

# THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICIALS AND LEADERS: A LITERATURE SURVEY

**SANJAY PATHANIA**

Research Scholar,  
PhD (Public Administration)  
Jayoti Vidyapeeth Women's University, Jaipur

**Dr. LAL KRISHAN SHARMA**

Research Supervisor,  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Humanities & Social Science  
Jayoti Vidyapeeth Women's University, Jaipur

## 1.0 Introduction

Democracy today is a growing consciousness for recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family. To achieve the fundamental freedom, justice and peace all over the world for all human beings, ensuring human rights through democratic governance has become essential. The constitutional principle of equality, liberty and fraternity is the pre-requisite for establishing a just democratic order, in which development of all without discrimination or oppression could thrive. Hence, social justice, democracy and development are inseparable

## 1.1 PRI'S IN Haryana

The subject of local government is in State list of the Federal Constitution. Therefore it is mandatory for the state legislature to enact a law in this regard. The various state legislative assemblies including Haryana have enacted the Panchayati Raj legislation in conformity with the 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act, 1992. It is known as —Haryana Panchayati Raj Act, 1994. The new act provides for the constitution of Gram Panchayats<sup>15</sup>, Panchayat Samitis<sup>16</sup> and Zila Parishads<sup>17</sup> for better administration of the rural areas. As per the new enactment, the PRIs have been organized at three levels – village, block and district. At village level, the elected body is Gram Panchayat, comprising of Panches and headed by directly elected Sarpanch; at block level, the Panchayat Samiti consists of elected members from various wards and indirectly elected Chairperson; and at the district level, the body is known as Zila Parishad headed by the President and elected members.

Social, economic and political mode of life of the rural people is directly or indirectly linked with PR bodies. In fact, the faith, values and convictions of person, either he is a leader or an official, are very much influenced by his environment<sup>27</sup>. Environment is the base of past or present socio-economic background of every community of this world. Social and economic backgrounds of PR leaders and administrative officials working in these institutions have been considered instrumental in shaping their role, behavior and orientation.

## 1.3 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICIALS AND LEADERS

Both the administrative officials and leaders have their separate universe of role sets. When they interact, only a part of their role universe becomes relevant for relationship between the administrative officials and leaders. Our focus, therefore, is on that role sector which coincides with the interacting aspects of administrator-leader relationship.

Politics-administration relationship has been an old theme since the beginning of intellectual inquiry into the structures and processes of administration. Earlier writings on public administration make a clear distinction between 'Politics' and 'Administration'. The distinction was made in terms of ends and means. Politics being concerned with the processes connected with shaping and uses of state power has been understood as the foundation of value laden policy decisions. Administration is the means for the fulfillment of policy objectives.

## **2.0 Review of Related Literature**

**Joshi (1998)** investigates the inadequacies of present system despite the constitutionalization of PR in India. He emphasizes the need to create a healthy and positive atmosphere for natural growth of PR, and also gives suggestions for the improvement and strengthening of the system provided that the states have political will to devolve powers and authority to PR Institutions.

**Malik (2002)** in a field based study carried out in Jind District divulges that there is excessive administrative control over PR Institutions in the state. The bureaucrats are reluctant to devolve meaningful powers to these bodies. The elected representatives of PRIs are considered rivals by state political leaders as well as by the officials. The incidence of bureaucratic tendencies to control elected leaders of these institutions is more, and often officials suggest the development works to be undertaken. Transferring the officials working with PR Institutions on political considerations is a common practice in the state.

**Kumar and Sudhakar (2003)** discussed the role of Panchayat Secretary in Andhra Pradesh. According to them, the Panchayat Secretary has to play a vital role in discharging various duties assigned to him and implementing the policy decisions taken by the Panchayat Secretariat Legislature. But it has been realized that Panchayat Secretaries erode the powers and position of Sarpanch and hinder the process of decentralization of powers at grass root level. According to the study, the village administration was facing new challenges from the bureaucracy with all its ill effects like red-tapism, favouritism, nepotism, authoritarianism and corruption. According to the authors, it further discouraged the local leadership and curbed the local talent and initiative. The authors stressed the need for the encouragement of village people for more active participation in the village administration and the strengthening of Gram Panchayats by the devolution of more powers. The system of Panchayat Raj has brought two partners (officials and elected representatives) in close relationship with each other. So the elected leaders and officials in the Gram Panchayats should be motivated and trained to suit the changing needs of village life and administration.

