Original Research Article

Relational Analysis of the Leaders in Progressive and Less Progressive Villages and its Role Perception and Role Performance

A.L. Khare* and R.P. Kadam

Department of Extension Education, VNMKV, Parbhani. (M.S.),India
*Corresponding author

A B S T R A C T

Keywords

Relational Analysis of The Leaders In Progressive

The present study was conducted in the Parbhani and Nanded district of the Marathwada region of Maharashtra state during the year 2016-2017. From these two district four tehsils i.e. (two tahsils from each district) were selected randomly. With irrespective of list of Grampanchayats and its members of each tehsil was collected from Block Development Officer (B.D.O.), Panchayat Samiti of respective talukas. In the first phase of data collection, 20 villages from each tehsil were selected randomly, thus making a sample of 80 villages i.e. (20 x 4 = 80). The selected villages were studied for their progressiveness with the help of village progressiveness scale of Singh *et al.,* (1972). In the second phase, after arranging list of villages in descending order top five villages with highest scores were selected as progressive villages and lowest five villages with lowest scores were selected as less-progressive villages from four talukas. Thus 40 villages were purposively selected for research study. From each selected villages five Grampanchayat leaders were selected randomly. Thus total of 200 Village leaders i.e. 100 Grampanchayat leaders from 20 progressive villages and 100 Grampanchayat leaders from 20 less-progressive villages from four tehsils were selected. The study portrayed that independents variables namely education, occupation, land holding, annual income, social participation, socio-economic status, achievement motivation, mass media exposure, training received by members, cosmopoliteness, leadership background, linkage with development agencies and leadership experience were positively and significantly related with overall role perception and role performance in progressive and less progressive villages. However, age and caste and training received by members could not establish any relationship with role perception and role performance. It was found that co-efficient of determination (R^2) of the independent variables were 0.835, 0.850, 0.791 and 0.809, respectively. It means that 83.50, 85.00, 79.10 and 80.90 per cent of total variation in the overall role perception and role performance was explained by the selected 15 independent variables. The unexplained variation may be due to the factors not included in the study.

Introduction

The Panchayati Raj is a South Asian political system mainly in India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Nepal. It is the oldest system of local government in the Indian subcontinent.

The dream of 'Gram Swaraj' of Mahatma Gandhi and motto of 'Power to People' are essence of true democracy. The task of capacity building of these large numbers of Panchayats is quite gigantic exercise. As per

the assessment of the Ministry of Panchayati Raj even after 20 years of enactment of 73rd Constitutional (Amendment) Act and also after having three rounds of Panchayat elections in many States in India. The empowerment of Panchayats has not taken place as envisioned in the 73rd Constitution (Amendment) Act in 1992. The 73rd Amendment to the Constitution in 1992 gave Constitutional status to the Panchayats as institutions of local self government and also for planning and implementing programmes for economic development and social justice. The concept of Panchayati raj seemed for a while in the years after Indian independence to have disappeared permanently into the mists of India's romantic past. In the late twentieth century however the notion has returned once more to the political agenda, for a variety of reasons: strategic, practical, economic, and ideology. This paper sets out to trace in brief the origins of the concept of Panchayati, offers some historical examples of the Panchayat in use, and attempts an explanation as to why it should once again have assumed importance in the minds of politicians, NGOs and administrators. To begin with, we need to ask about the place of the Panchayat in Indian tradition, upon which one discovers that the modern usage of the term has an etymology which is not very indigenous.

Materials and Methods

The present study was conducted in the Parbhani and Nanded district of the Marathwada region of Maharashtra state. From these two districts four tehsils i.e. (two tahsils from each district) were selected randomly for the study. With irrespective of list of Grampanchayats and its members of each tehsil was collected from Block Development Officer (B.D.O.), Panchayat Samiti of respective talukas. The villages

were selected for the study in two phases; in the first phase 20 villages from each tehsil were selected randomly, thus making a sample of 80 villages i.e. (20 x 4 = 80). The selected villages were studied for their progressiveness with the help of village progressiveness scale of Singh *et al.,* (1972). All the information was collected with the help of Gramsevak, Talathi and Agricultural Assistant from respective villages. After collection of information, score was assigned for each village. In the second phase, after arranging list of villages in descending order top five villages with highest scores were selected as progressive villages and lowest five villages with lowest scores were selected as less-progressive villages from four talukas. Thus 40 villages were purposively selected for research study. From each selected villages five Grampanchayat leaders were selected randomly. Thus total of 200 leaders i.e. 100 Grampanchayat leaders from 20 progressive villages and 100 Grampanchayat leaders from 20 less-progressive villages from four tehsils were selected. Ex-post facto research design was adopted in this study. The data were collected with the help of pretested interview schedule. The statistical methods and tests such as frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, co-efficient of correlation, multiple regressions, Z test and path analysis were used for the analysis of data.

