labour participation in development works. And otherways of participation, such as resource collection, planning, implementation and maintenance^g different economic and social activities have been relegated to the background. Identical views have been expressed by A.L. Pradhan^{and} and P.B. Chhetry "Despite plans for self-reliance, the rural people have developed dependency in all, including developing leadership for rural development programmes"²⁸. There is also another side of the pictures: "Backward and neglected though they are the rural people of Nepal have through centuries been surviving through self help and community effort. Difficult mountain trails elaborate irrigation schemes

drinking water systems etc have been built and maintained by them without any government support"²⁹. Even in the present days there are examples where participation in planning implementation and evaluations of developing activities have been fruitful such as the Gajuri Mini Hydel plant³⁰, Banglung suspension bridge and the Illam Charali road (75 km)³¹.

Now coming to our study areas we must firstly mention the existence of Users Committees. These committees are formed in different IRDPs operating in Nepal. But their functioning pattern are not uniform. As for example the Canadian supported Karnali-Bheri IRDP, the U.S.A. supported Rapti IRDP and U.K. supported Koshi hill IRDP and the Tuki (lamp) program introduced by Switz Assistance have the participation programme of the local people. In these projects the beneficiaries identify their needs, plan them and implement them. They also operate and maintain the projects. While in Rasuwa/Nuwakot and Sagarmatha IRDP Users Committee are formed to operate and maintain the projects. The thinking behind the Users Committee, is to create and develop viable local institutional for ensuring maximum participation of the village populace. Consequently, hoping that such IRDP will be most successful in the amelioration of economic condition of the rural mass. The success stories of these User's Committee are mixed. Nepalese economists, such as Bharat Bhadur Pradhan has remarked that the object of IRDPs to develop local institution as User's Committee have not come in the forefront, due to practical and operational weakness. While project analysis of Rasuwa/Nuwakot have showed them (Godkhar User's Committee) as "rare attempts by a department (His Majesty's Government) to establish

a responsible service recipient group"³².

These Users' Committees were not present in Sagarmatha project; hence we have not taken up this type of participation of our respondents. Nevertheless, to support the hypothesis on participation an overview based on secondary data of User's Committee working in R/N will be worthwhile. One such committee is the Gadkhar Water Users Committee (WUC), and the other is Labdu-Dhikure-Sera WUC.

The Gadkhar (GWUC) is in Chaugadha Panchayat, which is also the panchayat of our project area. This committee is formed for Gadkhar Irrigation scheme under R/N project. This irrigation is a gravity scheme, designed to irrigate 100 hectares crop of monsoon paddy. It is located at the confluence of the Tadi and Likhu rivers³³. This scheme is regarded "as the most successful of the three schemes undertaken by the department of irrigation"³⁴. The GWUC is in harmony with the New Decentralization Act 1982. This act emphasises maximum participation of the local people, in scarce resource mobilization on equity basis ensuring that it would institutionalize a pattern of self-reliance in the rural development process. The composition of WUC membership portrayed below shows that the big and medium land owners and rais (caste) who are actually in majority in the panchayat are dominant in membership.

Table 4.8Distribution of WUC Members

Political Affiliation		Landownership	
Pancha	14	Big (over 20 ropanis)	9
Non-pancha	12	Medium (10-20 ropanis)	8
		Small (4-10 ropanis)*	7
Caste:			
Rais	13	Tenant	1
Brahmins	5	Landless	1
Chhetries	3	Location of Holding:	
		Head	13
Newars	2	Middle/Tail	13
Others	3		

* No WUC members were marginal landholders (less than 4 ropanis)

20 ropanis = 1 hectare.

Source: Chaughada Agriculture Sub-Center (reproduced here from Upendra Gautam's Natural Resource Management Paper Series 1981).

The other remarkable thing is that, though with a slight margin, it is the panchas who are in greater numbers. The inference from our perception of Chaughada panchayat shows that perhaps this ethnicity is somewhat to blame for the causes of the irrigation projects' mounting problems, that were being faced in the later stages. The rais are noted for their simplicity, weakness and backwardness, in the Nepalese society. "Rais who still maintain deference patterns characteristic of feudal serfs"³⁵. Hence it is possible that