**Sharma (2003)** is of the view that people lack faith in the elected representatives and officials, and as a result, their participation in the institution of 'Gram Sabha' is very low. The earlier studies have shown that neither the bureaucrats nor the Panchayati Raj representatives are interested in making Gram Sabha really an effective institution. There is an ongoing tug-of-war between bureaucrats and the elected representatives for larger share of the power cake. The politicians, bureaucrats and local level leadership show indifference towards strengthening of effective functioning of Gram Sabha, as this may threaten their power.

**Singh (2003)** reveals that the 73rd constitutional Amendment Act, 1992 has noble intentions for providing more powers to the people in the Gram Panchayats. This major landmark has revolutionized and transformed representative democracy into participatory models. In Haryana, as many as 16 functions pertaining to different development departments have been assigned to Panchayati Raj Institutions. The process of transferring more powers and functions to the PRIs is going on. But there exists a strong nexus between rural bureaucracy and heads of Panchayat, which leads to manipulation of funds left at their disposal. So transparency must be there to check the mis-utilization of funds. Corruption and poor quality of goods and services must also be checked. This can be achieved by the proper functioning of the institution of Gram Sabha.

**Malik (2004)** illustrates that in the Gandhian framework, Panchayati Raj was visualized as the base level of decentralization. The Panchayati Raj system was established on the recommendations of Balwant Rai Mehta study team. Gandhi stood for Gram Swaraj at the local level and the village was to be nucleus of all activities limiting the role of state government only to those functions which could not be handled by village panchayat.

**Jha (2004)** states that PRIs are being looked upon as instruments for strengthening the democratic framework of administration, for bringing transparency in government functioning and for voicing the needs of people and for

greater participatory development. Devolution of functions, funds and functionaries has been an important feature of PRIs in Haryana.

**Pal (2004)** stresses and concludes that state government is not interested in devolution of Function, Finance and Functionaries to PRIs. Further political leadership of the state sees leaders of Panchayat as their rival and does not impart them with knowledge of rules and procedures. As a result, with some exceptions, Panchayats from Gram Panchayats to Zila Parishad are official-centric. The bureaucracy, like well trained horse, has not been ridden well by these representatives. Therefore, capacity building of the elected representatives has to be ensured and enhanced and they have to be skilled and erudite, then only they will be able to plan for economic development and social justice in the real sense.

**Chahar (2005)** highlights that PRIs have been constitutionalized through the historical enactment of the 73rd Amendment Act and thus a third tier of federal polity has emerged. But even after a decade the working of PRIs suffers from many flaws like lack of political will, non-co-operative attitude of officials and inadequate financial resources. These are hampering the progress of these institutions.

**Malik (2005)** observes that the gram panchayats established after 73rd Amendment are no doubt more empowered, but there is an urgent need on the part of polity to devolve the powers to these institutions so that they can be established as the real local self government in the country.

**Palanthurai (2005)** stresses the necessity of mind shift from the age-old bureaucratic red tapism to new, transparent, positive and facilitating administration. He emphasizes that there is misunderstanding/conflict between the officials and non-officials over the non-adherence of rules and regulations by non-officials and the pressure exerted by them on officials for speedy execution of development programmes. Moreover there is a lack of technical knowledge among non-officials. Village Panchayat members and President Zila Parishads have preference on caste, political party and religion, which results in favouritism in planning and allocation of various schemes. Due to these reasons people show indifference towards these PR institutions.

