

Monograph 01/2009

Political and Socio-Economic Background of PRIs in Bihar

SHAIBAL GUPTA
PRABHAT P. GHOSH



Centre for Economic Policy & Public Finance
Asian Development Research Institute



©Copyright
Asian Development Research Institute (ADRI)

Publisher

Asian Development Research Institute (ADRI)

BSIDC Colony, Off Boring-Patliputra Road

Patna – 800 013 (BIHAR)

Phone : 0612-2265649

Fax : 0612-2267102

E-mail : adri_patna@hotmail.com

Website : www.adriindia.org

Printer

The Offsetters (India) Private Limited

Chhajjubagh, Patna-800001

Study Sponsored by

World Bank

Disclaimer

This monograph may not reflect the views held by the Centre for Economic Policy and Public Finance (CEPPF), ADRI. Usual disclaimers apply.

CONTENTS

List of Tables	i-vii
List of Abbreviations	viii
Chapter I : Introduction	1-8
Panchayati Raj in Bihar	
Objectives of the Study	
Methodology	
Structure of the Report	
Chapter II : Profile of Study Areas	9-24
Profile of Sample Districts	
Demographic Characteristics	
Educational and Health Facilities	
Electricity and Transport Facilities	
Major Problems of the Villages	
Status of Development Administration	
Civil Society Organisations	
Chapter III : Panchayati Raj Functionaries	25-34
Demographic Profile	
Political Behaviour	
Chapter IV : Functioning of Gram Panchayats	35-44
Social Audit Forum and Gram Sabha	
Knowledge and Awareness of Elected Functionaries	
Pattern of Participation	
Development Problems and Response Patterns	
Chapter V : Panchayat Sachivs	45-53
Socio-economic Background	
Knowledge and Awareness	
Work Patterns	
Perception about Problems and Responses	
Chapter VI : Conclusion	54-59

LIST OF TABLES

Table numbers starting with P have been constructed from the PRA Questionnaire. Table numbers starting with M have been constructed from the questionnaire for Mukhiyas and Ward Members. Finally, the Table numbers starting with S have been constructed from the questionnaire for Panchayat Sachivs (secretaries).

Tables from PRA Questionnaire

- Table P 1 : Village summary information
- Table P 2 : Average number of households per village for different religion and caste groups
- Table P 3 : Percentage distribution of households of different religion and caste groups by location of their house
- Table P 4 : Percentage of households of different religion and caste groups living in Kuchcha dwellings
- Table P 5 : Percentage distribution of households of different religion and caste groups by their landholdings
- Table P 6 : Information on educational facilities in GP
- Table P 7 : Extent of private schooling practices in sample villages
- Table P 8 : Percentage of villages mentioning different reasons for their choice of health facilities
- Table P 9 : Information of availability of electricity and water in sample villages
- Table P 10 : Information about availability of public transport in sample villages
- Table P 11 : Percentage of villages reporting various problems
- Table P 12 : Current average ranking of the problems in different districts
- Table P 13 : Extent of activities for public goods and services in sample villages (road infrastructure)
- Table P 14 : Extent of activities for public goods and services in sample villages (education)
- Table P 15 : Extent of activities for public goods and services in sample villages (health)
- Table P 16 : Extent of activities for public goods and services in sample villages (water/sanitation/drainage)
- Table P 17 : Extent of activities for public goods and services in sample villages (electricity)

- Table P 18 : Extent of activities for public goods and services in sample villages (irrigation)
- Table P 19 : Information on functioning of the government health functionaries
- Table P 20 : Information on frequency of visits by development functionaries to the villages
- Table P 21 : Information on existence of NGOs or CBOs in sample villages
- Table P 22 : Information of social capital in sample villages
- Table P 23 : Functioning of Gram Sabha