their views, against the responsible officials, at the very initial stage of the irrigation plan was not heeded or scoffed at. The recorded complains in 1982, 84, 85, 86 about the illegal diversions of water, the committee's helplessness, and the unwillingness of the irrigation department is an evident for our inference³⁶. Upendra Gautam explains that the sub-divisional Assistant Engineer remarked that the project was in the "poorest shape"³⁷. N.S. Peabody corroborates that "officials assistance has been irregular, uncoordinated and arbitrary, sometimes impeding the efforts of farmers, rather than supporting them"³⁸. However the conclusion and suggestion put forward by these two studies reveal that participation is possible and is fruitful. This supports our hypothesis that effectiveness of IRDP hinges on meaningful participation. To quote N.S. Peabody, "Farmers in Gadkhar have benefitted despite poor leadership, poor coordination and the arbitrary exercise of vested interests, bureaucratic and personal. They have learnt much about collective irrigation management and about the promises and limitation of the Gadkhar system"³⁹. Similarly with little addition Upendra Gautam concludes "the committee actively participated in system maintenance at all levels through massive labour mobilisation and their belief that, irrespective of what is written in the Decentralisation Act, they can manage the system only when the users and the DIHM (Department of Irrigation, Hydrology and Meteorology) co-operate to evolve a meaningful framework on which to build a capable institution"⁴⁰.

Now let us overview the other project namely Labdu-Dhikure - Sera irrigation project. The project is not located in our study area

but comes very near to our control area, the Ganesthan panchayat of R/N project. It gives us a good example of less participation of the populace hence the projects ineffectiveness (failure). The project analysis done by N.S. Peabody says that "The exceedingly high concentration of ownership (4% of the ownership units control over 60% of the land) undoubtedly why it was impossible to obtain "voluntary labour contribution for construction of the project". Again he argues "Right from the outset, the committee has been seen as the "Irrigation Engineer's Committee" a structure imposed from above, important yet threatening. Instead of serving as a communication link between HMG officials and local farmers as the Design Report predicted, the committee has been a glaring manifestation of poor communication and purveyor of misinformation"⁴¹. By studying these analysis we can therefore add, that before working out these projects it is always prudent to study deeply the socio-economic conditions as well as the local traditional institutions and compare them to the present conditions. Only under such circumstances the programmes as IRDP can be properly evaluated.

Let us proceed with the analysis of our study. At the outset we must mention that our study entails participation of the respondents in tune with the components of IRD programmes. That is, the respondent of the concerning village panchayats were inquired, in which way they directly participated in these programmes. Further, visualizing the remoteness of the villages created by physical and psychological barriers as caste, race and education we have tried also to assess their indirect participation in the form of their awareness of the project, their problems and suggestions and what

should be the priorities of such IRDP. What could be the possibilities of their failure?

A study conducted by CEDA on the impact of Rasuwa/Nuwakot IRDP on meeting Basic Human Needs showed the local participation in selection of the project. The table is reproduced here.

Table 4.9

Participation in the Selection of Projects

Category of farmers	Rasuwa district			Nuwakot district		
	Parti- cipated	Not partici- pated	Total	Parti- cipated	Not partici- pated	Total
Landless	-	7 (100)	7 (100)	9 (100)	- (100)	9
Marginal	3 (10)	27 (90)	30 (100)	3 (6.12)	46 (9.88)	49 (100)
Small	6 (11.76)	45 (88.24)	51 (100)	7 (10.14)	62 (89.86)	69 (100)
Medium	3 (7.32)	38 (92.68)	41 (100)	5 (9.26)	49 (90.7)	54 (100)
Large	2 (16.67)	10 (83.33)	12 (100)	13 (13.40)	84 (86.60)	97 (100)
	14 (9.93)	127 (90.07)	141 (100)	28 (10.07)	250 (89.93)	272 (100)

Source: Centre for Economic Development and Administration (CEDA) page 157.

Looking at the table we find that majority of the respondents in both Rasuwa/Nuwakot had not participated in the selection of the projects. The main reason was ignorance. Our study, shows that the sampled respondents of these districts were not ignorant of the project. They had quite a good knowledge of these programmes. While comparing the two projects Sagarmatha and R/N it has been found that the respondents of R/N were more aware than that of Sagarmatha project. Upendra Gautam's findings of water Users Committee was also similar to ours.

The three tables below pictures the awareness of the respondents in respect of IRD components. Each table shows different sides of the same picture.

Table 4.10

Respondents Awareness of IRD Components

(In Percentage of Responses of multiple answers)

	Command Area	Control Area
Agriculture	63.20	48.65
Irrigation	30.30	29.63
Forest	8.23	17.57
Water Conservation	-	-
Health	61.04	32.88
Transport	23.81	4.95
Drinking water	33.77	30.18
Co-operatives	77.92	92.79
Cottage Industry	6.43	9.46
Education	0.87	-

The first table shows the comparison of the command with that of control area. Command area means where IRD investment is centred and control areas where investment is negligible or absent). It is seen that in the field of co-operatives, forest and cottage industries the respondents of control area are more aware than that of command area. The highest percentage 77.92 in the command and 92.79 in the control area demonstrates the remarkable work done by co-operatives. In other words, the respondents have received direct benefit from the co-operatives. Next we find that in both areas the respondents have no idea of water conservation. This may be because these have not benefitted them, directly. Again the lowest percentage 6.43 in cottage industry and 0.87 in education in the command area, while its conspicuous absence of education component and 4.95 percent of transport in control area, speaks out much. Works actually in these fields have been very much neglected by the I.R.D. programme.