**Kumar (2006)** concludes that PR leaders are unaware of their roles and responsibilities; and perform routine functions such as beneficiary selections, minor repair and construction works etc. PR leaders are better aware of the needs and priorities of local people but they have limited resources at their disposal.

**Pal (2006)** opines that all the six components (i.e. Irrigation, Roads, Water Supply, Housing, Rural Electrification and Rural Telecom Connectivity) of Bharat Nirman, except Telecom Connectivity, are under the domain of the PRIs. But more than a decade has lapsed after the amendment to the constitution under which, these subjects were given to the panchayats but not much in concrete term has been devolved to these bodies. In other words, had the central role these bodies been given, there would have not been any need to start programme named as Bharat Nirman. He also emphasizes the need to activate the Gram Sabhas as an important body for proper monitoring and evaluation of projects under Bharat Nirman.

**Singh (2008)** points out that under the Panchayati Raj Act (1994), the Gram Panchayats have been given far more powers than the Panchayat Samiti and Zila Parishad. There is a lack of clear cut demarcation of functions between the Gram Panchayat and the Panchayat Samiti. The Zila Parishad has not been given any powers. The Gram Sabha merely exists in law but not in fact. The author suggests that there is a need for changing the mindset of the political leadership, PRI representatives, officials of the Panchayat department, revenue department and the police administration.

**Mathew (2008)** opines that the role of political parties has been apathetic to the idea of making every village a little republic. By creating a separate 'Ministry for Panchayati Raj' the government has taken a right step. But those committed to decentralization and grassroots democracy will agree that it is only a half hearted measure. The author suggests that today panchayats need a new deal, which will open a new chapter for 800 million people living in our villages. The new deal must ensure ways and means to make panchayats the third tier of government.

**Pal (2009)** has investigated the initiative taken by district administration, Sirsa to assess the level of participation of the people in the meetings of Gram Sabha in the presence of key officials of the district. The study explores that

Gram Sabha could be responsive, accountable and efficient, if district and sub-district level politicians and bureaucrats allow this institution to function as viable and energetic body. The main reason for not making this institution strong is the apprehension of a big risk involved in promotion of this body because it has inherit potential to expose their misdeeds in the works related to rural development and poverty alleviation. There is a silver lining in the dark scenario in the form of campaign that took place in Sirsa, as pioneering efforts taken by the bureaucracy itself with sincere commitment and dedication.

**Srinivasulu et al (2009)** opine that PRIs in Andhra Pradesh play a vital role in the socio and cultural life of people. But the system is not free from the daunting problems, such as lack of finances, unsound recruitment policy, inadequate training facilities both for officials and non-officials, undue political interference, over population and lack of active and effective working relationship between the officials and non-officials.

**Ambedkar (2009)** has attempted to apply the concept of good governance in Panchayati Raj Institutions in Rajasthan state. He highlights that the problem of corruption affects PRI functioning. The lack of clear demarcation of the spheres of action of Panchayats and the B.D.O. also leads to ineffectiveness. In case of friction between the two, the extension personnel are found to align themselves, some with the panchayats and other with the B.D.O.

**Singh and Yadav (2010)** in their study related to Panchayati Raj Institutions in Bihar identify the dominance of richer strata and bureaucracy and also highlight the hostility from higher level political leaders like MPs, MLAs etc. They opine that PRIs remain sandwiched between political leaders and bureaucrats and the poor have little say in the activities of PRIs. Traditional leadership entrenched in caste and land ownership still dominates Vested interests like corruption, groupism, unhealthy rivalry and other factors like inefficiency, illiteracy, male dominated society and misuse of power etc. have adversely affected the functioning of PRIs. It has limited the utility of PRIs for the average villagers.

**Palekar (2010)** in his paper about Panchayati Raj Institutions illustrates that there is a dominance of bureaucracy in PRIs. Cases of bureaucracy dominating the rural development scene abound. The district, block and village panchayat bodies are controlled by the bureaucrats at the corresponding levels of administration. With the enhancement of its powers, the bureaucracy develops, as has been highlighted by Fred Riggs and other scholars, bureaucrats try to retain power in their own hands. Besides they develop alliance patterns in order to strengthen their own position and power.