Tables from Mukhiya/Ward Member Questionnaire

- Table M 1 : Demographic profile of Mukhiyas
- Table M 2 : Demographic profile of Ward Members
- Table M 3 : Gender differences in the demographic profile of Mukhiyas/Ward Members
- Table M 4 : Occupational profile of Mukhiyas
- Table M 5 : Occupational profile of Ward Members
- Table M 6 : Percentage distribution of Mukhiyas and Ward Members by their cultivable landholdings
- Table M 7 : Information about Job Cards held by respondents (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)
- Table M 8 : Information about working under NREGA by respondents (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)
- Table M 9 : Percentage distribution of respondents not applying for Job Card by reasons for not applying (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)
- Table M 10 : Percentage distribution of respondents who have applied for Job Card by person to whom applied (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)
- Table M 11 : Average expenses incurred by respondents for applying for Job Card (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)
- Table M 12 : Percentage distribution of respondents by their housing pattern
- Table M 13 : Percentage distribution of respondents by toilet facilities in their dwellings
- Table M 14 : Percentage distribution of respondents using private toilets by type of toilet and related information
- Table M 15 : Percentage distribution of respondents using private toilets by year of installation
- Table M 16 : Information on landholding of Mukhiyas
- Table M 17 : Information on landholding of Ward Members

- Table M 18 : Percentage distribution of landowning respondents by their main source of irrigation
- Table M 19 : Percentage distribution of landowning respondents by fertility of their holdings (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)
- Table M 20 : Percentage of respondents owning different farm implements (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)
- Table M 21 : Percentage of respondents owning different livestock
- Table M 22 : Percentage of respondents owning different household assets (Part I)
- Table M 23 : Percentage of respondents owning different household assets (Part II)
- Table M 24 : Information about availability of food throughout the year and possession of BPL/APL Ration Cards for the respondents (Mukhiyas)
- Table M 25 : Information about availability of food throughout the year and possession of BPL/APL Ration Cards for the respondents (Ward Members)
- Table M 26 : Selected information on political behaviour of respondents
- Table M 27 : Percentage distribution of respondents by the category for which the position is reserved (Mukhiyas)
- Table M 28 : Percentage distribution of respondents by the category for which the position is reserved (Ward Members)
- Table M 29 : Percentage distribution of respondents by their plans regarding re-contesting for present GP position in next election by districts
- Table M 30 : Percentage distribution of respondents by their plans regarding re-contesting for present GP position in next election by religion/caste groups
- Table M 31 : Percentage distribution of respondents by their plans regarding re-contesting for present GP position in next election by gender
- Table M 32 : Most important source of persuasion for respondents to contest election by districts
- Table M 33 : Most important source of persuasion for respondents to contest election by religion/caste groups
- Table M 34 : Most important source of persuasion for the respondents to contest election by gender
- Table M 35 : Information on political affiliation of respondents (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)

- Table M 36 : Percentage of Respondents Undertaking Different Types of Political Activities (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)
- Table M 37 : Membership of Respondents in Other Local Bodies and Whether Holding Positions in Political Party
- Table M 38 : Percentage of Respondents who correctly named Important Political Functionaries (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)
- Table M 39 : Percentage of Respondents Who Have Voted in Last Election
- Table M 40 : Frequency of Social Audit Forum as Reported by Respondents (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)
- Table M 41 : Source of Information for Respondents Regarding Social Audit Forum (Mukhiyas and Ward members)
- Table M 42 : Information on Chairpersons of Social Audit Forum
- Table M 43 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Knowledge about Statutory Requirement of Gram Sabha and General Body Meeting (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)
- Table M 44 : Percentage of Respondents who Attended Any Village Meeting in Last One Year (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)
- Table M 45 : Information about Attendance by Respondents in Gram Sabha
- Table M 46 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Source of Information about Gram Sabha Meeting (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)
- Table M 47 : Reasons for Attending Gram Sabha Meeting
- Table M 48 : Location of Gram Sabha Meeting
- Table M 49 : Information on Awareness about NREGA among Mukhiyas and Ward members
- Table M 50 : Extent of Knowledge about Different Provisions of NREGA (Availability of Work)
- Table M 51 : Extent of Knowledge about Different Provisions of NREGA (Wage Rate)
- Table M 52 : Extent of Knowledge about Different Provisions of NREGA (Worker's Responsibility) (Mukhiyas)
- Table M 53 : Extent of Knowledge about Different Provisions of NREGA (Worker's Responsibility) (Ward Members)
- Table M 54 : Extent of Knowledge about Different Provisions of NREGA (Duration of Waiting)