The second table represents awareness caste-wise (Table 4-11). Looking at the table we find that the activities of Co-operatives has drawn the highest number of attention of all the castes. The second highest in number is on Agriculture. Here I.R.D.'s contribution is in the provision of market facilities, loans, irrigation and extension services. Further, the caste-wise table shows that it is the higher Madhyse and lower Madhyse who are most aware of the co-operatives. This may be because of two reasons. First they represent the caste with highest owner-land ownership, is thus requiring more agriculture inputs supplied by these co-operatives. Secondly, because in the Sagarmatha I.R.D.P. the two districts Siraha and Saptari covered by the project is more inhabited by

Table 4.11

Respondents knowledge of I.R.D. by Castes

Castes	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	Total
Tagadhari	37	54	7	-	32	4	59	69	4	1	267
Tibeto Burman	37	35	2	-	30	13	47	44	18	-	226
Other Choko (hill groups)	12	12	-	-	19	10	10	30	-	-	93
Occupation- al caste	23	3	6	-	21	6	3	27	-	-	89
Higher caste Madhyse	84	8	27	-	34	18	3	92	-	-	287
Lower caste Madhyse	65	14	16	-	34	14	6	90	-	-	279
Others	4	12	-	-	5	1	18	32	-	-	62

a- Agriculture. b. - Irrigation c. Forest d. Water conservation
e. Health f. Transportation g. Drinking water h. Co-operative
i. Cottage Industry j. Education.

(Caste distribution based on the study of New Era Research
Project Centre in 1982).

these castes and other castes are negligible. But Rasuwa/Nuwakot project is a mixture of inhabitants of different castes. Another striking point featured by the table is that in the field of irrigation, drinking water and education the awareness of Tagadhari respondents is highest. Thus supporting the general perception that they had been benefited more or being the elite class they were more knowledgeable.

Table - 4.12

Percentage Distribution of Respondents
knowledge of IRDP by Income Group.

Income Group (in Nepali Rs)	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i
0-3000	1	1	-	-	3	1	2	2	-
3000-6000	39	30	19	-	23	11	35	66	4
6000-9000	51	35	12	-	40	8	41	75	8
9000-12000	47	27	15	-	36	12	38	61	3
12000-15000	31	16	13	-	22	8	16	43	5
15000 +	92	29	42	-	74	26	21	127	2
Total	261	138	101	-	198	76	153	374	22

Note: 1. The percentage is calculated on the basis of multiple response)

2. Abbreviation similar to the other tables.

The above table shows that all respondents irrespective of their income level are aware of co-operatives (Sajha) in their respected areas. However we find that the highest percentage is represented by the highest income group. Our perception is that this income group has benefited more because they are the ones whose ownership of land is also large. Similar is the case in the areas of forest, health and transportation. While in the field of irrigation, drinking water and education, it is the second and third income group who are more aware of the IRD programmes. The conclusion drawn is that in the field of agriculture health, and co-operatives

there is perfect correlation with income. That is higher the income, higher the awareness and vice-versa. In other areas the correlation is imperfect.

It is generally conceived that one major cause of the failure of programme is the distance maintained by the bureaucrats and technocrats from the village people. Consequently, the people have also looked at them as person, with whom distance should be maintained. This is just contrary to the idea of taking such personnels as the guide, supervisor and helpers to the villagers attempt for better life.

The pivotal role for village development is played by the Local Development Officer (L.D.O). He represents the bureaucrat administration of the government in the District Panchayat. Hence the L.D.O's way of thinking and his efficiency etc. is very important for the effectiveness of I.R.D.Ps. There is no doubt that between the panchayat leaders (Chairman of the district and the Chairman of the village) and the L.D.O. there will be frequent contact acquaintancy because both represent the agents of local development. But this would not suffice. Since effectiveness depends, not only on the knowledge and action of the leaders but also of the mass. Therefore our respondents knowledge of L.D.O. and how they rate him as a development worker was taken up for our study. The following tables give us the respondents view of L.D.O. in their respective districts.