**Gopalappa (2010)** highlights the worst situation of the Shahapur and Chitapur Taluka panchayats in District Gulbarga (Karnataka). He observes that although the elected leaders are strong and plans have to be executed as per their will yet the officials try to manipulate certain issues as they have the possession of all the official files. They are the first ones to know about government programmes and policies, about which sometimes they do not inform the elected leaders. Though the leaders decide everything about the programme; implementation has been through the officials. And finally the cheque signing authority rests with the concerned executive officer which hampers the effective functioning of PRIs.

**Rajasekharan (2011)** illustrates that both the elected leaders and officials are indispensable and need to be positioned in tandem so as to work cordially in a democratic system of governance. The difference in terms of tenure, expectations and capabilities of both make them distinctly different in their functional path. Creating and enforcing a code of conduct for both is a means to streamline their individual behavior, joint functioning and bilateral relationships. The need of such code of behavior is more evident in the sphere of local governance as compared to other tiers of governance.

**Malik (2012)** in his empirical study conducted in the state of Haryana illustrates that PR leaders before 73rd Amendment were used to be rich, influential, party workers and having closeness with mainstream political leadership of the state. But, the PR leaders elected after amendment are, no doubt, from different classes of people but maximum of them are still rich, influential and active in politics. The author opines that gram panchayat leaders now are coming from all classes of rural people and the dominance of earlier dominant class has diluted to the extent that the base of recruiting leaders in local politics has widened to include more common and poor people. The author further concludes that many of the local leaders are competent enough to decide village priorities and have necessary

strength of enthusiasm and wisdom to perform the panchayat's responsibilities. The study also suggests various ways to strengthen democratic decentralization in the state.

### 3.0 CONCLUSION

Wherever the leaders and officials work in complete harmony the results have been encouraging. It is important to note that the attitude/behavioral patterns of bureaucrats and PR leaders, the two partners responsible for bringing about rural development, has always been different from each other because of their different socio-economic and educational backgrounds.

### 4.0 Bibliography/References

1. Audit Commission: *The Changing Role of Local Authority Members*. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1990.
2. Bakshi, Rajinder Singh. (1985). *Politicians, Bureaucrats and the Development Process*. New Delhi: Radiant Publishers. pp. 166-71.
3. Chahar, S.S. (2005). *Government at Grassroot Level in India*. New Delhi: Kanishka Publications.
4. Chaudhary, D.S. (1984). *Emerging Rural Leadership in an Indian State: A Case Study of Rajasthan*. Rohtak: Manthan Publications.
5. Ghilayal, U.C. Political Executive and Local Government with Practicable reference to India, in Awasthi, A. and Arora, Ramesh Kumar (Ed.) (1978) *Bureaucracy and Development: Indian Perspective* Delhi: Associated Press. pp. 117-125.
6. Government of India, Report of the Team for the Study of Community Projects and National Extension Service (Chairperson: Balwant Rai Mehta), Committee on Plan Projects, National Development Council, New Delhi: Government of India, November 1957, Vol. I, p.23.
7. Hood, Christopher. (1995). The New Public Management in the 1980s: Variations on a Theme. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*. 20(2/3). pp.93-109 ii) Humphrey, Christopher. Peter Miller. Robert W. Scapens. (1993). Accountability and Accountable in the U.K. Public Sector. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability* 6(3). pp. 7-27.
8. Jha, Amit. Devolution of Powers and Functions to the PRIs. Singh, Surat. (Ed.) (2004). *Decentralization Governance in India: Myth and Reality*. New Delhi: Deep and Deep Publications.
9. Jones, Morris W.H. (1964). *The Government and Politics of India*. London: Hutchinson University Library Publishers. p. 147.
10. Joshi, R.P. (Ed.) (1998). *Constitutionalization of Panchayati Raj*. Jaipur: Rawat Publications.
11. Kothari and Roy. op. cit.
12. Kothari, Shanti and Roy, Ramashray. (1969). *Relations between Politicians and Administrators at the District Level*. New Delhi: Indian Institute of Public Administration. p.2.
13. Kothari, Shanti and Roy, Ramashray. (1969). *Relations between Politicians and Administrators at the District Level*. New Delhi: IIPA. p.22.
14. Kumar, Girish. (2006). *Local Democracy in India: Interpreting Decentralization*. New Delhi: Eastern Book Corporation.
15. Maheshwari, S.R. (1970). *Local Government in India*. Agra: Luxmi Agency. p.104.
16. Malik, A.S. (2005). Local Self Government at Village Level – An Assessment. *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, 66(4) p.773-92.
17. Malik, A.S. (2012). *Rural Leadership – Emerging Trends*. New Delhi: Deep and Deep Publications.
18. Malik, Saroj. *Democratic Decentralization and Panchayati Raj in India: The Gandhian Paradigm*. Singh, Surat. (Ed.) (2004). *Decentralization Governance in India: Myth and Reality*. New Delhi: Deep and Deep Publications.
19. Malik, Shamsheer Singh. (2002). *The New Panchayati Raj: Rural Transformation in the State of Haryana*. Jaipur: Aalekh Publishers.
20. Mathew, George (Ed.) (2000). *Status of Panchayati Raj in the States and UTs of India*. New Delhi: Institute of Social Sciences. p.3.
21. Mishra S.N. & Mishra Sweta. (2002). *Decentralized Governance*. New Delhi: Shipra Publications.