- Table M 55 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Opinion about Beneficiary of NREGA (Mukhiyas)
- Table M 56 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Opinion about Beneficiary of NREGA (Ward members)
- Table M 57 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Knowledge about NREGA Allocations (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)
- Table M 58 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Knowledge about BRGF Allocations (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)
- Table M 59 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Knowledge about FC12 Allocations (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)
- Table M 60 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Knowledge about RTI Act (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)
- Table M 61 : Decision Making Process in Gram Panchayat (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)
- Table M 62 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Responses on the Questions on Functioning of Gram Panchayat (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)
- Table M 63 : Extent of Interaction between Respondents and Political and Administrative Functionaries
- Table M 64 : Information on Frequency of Visits by Respondents to Block Headquarters and ZP Headquarters
- Table M 65 : Perception of Mukhiyas about Their Two Most Important Problems
- Table M 66 : Perception of Ward Members about Their Two Most Important Problems
- Table M 67 : Identification by the Respondents of Three Major Problems Facing the Villages
- Table M 68 : Perception of Respondents Regarding Person/Agency Responsible for Three Most Serious Problems
- Table M 69 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Perception about Responsible Agency for Different Facilities
- Table M 70 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Perception about Quality of Facilities in Their Own Village
- Table M 71 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Contribution to Working of Different Facilities
- Table M 72 : Information on Frequency of Different Types of Health Service in GPs
- Table M 73 : Perception of Respondents about Responsible Agency for Different Health Services

Table M 74 : Perception of Respondents about Responsible Agencies for Selected Education, Health and Construction Related Activities

Table M 75 : Percentage of Respondents Reporting Action by GP in Last 12 Months for Different Health, Education and Construction Related Activities

Tables from Panchayat Sachiv Questionnaire

Table S 1 : Demographic Profile of Panchayat Sachivs

Table S 2 : Occupational Profile of Panchayat Sachivs

Table S 3 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Main Mode of Transportation

Table S 4 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Housing Pattern

Table S 5 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Toilet Facilities in Their Dwellings

Table S 6 : Information on Landholding of Panchayat Sachivs

Table S 7 : Percentage Distribution of Landowning Panchayat Sachivs by Their Main Source of Irrigation

Table S 8 : Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs Having Different Farm Implements and Livestock

Table S 9 : Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs Owning Different Household Assets

Table S 10 : Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs who Correctly Named Important Political Functionaries

Table S 11 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Knowledge about Statutory Requirement of Gram Sabha and General Body Meeting

Table S 12 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Knowledge about NREGA Allocations

Table S 13 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Knowledge about BRGF Allocations

Table S 14 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Knowledge about FC12 Allocations

Table S 15 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Knowledge and Uses of RTI

Table S 16 : Decision Making Process in Gram Panchayat as Reported by Panchayat Sachivs

Table S 17 : Frequency of Social Audit Forum as Reported by Panchayat Sachivs

- Table S 18 : Information about Attendance of Panchayat Sachivs in Gram Sabha
- Table S 19 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Attendance in Any Village Meeting in Last One Year
- Table S 20 : Location of Gram Sabha Meetings as Reported by Panchayat Sachivs
- Table S 21 : Extent of Interaction Between Administrative / Political Functionaries and Panchayat Sachivs
- Table S 22 : Information on Frequency of Visits by Panchayat Sachivs to Block Headquarters and ZP Headquarters
- Table S 23 : Information on Work Pattern of Panchayat Sachiv
- Table S 24 : Perception of Panchayat Sachivs about Their Two Most Important Problems
- Table S 25 : Identification by Panchayat Sachivs of Three Major Problems in Their Villages
- Table S 26 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Perception about Quality of Facilities in Their Own Village
- Table S 27 : Information on Frequency of Different Types of Health Service in GPs as Reported by Panchayat Sachivs
- Table S 28 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Perception Regarding Person/Agency Responsible for Different Problems
- Table S 29 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Perception about Responsible Agency for Different Facilities
- Table S 30 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Perception about Responsible Agency for Different Health Services
- Table S 31 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Perception about Responsible Agencies for Selected Education and Construction Related Activities
- Table S 32 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Responses on the Questions on Functioning of Gram Panchayat
- Table S 33 : Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs Reporting Action by GP in Last 12 Months for Different Health, Education and Construction Related Activities