Table - 4.13Rating of L.D.O. Assistance

	Yes	No	Total
Attentive	10 (3.31)	292 (96.69)	302 (100)
Co-operative	1 (4.55)	21 (95.45)	22 (100)
Efficient	6 (4.65)	123 (95.35)	129 (100)
	17 (3.75)	436 (96.25)	453 (100)

The respondents were questioned about L.D.O. assistance to their problems, the table-9 shows that only 3.75 percent gave their positive view and of which only 4.55 percent said that he was co-operative and 3.31 percent said that he was attentive. The second table shows the comparative picture of the two projects. Here we find that the whole positive view of the L.D.O. was the L.D.O. of Rasuwa/Nuwakot project. The Sagarmatha Project households totally gave the negative answer.

Table-4.14LD. O. Assistance Projectwise

	<u>Rasuwa/Nuwakot</u>			<u>Sagarmatha</u>		
	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total
Attentive	10 (58.82)	-	10 (6.25)	-	292 (99.66)	292 (99.66)
Co-operative	1 (5.08)	20 (13.99)	21 (13.13)	-	1 (1.34)	1 (1.34)
Efficient	6 (35.29)	123 (86.01)	129 (80.63)	-	-	-
Total	17 (100)	143 (100)	160 (100)	-	293 (100)	293 (100)

The respondents were also enquired about the L.D.Os' visits to their villages. One of the main functions of the L.D.O. is to supervise the development works conducted in the villages. This role has double effect. One is he can be more aware of the actual condition prevailing for development works (which he can relay to the higher level or, the centre). Secondly it will have the impression on the mass that he is vigilant so they may not shy away from him.

Table - 4.15Rating of L.D.Os visit

	<u>Number</u> <u>Total</u>	<u>Rasuwa/Nuwakot</u>	<u>Sagarmatha</u>
Once a month	12 (2.65)	12 (7.50)	-
Twice in a month	-	-	-
Thrice in a month	-	-	-
Don't know	441 (47.35)	148 (92.50)	293 (100)
Total	453	160 (100)	293 (100)

The above table portrays a poor picture of L.D.O. The respondents of the Sagarmatha project were ignorant of the L.D.O. visits. While only 7.50 percent of Rasuwa/Nuwakot I.R.D. responded that his visits were once a month.

The assessment of the views of our respondents relating to the L.D.O. is that the responsible L.D.Os of our study area have not been able to bridge the distance (between the officials and the public). Secondly, the respondents themselves have not been vigilant of the development activities.

Now let us come to the second important man, the Multipurpose Development Worker (MPDW). He is the lowest bureaucratic representative of the village level. His role is to assist the village panchayat in the formulation, implementation, and the evaluation of the annual plans. Hence there is no question as to his importance, in I.R.D. projects. Therefore the respondents of our surveyed panchayat were asked about the knowledge of MPDWs of their panchayats and his visits to the villages.

Table - 4.16

Distribution of Respondents aware of Multipurpose Development Worker Projectwise

	Rasuwa/Nuwakot			Sagarmatha		
	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total
Knowledge of MDW	95 (59.38)	65 (40.62)	160 (100)	220 (75.09)	73 (24.91)	293 (100)
Visit of MDW	91 (56.88)	69 (43.13)	160 (100)	153 (52.22)	140 (47.78)	293 (100)

The respective tables shows the comparative picture of the two projects; as well as the comparative picture of the command area and the control area. Looking at the first table we see that 59.38 percent of the respondents were aware of MPDWs in Rasuwa/Nuwakot while it was higher i.e. 75.09 in Sagarmatha. Considering the visits of MPDWs we find that the MPDWs of R/N were more frequent visitors than that of Sagarmatha.

Table - 4.17

Distribution of Respondents aware of Multipurpose Development Worker Projectwise

	Command Area			Control Area		
	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total
Knowledge of M. D. W.	119 (51.52)	112 (48.48)	231 (100)	101 (45.50)	121 (54.50)	222 (100)
Visit of MDW	85 (36.80)	146 (63.20)	231 (100)	68 (30.63)	154 (68.37)	222 (100)

The tables of command area and control area show that knowledge of the respondent for MPDW was 51.52 percent of command area and 45.50 percent of control area. But in the control area larger number of respondents were ignorant of M.P.D.Ws visits to their respective villages. The 63.80 percent of command and 69.37 percent of control area respondents had no idea of their visits. However the table shows that the percentage knowledge of MPDW and his visits is higher in command area than that of control area. The inference that can be drawn from these findings is that on the

whole the awareness of the MPDWs was not so poor. But about the visit it seems the respondents were not satisfied. This is important for we must not forget that he represents the Govt. and the general villagers will depend on his role to initiate them to participate in development works.