22. Mukharji, Nirmal. (1995). Self-Government and its Instrumentalities in Nirmal Mukharji et al. (Ed.) Peoples Representatives and Bureaucracy: The Interface in Panchayati Raj. New Delhi: Institute of Social Sciences.
23. Osborne, David. Ted, Gaebler, T. (1992) *Reinventing Government*. New York: Plume.
24. Pal, M. (2009). Gram Sabha Meetings in India: Processes, Outcomes and Perspectives. *JOAAG*. Vol. 4. No. 2.
25. Palanthurai G. (2005). New Panchayati Raj System at Work – An Evaluation. New Delhi: Concept Publishers.
26. Report of the Committee to Review the Existing Administrative Arrangements for Rural Development and Poverty Alleviation Programmes (CAARD), Department of Rural Development. New Delhi: Ministry of Agriculture, 1985.
27. Self, Peter. (1972). Administrative Theories and Politics: An Enquiry into the Structure and Processes of Modern Government. London: George Allan and Urwin. p. 153.
28. Sharma, Rajiv (2000). Emerging Pattern of Rural leadership in Haryana: A study of Zila Parishad, Bhiwani. A dissertation submitted for the Degree of Master of Philosophy in Department of Political Science. Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra. p.27.
29. Shiviah, M. (1976). Panchayati Raj: An Analytical Survey, Hyderabad: NIRD. p.35.
30. Singh, Raj and Bhan, Chander (2004). Strengthening PRIs in Haryana – A Politico-Legal Perspective in the book entitled —Decentralized Governance in India-Myth and Realityl edited by Surat Singh. New Delhi: Deep and Deep Publications. p. 376.
31. Srinivasulu, Bayineni, Babu V. Ramesh and Sreeramulu, N. (2009, July-Dec). Rural Development Administration in Chittoor District – Perceptions of Officials and Non-Officials. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Social Sciences*. Vol. 1(2). pp. 91-122.
32. Stamp, Josia. Quoted in K.K. Puri and G.S. Barara. (1987). Elements of Administration. Jalandhar City: Bharat Prakashan. p. 223.
33. Svara, James H. and Brunet, James R. Findings and refining complimentarily in recent conceptual models of politics and administration. In *Retracing Public Administration. Research in Public Administration*, Vol. 7. (Ed.) (2003). Mark R. Rutgers, Amsterdam Elsevier. pp. 161-184.
34. The Constitution (Seventy-Third Amendment) Act, 1992. The Gazette of India, Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs. New Delhi, 1993.
35. The Haryana Panchayati Raj Act (1994). Section 7 Chandigarh: Government of Haryana Legislative Department.
36. Wilson, Woodrow. (1887, June). The Study of Administration. *Political Science Quarterly*. Vol. 2. pp. 197-222.
37. Gandhi, M.K. (1942, July 26). My Idea of Village Swaraj. Harijan. p.6.
38. Maheshwari, Shriram. (1980, July-Sept). The Political Executive and Permanent Executive: An Analysis of the Emerging Role Patterns. *The Indian Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. XXVI, NO. 3. pp. 239-42.
39. Maheshwari, S.R. (1984, Oct-Dec). Rural Development and Bureaucracy in India, *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. XXX, No. 4, pp. 1093-1104.
40. Sadasivan S.N. (1985, July-Sept) Towards a theory of District Administration, *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. XXXI, NO. 3. pp. 729-738.
41. Haskar P.N. (1987, Feb. 21) Politicians and Bureaucracy. *Mainstream*. pp. 6 & 33.
42. Quoted in Singh, Hoshier (1994, September). Constitutional Base for Panchayati Raj in India. *Asian Survey*, Vol. 34 (9), pp 818-27.
43. Singh, Hoshier. (1994, Sept). Constitutional Base for Panchayati Raj in India – The 73rd Amendment Act. *Asian Survey*, Vol. 34(9). pp. 818-827.
44. Balarammalu, C.H. and Rao, Raghavender. (1995, Jan-June). Political Leadership in Panchayati Raj: A Study of Mandal Praja Parishad Leadership in Andhra Pradesh. *Administrative Change*, Vol. XXII, No. 2.
45. Gangrade K.D. (1995, April). Power to the Power less – Dawn of Participatory Democracy. *Kurukshetra*. Vol. XL III. p. 4.
46. Jain, S.P. (1995, April). The Emerging Phase of Democratic Decentralization in India: Some issues, *Kurukshetra*, Vol. XL III. p. 40.
47. Kumar A. Vijay and Sudhakar E. (2003, April-June). Role of Panchayat Secretary in Andhra Pradesh – A Study. *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. XLIX No. 2. pp. 203-209.