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

APL	Above Poverty Line
BDO	Block Development Officer
BPL	Below Poverty Line
BRGF	Backward Region Grant Fund
CBO	Community-based Organisation
CDPO	Child Development Programme Officer
DRDA	District Rural Development Authority
FC12	Twelfth Finance Commission
GP	Gram Panchayat
ICDS	Integrated Child Development Scheme
MLA	Member of Legislative Assembly
MP	Member of Parliament
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
NREGA	National Rural Employment Guarantee Programme
NRHM	National Rural Health Mission
PACS	Primary Agricultural Credit Society
PDS	Public Distribution System
PHC	Primary Health Centre
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
PRI	Panchayati Raj System
PS	Panchayat Samiti
SC	Schedule Castes
ST	Scheduled Tribes
ZP	Zilla Parishad

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In a country as large as India where three-fourth of the population live in highly disadvantaged rural areas, the imperatives of a responsive and efficient self-government is obvious. A broad calculation would indicate that, at the present size of population, a Member of Parliament (MP in Lok Sabha) here represents no less than 20 lakh people and the people's representatives at the second level, a Member of the Legislative Assembly (MLA) in different states represents again about three lakh people. For the representatives of urban areas, the geographical spread of their constituencies might be rather limited but the average spread of the rural constituencies is generally so large that any direct communication between the people and their representatives is extremely unlikely. In this background, Article 40 of the Indian Constitution, which enshrines one of the directive principles of state policy, lays down that the respective state governments shall take steps to organise village 'panchayats' and endow them with such powers and authority as may be necessary to enable them to function as the units of self-governance. However, since this provision of the said article was not mandatory, the Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) were either not created at all or were abandoned after allowing them to function for some years in many Indian states. Fortunately, the legislative infirmity about PRI was later removed in 1993 through the 73rd amendment of the constitution which made a three-tier system of PRI a mandatory practice in all states.

Panchayati Raj in Bihar

Bihar was one of the Indian states where PRIs were introduced in the early years after independence. The elections for the Gram Panchayats (GP) were held in 1952, 1955, 1958, 1962, 1965, 1972, and 1978. The elections for Gram Panchayats in 1978 were followed by those for the Panchayat Samitis and Zilla Parishads in 1979 and 1980, respectively. But, thereafter, no elections were held and the old elected bodies continued to function even after completing their mandated term of five years. It was only in 1997 that the repeated term extensions for the elected bodies were stopped through a judicial order. Although the 73rd amendment of the constitution making formation of a three-tier system of PRIs a mandatory practice was made in 1993, the state

government was unwilling to honour the provision for several years, possibly because of an apprehension that the new centers of self-governance would weaken the state-level leadership. Thanks to yet another intervention by the judicial authority compelling the state government to hold the elections to the PRIs, it was held in 2001 after a lapse of 23 years.

From the perspective of the social base of Panchayati Raj, the 2001 PRI elections were indeed a turning point for the electoral empowerment of lower backward castes (listed in Annexure-1). Until that election, they were not taken into social or political cognisance despite numbering about one-third of the population. But 2001 election saw one of them being elected even as the Chairperson of the Zilla Parishad, and they also accounted for 3.9 percent of the elected Mukhiyas and 3.5 percent of Zilla Parishad members. This success of the lower backward castes, although not spectacular, was enough to register their presence in the emerging political power structure of the state. A second important phenomenon to be noted from the PRI elections in 2001 was that although both the backward and the extremely backward castes emerged strong from this election the upper castes or the traditional elites were seen to retain a substantial amount of their earlier political power at the grassroot level; their share in different elected posts were — Chairmanship of Zilla Parishad (35 percent), Membership of Zilla Parishads (25 percent) and Mukhiyas (34 percent). This pattern was in contrast to the much smaller political space owned by the upper castes in the state-level power structure.