The main objectives of this study includes relationship between personal and socio-economic characteristics with role perception and role performance of leaders in progressive villages

Relationship between personal and socio-economic characteristics with role perception and role performance of leaders in less progressive villages

Results and Discussion

Relationship between personal and socio-economic characteristics with role perception and role performance of leaders in progressive villages

Assess relationship between profiles of the leaders in progressive villages with role perception

The data given in Table 1 indicated that independents variables namely education, occupation, land holding, annual income, social participation, socio-economic status, achievement motivation, mass media exposure, training received by members, cosmopoliteness, leadership background, linkage with development agencies and leadership experience were positively and significantly related with overall role perception in progressive villages. However, age and caste could not establish any relationship with overall role perception.

Assess relationship between profiles of the leaders in less progressive villages with role perception

The data given in Table 2 indicated that independents variables namely education, occupation, land holding, annual income, social participation, socio-economic status, achievement motivation, mass media exposure, cosmopoliteness, leadership background, linkage with development agencies and leadership experience were positively and significantly related with overall role perception in less progressive villages. However, age, caste and training received by members could not establish any relationship with overall role perception. Similar findings were reported by Bhosale (2005), Satpal Singh *et al.,* (2013), Deshpande *et al.,* (2013), and Neog *et al.,* (2015).

Assess relationship between profiles of the leaders in progressive villages with role performance

The data given in Table 3 indicated that independents variables namely education, occupation, land holding, annual income, social participation, socio-economic status, achievement motivation, mass media exposure, training received by members, cosmopoliteness, leadership background, linkage with development agencies and leadership experience were positively and significantly related with overall role performance in progressive villages. However, age and caste could not establish any relationship with overall role performance.

Similar findings were reported by Prakash (2013), Garg *et al.,* (2014), Kumar *et al.,* (2016) and Tanweer (2015).

Assess relationship between profiles of the leaders in less progressive villages with role performance

The data given in Table 4 indicated that independents variables namely education, occupation, land holding, annual income, social participation, socio-economic status, achievement motivation, mass media exposure, cosmopoliteness, leadership background, linkage with development agencies and leadership experience were positively and significantly related with overall role performance in less progressive villages.

However, age, caste and training received by members could not establish any relationship with overall role performance. This finding was in the agreement with the findings of Suradkar (2005), Rewatkar (2006), Kshatriya (2011) and Tanweer (2015).

Multiple Regressions Analysis

Multiple regressions between the personal characteristics of the leaders and their role perception in progressive villages

It was observed that co-efficient of determination (R^2) of the independent variables was 0.835. It means that 83.50 per cent of total variation in the overall role perception in progressive villages was explained by the selected 15 independent variables. The unexplained variation may be due to the factors not included in the study.

The value of 't' showed that role perception was significantly related with achievement motivation, linkage with developmental agencies and training received by members. The regression coefficients of these variables were 0.0568, 0.2549, 0.0438, 0.00005, 0.6901, 0.3092, 0.3815, 0.4490 and 0.0981 respectively which indicates that one units change in the variable viz., age, occupation, land holding, annual income, achievement motivation, mass media exposure, cosmopoliteness, linkage with development agencies and leadership experience would affect 0.0568, 0.2549, 0.0438, 0.00005, 0.6901, 0.3092, 0.3815, 0.4490 and 0.0981 unit change in role perception.

Multiple regressions between the personal characteristics of the leaders and their role perception in less progressive villages

It was observed that co-efficient of determination (R^2) of the independent variables was 0.850. It means that 85.00 per cent of total variation in the overall role perception in less progressive villages was explained by the selected 15 independent variables.

The unexplained variation may be due to the factors not included in the study.

The calculated 't' value for each of the partial 'b' values is presented in column 5 of the Table 6.

The role perception of the leaders was found to be positively and significantly influenced by variables namely linkage with developmental agencies and leadership experience.

The regression coefficients of these variables were 0.1211, 0.9735, 0.0017, 0.00003, 0.3990, 0.2572, 00.6963 and 0.6466 respectively which indicates that one units change in the variable viz., age, education occupation, annual income, achievement motivation, mass media exposure, linkage with development agencies and leadership experience would affect 0.1211, 0.9735, 0.0017, 0.00003, 0.3990, 0.2572, 00.6963 and 0.6466 unit change in role perception.