Our foregoing analysis give us the perceptions of the sampled respondents towards I.R.D. programmes and their assessment of administrative agents. Now we will proceed to analyse the form and extent of our respondents participation in the different development areas. Though there is participation in many areas, we have taken up only four areas such as transport, (road, trail, bridges), water, canal (irrigation) and public health. Since these are I.R.D. programmes highest investment areas, and also because participation of the respondents were negligible in other areas. Respondents were asked in which field they were engaged or where they contributed most in I.R.D. programmes.

Table - 4.18

Distribution of Respondents engaged to different development district-wise (percentage)

Districts	Transport	Drinking Water	Canal	Public Health	Total No. (%)
Siraha	51.57	30.00	3.14	14.47	159(100)
Saptari	46.48	30.23	9.86	13.38	142(100)
Udaipur	41.46	26.83	2.44	29.27	205(100)
Nuwakot	40.88	25.10	27.04	6.92	159(100)
Rasuwa	31.06	35.11	28.21	4.58	131(100)

The above table shows the districtwise engagement. It is seen that in all the districts except for Rasuwa the number of households contribution is highest in the field of transport. Second, is in the field of drinking water and the lowest is in the canal area. The highest number of respondents participating is in Udaipur.

Table - 4.19

Distribution of the Sample Respondents Contributing

Sagarmatha Project	a	b	c	d	Total
Hill Area	85 (41.46%)	55 (26.83)	5 (2.44)	60 (29.27)	205 (100)
Terai Area	148 (19.17)	92 (30.56)	19 (6.31)	42 (13.95)	301 (100)
<u>Rasuwa/Nuwakot Project</u>					
Hill area	107 (36.90)	86 (29.65)	80 (27.52)	17 (5.86)	290 (100)

Note: a. Road & Trail Construction. b. Drinking water. c. Canal.
d. Health Centre.

The second related table points out that development works through successful participation of the rural mass, is directly linked with the declaration of basic needs. It shows that in both project areas people participation was substantially higher for the construction of road and trail. The percentage of respondents participated in the hill area of Sagarmatha project is 41.46% and in Terai areas 49.17%, while in the Rasuwa Nuwakot project it is 36.90%. The relative low percentage in the field of canal in Sagarmatha

project speaks out the low investment on such areas. Thus alienating the main objective of I.R.D. to increase agricultural output.

The majority participation of our sample on transportation has been in conformity with other similar studies. As can be seen from the table projected by the base line studies of Sagarmatha and Rasuwa/Nuwakot projects.

Table - 4.20

Percentage Distribution of Households contribution of Different Development Activities by District.

Districts	School	Trail Roads	Panchayats Buildings	Irri-gation	Health	Soil conservation
Siraha	24.7	0.5	8.4	0.5	-	-
Saptari	57.0	2.3	4.0	-	-	-
Udaipur	53.2	78.7	10.2	15.7	2.8	3.9
Project Area	43.8	13.7	6.7	2.7	0.7	0.6

Source : Household Base Line Study (Sagarmatha)

Table 4.21Distribution of Farmers contribution to Local Development Projects.

Types of project	Percentage of total contribution
1. School	58.1
2. Tracks and trails	28.6
3. Bridges	7.4
4. Irrigation	3.6
5. Drinking water	1.0
6. Others	1.2
	100.00

Source : Household Base Line Survey, Rasuwa Nuwakot Development project.

These two tables reproduced here is only slight departure from ours. That is the participation of households were highest in the field of school developments. But we can see that the second highest participation was in the development of roads and trails.

The table showing participation analyses on the basis of different income group, gives the results as follows:

Table 4.22Distribution of Respondents Contributing to Different Development Activities by Income.

Income	Transport	Drinking water	Canal	Public Health	Total
0-3000	4	3	1	1	9
3000-6000	44	28	12	14	98
6000-9000	62	52	30	24	168
9000-12000	53	39	19	18	129
12000-15000	39	30	11	13	93
15000+	103	59	21	45	228
Total	305	211	94	115	725

Chi square 102.51* 63.84* 30.56* 57.21*

Chi square value from table for 5 df 15.09

Significant at 1 percent level of significance.

Highest participation of all income group is in the field of Transport at 305 and secondly Drinking water at 291. In the field of transport the participation is highest by the last income group, in the field of drinking water it is again the same group. While in the field of canal it is the third group. In public health it is again the highest income group. Chi square test is conducted to ascertain association between various activities by income group. The association was found to be highly associative as indicated by high value of chi square. Hence, it is concluded that as income increases involvement also increases in all activities.

The respondents of our sample were also enquired if they had contributed in I.R.D. programmes in cash or in labour days.