48. Sharma, Ashok. (2003, Oct-Dec). Developing Accountable Local Leadership through Citizens Voice: An experience of Gram Sabha in an Indian State. *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. XLIX. No. 4. pp. 762-63.
49. Singh, Mohinder. (2003, Oct-Dec). Transparency in Functions: Vital for Gram Panchayats. *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. XLIX. No. 4. pp. 769-70.
50. Pal, M. (2004, August). From Raj Governance to Swaraj Governance. *Kurukshetra*. pp. 4-8.
51. Pal, M. (2006, Oct). Panchayati Raj and Bharat Nirman: Role in Effective Implementation. *Kurukshetra*. p.66.
52. Singh, Ranbir. (2008, April 20). Strengthening Panchayati Raj. Chandigarh: The Tribune.
53. Mathew, George. (2008, April 23). Panchayats need New Deal. Chandigarh: The Tribune.
54. Ambedkar, S. Nagendra. (2009, Jan-Dec) Good Governance, Administration and Panchayati Raj. *Administrative Change*. Vol XXXVI, No. 2 & Vol. XXXVII, No. 1.
55. Palekar S.A. (2010, April-June). Panchayati Raj Institutions: Changes and Challenges, *Local Government Quarterly*. p. 84.
56. Gopalappa, D.Y. (2010, July-Sept). The Role of Elected Representatives and Administrators in the Performance of PRIs in Karnataka State. *Local Government Quarterly*.
57. Singh B.N. and Yadav L.D. (2010, July-Sept). Panchayati Raj Institutions in Bihar: A New Perspective. *Local Government Quarterly*.
58. Rajasekharan, K. (2011, July-Sept). A Code of Conduct for Functionaries of Local Governments in Kerala. *Local Government Quarterly*.