Multiple regressions between the personal characteristics of the leaders and their role performance in progressive villages

It could be observed that co-efficient of determination (R^2) of the independent variables was 0.791.

It means that 79.10 per cent of total variation in the overall role performance in progressive villages was explained by the selected 15 independent variables. The unexplained variation may be due to the factors not included in the study.

Table.1 Relationship between Personal Characteristics Of The Leaders And Their Role Perception In Progressive Villages

Sr. No.	Independent Variables	Progressive Villages Correlation Coefficient (r)
1	Age	-0.029 ^{NS}
2	Education	0.547**
3	Caste	-0.003 ^{NS}
4	Occupation	0.394**
5	Land holding	0.583**
6	Annual income	0.600**
7	Social participation	0.716**
8	Socio economic status	0.767**
9	Achievement motivation	0.822**
10	Mass media exposure	0.783**
11	Training received by members	0.628**
12	Cosmopoliteness	0.794**
13	Leadership background	0.459**
14	Linkage with development agencies	0.862**
15	Leadership experience	0.518**

** Significant at 0.01 level of probability * Significant at 0.05 level of probability

Table.2 Relationship between personal and socio-economic characteristics of the leaders and their role perception in less progressive villages

Sr. No.	Independent Variables	Less-progressive villages Correlation Coefficient (r)
1	Age	-0.060 NS
2	Education	0.472^{**}
3	Caste	0.053 NS
4	Occupation	0.242^{*}
5	Land holding	0.534^{**}
6	Annual income	0.508^{**}
7	Social participation	0.672^{**}
8	Socio economic status	0.718^{**}
9	Achievement motivation	0.808^{**}
10	Mass media exposure	0.591^{**}
11	Training received by members	0.080 NS
12	Cosmopoliteness	0.617^{**}
13	Leadership background	0.448^{**}
14	Linkage with development agencies	0.719^{**}
15	Leadership experience	0.495^{**}

** Significant at 0.01 level of probability* Significant at 0.05 level of probability

Table.3 Relationship between personal characteristics of the leaders and their role performance in progressive villages

Sr. No.	Independent Variables	Progressive villages Correlation Coefficient (r)
1	Age	-0.006 NS
2	Education	0.505^{**}
3	Caste	-0.041 NS
4	Occupation	0.374^{**}
5	Land holding	0.514^{**}
6	Annual income	0.514^{**}
7	Social participation	0.672^{**}
8	Socio economic status	0.723^{**}
9	Achievement motivation	0.799^{**}
10	Mass media exposure	0.738^{**}
11	Training received by members	0.507^{**}
12	Cosmopoliteness	0.750^{**}
13	Leadership background	0.421^{**}
14	Linkage with development agencies	0.823^{**}
15	Leadership experience	0.490^{**}

** Significant at 0.01 level of probability* Significant at 0.05 level of probability

Table.4 Relationship between personal and socio economic characteristics of the leaders and their role performance in less progressive villages

Sr. No.	Independent Variables	Less-progressive villages Correlation coefficient (r)
1	Age	-0.098 ^{NS}
2	Education	0.478**
3	Caste	0.051^{NS}
4	Occupation	0.219*
5	Land holding	0.507**
6	Annual income	0.504**
7	Social participation	0.618**
8	Socio economic status	0.690**
9	Achievement motivation	0.789**
10	Mass media exposure	0.515**
11	Training received by members	0.051 ^{NS}
12	Cosmopoliteness	0.568**
13	Leadership background	0.403**
14	Linkage with development agencies	0.635**
15	Leadership experience	0.451**

** Significant at 0.01 level of probability* Significant at 0.05 level of probability

Table.5 Multiple regression analysis of role perception with independent
variables in progressive villages

Sr. No.	Variables	B(i)	S.E.	't' value
1	Age	0.0568	0.0959	0.5929
2	Education	-0.5532	0.6823	-0.8107
3	Caste	-0.6746	0.4936	-1.3667
4	Occupation	0.2549	0.6743	0.3781
5	Land holding	0.0438	0.4053	0.1080
6	Annual income	0.00005	0.00002	0.2513
7	Social participation	-0.0516	0.4854	-0.1063
8	Socio economic status	-0.0129	0.1523	-0.1121
9	Achievement motivation	0.6901	0.2188	3.1538[**]
10	Mass media exposure	0.3092	0.2378	1.2998
11	Training received by members	-0.5210	0.2424	-2.1491[*]
12	Cosmopoliteness	0.3815	0.4761	0.8012
13	Leadership background	-0.1453	0.7591	-0.1914
14	Linkage with development agencies	0.4490	0.1176	3.8157[**]
15	Leadership experience	0.0981	0.2012	0.4878