Table 4.23

Respondents Contribution in Public Works

Income group	In Cash	In Labour
0-3000	-	2
3000-6000	-	80
6000-9000	-	86
9000-12000	-	73
12000-15000	-	43
15000+	14	116
Total	14	400

The contribution in I.R.D. works is seen from the above table. It shows that contribution in cash, is done by only 14 respondents and all of them fall in the highest income group. It is again the same income group who have contributed in development works by highest labour participation which is followed by the third income group. The respondents were asked to rate their priority in which way their participation could be enhanced in I.R.D.P. components. The following table explains the results.

Table 4.24

Priority Set by Respondents for R/N and Sagarmatha Project

I.R.D. Components	<u>Command Area</u>				<u>Control Area</u>			
	I	II	III	Total (%)	I	II	III	Total (%)
Transport	38	68	48	154 (23.26)	49	57	45	151 (26.58)
Drinking water	28	59	17	104 (15.71)	19	56	19	94 (16.55)
Canal	125	62	14	201 (30.36)	58	49	41	148 (26.06)
Public Health	6	27	45	78 (11.78)	13	46	50	109 (19.19)
Education	3	12	22	37 (5.59)	1	8	12	21 (3.70)
Forestry	-	3	3	6 (.91)	-	-	-	-
Cottage Industry	3	2	-	5 (.76)	-	-	7	7 (1.23)
Co-operative Panchayats	-	4	37	7 (1.06)	-	2	2	4 (.70)
Water Conser- vation	14	20	33	67 (10.12)	5	2	16	23 (4.05)
	3	-	-	3 (.45)	-	1	10	11 (1.94)
Total	220	257	185	662 (100)	145	221	202	568 (100)

In both the command and control areas the top priority was given for canal constructions, percentage being 30.36 and 26.06 for command and control area respectively. The order of priority in the command area was canal, transport and drinking water. While for control area it was canal transport and public health. Thus except for the third priority, there is no difference in the priority set by the respondents. This clearly shows that IRDP has not been able to meet the fully ^{the} demands of the rural people.

The projectwise comparison of the respondents view can be seen from the table below:

Table 4.25

Respondents Priority in Sagarmatha project

Project Area	Highest I	Priority II	Set III
Transport	-	33 (32.67)	35 (36.84)
Drinking water	42 (25.30)	41 (40.59)	14 (14.74)
Canal	124 (74.70)	-	-
Public Health	-	27 (26.74)	34 (35.79)
Panchayat Develop- ment	-	-	12 (12.63)
Total	166 (100)	101 (100)	95 (100)

Table 4.26Respondents priority in Rasuwa/Nuwakot Project

Project Area	Highest I	Priority II	Set III
Transport	14(13.59)	15(34.88)	6(14.63)
Drinking water	44(42.72)	-	-
Canal	45(43.69)	16(37.21)	8(19.52)
Public Health	-	12(27.91)	27(65.85)
Total	103(100)	43(100)	41(100)

These tables depict that larger number of Sagarmatha IRDP, respondents set their first priority for canal and drinking water. For canal the percentage is higher. Drinking water was rated the second priority followed by transport. And the third priority was for transport, followed by public health, while the respondents of Rasuwa/Nuwakot project set their first priority for canal and drinking water. The percentage difference between these two is very little, compared to that of Sagarmatha. The same pattern of difference in priority was for the second position i.e. between canal and drinking water. The third position was given for public health. All these tables of priority (basis) for participation, point out that the factors as canal, transport, drinking water and public health are in fact those areas, where greater number of respondents can receive benefits. Thus they would participate more on these areas when they are called for.

In the setting of preferences, our study has differed from that of CEDA's. Their sample households of both Rasuwa/Nuwakot recorded their highest preference for cottage industries. The preference for irrigation and drinking water was given less priority⁴². We can conclude from this discussion that our respondents were more aware of their pressing needs. Naturally a country where agriculture is the life blood of the people its development should have top priority, which has been well assessed by our sampled respondents. These analysis also suggest that the investment pattern of IRDPs of both projects should be more channeled towards the development of irrigation facilities.

The establishment of IRD organisation to uproot the deep seated rural poverty can be possible by ~~motiva~~ motivating rural participation. Hence our above analysis proves the hypothesis that there is relation between rural participation and successful implementation of rural development programme. We have shown that since there is limited participation of the implementing agencies as well as the local people in the two projects, there has been limited success of the IRDPs, our evaluation brought forward the fact that the responsible agents created by IRDP as the project co-ordinator, has been given duties not in keeping with power and authority. The L.DO. was made responsible but was saddled with the extra burden of IRDP works. It seemed that these activities are not their responsibility. Further the frequent turnover, limited facility and incentive of these cadres hindered their participation in IRDP⁴³. The MPDW is the administrative link between the district and the respective village panchayat. He works as Secretary to the

village Panchayat. Hence in all village development works he is also made responsible agent. Our study found that these personnel had little influence where the village Pradhan, was educated and bold⁴⁴. Vice-versa was the case where village panchayat were docile and less educated. Records of village panchayat income and expenditure was kept by few M.P.D.W. No preliminary data of the village panchayat was recorded. Complaint of the M.P.D.W. was that, he was regularly absent and instance was also found of his seeking personal benefit by malpractices.

To create self reliant villages, Sajhas have been vehicles for IRDP as a local institution to motivate participation. Our findings prove that these societies have been somewhat successful in initiating participation. But our observation showed that only few Sajhas were running successfully; hence membership was not healthy. This was because of lack of financial resources and limited selling of consumer goods.

To break the inertia of the rural mass from their slumber of ignorance, much depends on the capacity of the local leader. Here the village Panchayat members are the local leaders. The panchayat system had made them the developing agents of their respective villages. Hence to initiate participation in development works, depends largely on these institutes representing the local people. Our foregoing discussion, support the hypothesis that participation depends on the mobilising capacity of the leaders. The mobilising capacity of the leaders in turn depend on factors such as age, castes, ownership, sincerity, honesty and education. The findings show that all leaders were well off person.

But their mobilizing capability depended on the above mentioned numerous factors. The study of the village Panchayat showed that these leaders were capable to mobilise participation, but the limited participation of villagers in IRDP was more of such programme not requiring the local participation. However, the lackings and inactiveness of these leaders were also the causes of less participation. Another important factor hindering mass participation was the bitter relation between bureaucrat and peoples representatives - the leaders. The bureaucrats consider these leaders as ignorant persons who unnecessarily meddle in the running of development works. Sometimes vexing the bureaucrats so much that they were compelled to ask for transfer. While leaders regard the bureaucrats as unpractical persons, and they in turn are vexed with red-tapism policy of these officials.

Summing up we can say that there exists very little co-ordination and understanding between these two responsible agents of IRDP.

Finally we come to the participation of the respondent in IRDP. The study enlightens the condition of local participation in the village panchayat. Though planners and national leaders voice that maximum participation should be sought in planning implementation and evaluation of rural programme; there is no clear and pragmatic thinking in which way this should be operationalised. Hence in Rasuwa/Nuwakot and Sagarmatha IRDP the peoples participation has been analogous to labour participation only. Our evaluation found that there is positive correlation between benefit and participation. The respondents were aware of IRDP Programmes

such as co-operatives, irrigation, health, drinking water and roads (Trails ^{and} Bridges) and they could visualise the benefits they received from these. But programmes as forestry and forest conservation, education, panchayat development were not acquainted to them. Similarly their willingness for labour participation was specifically in irrigation, drinking water, roads and health areas. As to the inquiry in which way they participated in the programme our study revealed that except for the few, majority contributed their physical labour. The investment of irrigation sector by IRDP cite one good example where in one hand the sector is granted the top priority, but on the other hand a poor performance was recorded. Because the majority of respondents and all the leaders voiced unanimously ^{the} lack of irrigation facility. The highest priority in all village Panchayats by the respondents was given to the IRDP components as irrigation followed by road, health and drinking water for mobilizing maximum participation.

R E F E R E N C E S

1. King, Bert, Streufert and Fiedler, E. Fred - 'Managerial control and organisational democracy'. The problem of participation in organisation - A conceptual Evaluation, V.H. Wiston & Sons, Washington D.C., p. 17.
2. Wang Kenn, In 'Asian Economics Journal', 'Some Strategic of developing rural poor in Integrated Rural Development in Asia', September, No. 54, 1985, Korea, pp. 14-18.
3. Khan, Obaidullah, A.Z.M., Seminar on - 'Peoples participation in Rural Development in Nepal, Experience with people's participation in other countries', APROSC, Kathmandu, 1978, p. 21.
4. Nepalese Constitution, Article 19, Ministry of H.M.G. publication. Law & Justice, H.M.G. 1977, Kathmandu.
5. Shrestha, B.P., Seminar on "Peoples participation in Rural Development in Nepal", APROSC, Kathmandu, 1978, p. 92.
6. Development Research communication Group (DRCG) Rasuwa/ Nuwakot Evaluation Report, Kathmandu, 1981, p. 56.
7. Agriculture Projects Service Centre (APROSC)- Rasuwa/ Nuwakot Final Report, Annex-17, Vol. 1, Kathmandu, 1983, p. 3.
8. Rasuwa/Nuwakot First Phase Report. Referred by Pradhan Bharat Bahadur in 'Report of the colloquim on the problems and prospects of Rural Development in Nepal', APROSC, Kathmandu, 1983, pp. 61-73.
9. Agrawal, Govind Ram, Organisational Arrangements for Integrated Rural Development in Nepal, Centre for Economic Development and Administration (CEDA) Kathmandu, 1982, p. 23.
10. Pradhan, Bharat Bahadur, Rural Development in Nepal Problems and Prospects, Kathmandu, 1982, p. 39.