'F' value= 2.83 R^2**= 0.83**

**** Significant at 0.01 level of probability ***** Significant at 0.05 level of probability

Table.6 Multiple regression analysis of role perception with independent
variables in less progressive villages

Sr. No.	Variables	B(i)	S.E.	't' value
1	Age	0.1211	0.0660	1.836
2	Education	0.9735	0.7082	1.374
3	Caste	-0.0192	0.4019	-0.0478
4	Occupation	0.0017	0.5011	0.0035
5	Land holding	-0.2341	0.5332	-0.4391
6	Annual income	0.00003	0.00003	1.2410
7	Social participation	-0.1911	0.3540	-0.5398
8	Socio economic status	-0.0816	0.1040	-0.7851
9	Achievement motivation	0.3990	0.2910	1.3714
10	Mass media exposure	0.2572	0.2705	0.9507
11	Training received by members	-0.6254	0.2251	-2.7784[**]
12	Cosmopoliteness	-0.6521	0.5429	-1.2011
13	Leadership background	-0.7022	0.7288	-0.9634
14	Linkage with development agencies	0.6963	0.1141	6.1023[**]
15	Leadership experience	0.6466	0.1947	3.320[**]

'F' value= 03.17 R^2= 0.85

** Significant at 0.01 level of probability

Table.7 Multiple regression analysis of role performance with independent variables in progressive villages

Sr. No.	Variables	B(i)	S.E.	't' value
1	Age	0.2743	0.2300	1.1927
2	Education	-2.2874	1.6366	-1.3977
3	Caste	-2.0416	1.1838	-1.7245
4	Occupation	0.6990	1.6172	0.4322
5	Land holding	0.4447	0.9721	0.4575
6	Annual income	-0.00005	0.00005	-0.9631
7	Social participation	-1.0430	1.1643	-0.8958
8	Socio economic status	0.0317	0.2763	0.1150
9	Achievement motivation	1.9658	0.5248	3.7458[**]
10	Mass media exposure	0.7077	0.5705	1.2405
11	Training received by members	-1.4266	0.5814	-2.4533*
12	Cosmopoliteness	0.5778	1.1419	0.5060
13	Leadership background	-1.2413	1.8205	-0.6818
14	Linkage with development agencies	1.1147	0.2822	3.9495[**]
15	Leadership experience	-0.0056	0.4827	-0.0117

'F' value= 02.12 R^2= 0.79

** Significant at 0.01 level of probability * Significant at 0.05 level of probability

Table.8 Multiple regression analysis of role performance with independent variables in less progressive villages

Sr. No.	Variables	B(i)	S.E.	't' value
1	Age	0.2585	0.1521	1.6999
2	Education	2.3865	1.6321	1.4621
3	Caste	-0.1767	0.9264	-0.1907
4	Occupation	1.1454	1.1548	0.9918
5	Land holding	-1.4366	1.2289	-1.1685
6	Annual income	0.0001	0.0000	1.6567
7	Social participation	-0.7319	0.8159	-0.8970
8	Socio economic status	-0.1846	0.2397	-0.7699
9	Achievement motivation	1.0083	0.6706	1.5035
10	Mass media exposure	-0.0187	0.6235	-0.0300
11	Training received by members	-1.2676	0.5188	-2.4432*
12	Cosmopoliteness	-0.4097	1.2512	-0.3275
13	Leadership background	-2.4929	1.6798	-1.4840
14	Linkage with developmental agencies	1.4477	0.2629	5.5049**
15	Leadership experience	1.2768	0.4488	2.8448**

The value of 't' showed that role performance was significantly related with linkage with developmental agencies, achievement motivation and negatively significant with training received by members. The regression coefficients of

these variables were 0.2743, 0.6990, 0.4447, 0.0317, 1.9658, 0.7077, 0.5778 and 1.1147 respectively which indicates that one units change in the variable viz., age, occupation, land holding, socio-economic status, achievement motivation, mass media exposure, cosmopoliteness and linkage with development agencies and leadership experience would affect 0.2743, 0.6990, 0.4447, 0.0317, 1.9658, 0.7077, 0.5778 and 1.1147 unit change in role performance.

Multiple regressions between the personal characteristics of the leaders and their role performance in less progressive villages

It could be observed that co-efficient of determination (R^2) of the independent variables was 0.809. It means that 80.90 per cent of total variation in the overall role performance in less progressive villages was explained by the selected 15 independent variables. The unexplained variation may be due to the factors not included in the study.

The calculated 't' value for each of the partial 'b' values is presented in column 5 of the Table 8. The role performance of the leaders was found to be positively and significantly influenced by variables namely linkage with developmental agencies, leadership experience and training received by members.

The regression coefficients of these variables were 0. 0.2585, 2.3865, 1.1454, 0.0001, 1.0083, 1.4477 and 1.2768 respectively which indicates that one units change in the variable viz., age, education, occupation, annual income, achievement motivation, linkage with development agencies and leadership experience would affect 0. 0.2585, 2.3865, 1.1454, 0.0001, 1.0083, 1.4477 and 1.2768 unit change in role performance. The study portrayed that independents variables namely education,

occupation, land holding, annual income, social participation, socio-economic status, achievement motivation, mass media exposure, training received by members, cosmopoliteness, leadership background, linkage with development agencies and leadership experience were positively and significantly related with overall role perception and role performance in progressive villages. However, age and caste could not establish any relationship with role perception and role performance.

In case of less progressive villages, the data indicated that independents variables namely education, occupation, land holding, annual income, social participation, socio-economic status, achievement motivation, mass media exposure, cosmopoliteness, leadership background, linkage with development agencies and leadership experience were positively and significantly related with overall role perception and role performance in less progressive villages. However, age, caste and training received by members could not establish any relationship with overall role perception and role performance.

It was found that co-efficient of determination (R^2) of the independent variables were 0.835, 0.850, 0.791 and 0.809, respectively. It means that 83.50, 85.00, 79.10 and 80.90 per cent of total variation in the overall role perception and role performance was explained by the selected 15 independent variables. The unexplained variation may be due to the factors not included in the study.

References

Bhosale, P.B. 2005. Leadership role in progressive and less progressive villages of Marathwada. Ph.D (Agri.)

Thesis, Marathwada Agricultural University, Parbhani (Maharashtra).

Deshpande, A.R., M.C. Soni and Shekhawat, S.S. 2013. Role Performance of Gram Panchayat members in Agriculture Develpoment Programme. *Indian Res. J. Extn. Edu.* 13 (2): 89-92.

Garg, K., Rai, D.P. Badodiya, S.K. and Shakya, S.K. (2014). Perception of radio listeners about effectiveness of farm broadcast in transfer of agricultural technology. *Indian Res. J. Extn. Edu. 14* (2): 78-81.

Kshatriya, A.M. 2011. Role Performance of Women member of Grampanchayat. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, Vasantrao Naik Marathwada Krishi Vidyapeeth, Parbhani (Maharashtra).

Kumar, S., Mazher, S.H. and Bose, D.K. (2016). Role performance and relationship between the selected characteristics of the respondents towards farm school of Agricultural Technology Management Agency (ATMA). *Young*(80): 50.

Neog, P., Bortamuly, K.D., Khuhly, B.L., and Borah, D. (2015). Role perception and role performance of the members of block farmer's advisory committee (BFAC). *Advance Research. Journal of Social Science* 6 (1): 24-27.

Rewatkar, A.R. 2006. Comparative study of Role Perception and Role Performance of Panchayat Raj members. Ph.D (Agri.) Thesis, Marathwada Agricultural University, Parbhani (Maharashtra).

Satpal Singh, Joginder S.M. and Singh, J. (2013). Role perception of Gram Panchayat Members (GPMs). *Journal of Multidisciplinary Advance Research* 2 (1): 131-136.

Singh, K.N., Singh, S.N., K. Pal, and Singh, J. (1972). A scale for measurement of agricultural progressiveness of a village. *Indian J. Extn. Edu.,* 8 (3 & 4): 25-31.

Suradkar, D.D. 2005. A study on role perception and role performance of woman members in Panchayat Raj setup of Parbhani district. Ph.D (Agri.) Thesis, Marathwada Agricultural University, Parbhani(Maharashtra).

Tanweer Ahmed M. 2015. Knowledge level, role perception and job performance of farm facilitators under Bhoochetana programme of KSDA in Chickballapur district.M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore (Karnataka).