11. Pradhan, Bharat Bahadur, Rising Nepal Daily, January 18, 1990, Kathmandu.
12. Agrawal, Govind Ram, Planning for Co-operative Development in Nepal, Centre for Economic Development and Administration, Kathmandu, 1984, p. 1.
13. Sixth Plan - 1980-1985, National Planning Commission, Kathmandu, p. 5.
14. Upadhyay, Kamal Pd, 'Study on participation of non-government organisational (NGO's) in planning and implementation of Integrated rural Development Programme in Nepal', CEDA, Kathmandu, 1982, p. 50.
15. His Majesty's Government of Nepal (H.M.G.) Sajha Development Departments - Reports of Sajha development programme, 1981-82.
16. Reports of village Panchayats, Dhaibung (Bhorle) and Kalyanpur Village Panchayat Office, 1985.
17. Co-ordinator office, Socio economic unit of Rasuwa/Nuwakot IRDP, Reports 1982, p. 9.
18. Pradhan, Prachanda, Decentralisation Local Government: Institution and resource Mobilisation, 'Local Institutions, Decentralisation and resource Mobilisation in Nepal, Bangladesh Academy, Comilla, 1985, p. 231.
19. Ibid, p. 232.
20. Seshadri, K., Political Linkages and Rural Development, Delhi, 1976, pp. 78.
21. Bhowmik, Dhrubajyoti and Dhamala Ranju Rani : Democratic Decentralisation and Panchayati Raj'. An Evaluation with special reference to Sikkim, Journal of Constitutional and Parliamentary Studies, Delhi, 1982, p. 296.
22. Arora, R.C., Integrated Rural Development, S. Chand & Company, Delhi, 1979, p. 400.
23. Malla, B.C. and Rajbhandari, Bhup Das, Centre for Economic Development and Administration (CEDA) Kathmandu, 1986, pp. 64-65.

24. Bhowmik, Dhrubajyoti and Ranju Rani Dhamala, op. cit., 297.
25. Pradhan, Bharat Bahadur, op. cit., 41.
26. Ibid., p. 41.
27. Ibid., p. 41.
28. Pradhanang, A.L. and Chhetry, P.B., The Economic Journal of Nepal, Faculty of Economics, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, 1981, p. 37.
29. Pradhan Bharat Bahadur, op. cit., p. 43.
30. Agrawal, Govind Ram, Centre for Economic Development and Administration (CEDA), Kathmandu, 1986, p. 59.
31. Pradhan, Prachanda, Overview, Development Research Communication Group (DROG), Kathmandu, pp. 51-55.
32. Peabody, N.S., GADKHAR IRRIGATION SCHEME Draft Report The Socio-Economic Unit, Project Co-ordinator's office, Kathmandu, 1984, p. 20.
33. Peabody, N.S. Rasuwa-Nuwakot Rural Development Project, 'Project component analysis series', Volume 1, Gadkhar Irrigation Scheme', Socio-Economic Unit, Project Co-ordinator office, Kathmandu, 1983, p. 3.
34. Ibid., p. 1.
35. Peabody, N.S. Rasuwa/Nuwakot Rural Development Project, Project component analysis series, volume 3, Socio-Economic Unit Project Co-ordinator Office, Kathmandu, 1983, p. 4.
36. Gautam, Upendra, Natural Resource Management Paper series, Institution building and Rural Development in Nepal, Gadkhar water user's Committee, Winrock project (Winrock International Institute for agricultural Development, 1981.
37. Ibid, 18.
38. Peabody, N.S., op. cit., p. 35.
39. Ibid., p. 37.

40. Gautam, Upendra, op. cit., p. 20.
41. Peabody, N.S., op. cit., p. 20.
42. Acharya, Rajeswar : Impact of Rasuwa/Nuwakot Integrated rural development project on meeting Basic Human Needs, Centre for Economic Development and Administration, Kathmandu, 1982, pp. 167-169.
43. Field Survey, 1984-85.
44. Ibid., 1984-85.