The 2006 elections for PRIs in Bihar were again a landmark in its political development because unlike the 2001 elections which were held after an intervention by the judicial authority, the next election was held with the full support of the state government which had come to power in 2005. Not only was the new state government committed to strengthening the third tier of parliamentary institution, it had also institutionalised the strategy of political inclusion through the provision for positive discrimination for extremely backward castes, in addition to such provisions for scheduled castes/ tribes and women which were already there. Because of these provisions (some of them covering even single posts like Mukhiya), 2006 elections ensured a much larger role for the marginalised sections of the population in local governance.

Apart from electoral provisions, the PRIs in present Bihar have also acquired an additional strength because of the financial support they now enjoy. Constitutionally, there are no less than 29 items of expenditure for which devolutions are to be made to Zilla Parishads, Panchayat Samitis and Gram Panchayats. But in the absence of such devolutions, PRIs emerging from the 2001 elections had only a legal existence with no function and fund being made available to them. Fortunately, the Twelfth Finance Commission (whose recommendations covered the period 2005-10) had provided the state governments with funds earmarked for the PRIs. Thus, the PRIs emerging from the 2006 election were to receive regular annual grants to cover some of the 29 heads of expenditure that were within their mandate. This financial endowment is now further supplemented by allocations under Backward Area Grant Fund (BRGF) and National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA). All these constitutional, administrative and financial developments together now make the PRIs not only a constitutional body but an actual unit of local self-governance with both opportunities and challenges.

Objectives of the study

From the policies of the state government on PRIs, as evident from its administrative and financial actions in last few years, it is quite obvious that it is committed to strengthening the system. Towards this direction, the state government has been interacting with the World Bank, seeking its cooperation to support and reinforce the PRIs in the state and the process of decentralisation. In response, the World Bank is preparing a 'Bihar Panchayat Strengthening Project' whose objective is to improve the autonomy, capacity and accountability of the PRIs. Specifically, the objectives encompass — (a) Improvement of PRI governance in select districts to implement government anti-poverty schemes and undertake discretionary development initiatives that are responsive to community needs and; (b) Improvement of the policy and administrative environment for efficient functioning of the PRIs.

The present study, commissioned by the World Bank as part of the said project preparation, aims to analyse the political and socio-economic conditions of Gram Panchayats in Bihar. In particular, the study will obtain measures of socio-economic inequality in the GPs, the problems faced by its citizens, the quality and experience of the GP leaders and secretaries, and other related issues

relevant to the functioning of the GPs. The main deliverables is an analysis of the socio-economic and political conditions of the GPs in terms of the following:

- (a) Caste and religious diversity of GP functionaries
- (b) Land inequality within the GPs
- (c) Main problems faced by citizens
- (d) Conflicts within the village and their history
- (e) Quality of public goods
- (f) Quality of response to those problems and to public goods allocation
- (g) Quality of access to GP functions
- (h) Quality of GP members and functionaries, including the Panchayat Sachiv

It is expected that the results of the study will inform the state government and the World Bank on the social and political context under which the GPs function. The study also makes some recommendations that are expected to work best under the given circumstances. Finally, it is also expected to stimulate dialogues among the stakeholders on the possible points of entry for an effective intervention to strengthen the PRIs in Bihar.

Methodology

The study is based on the primary data collected from 50 GPs, spread over five districts - Bhojpur, Nalanda, Begusarai, Saharsa, Sitamarhi – of the state. After choosing the districts in the first stage, two blocks were chosen from each of these five districts, resulting in 10 sample blocks. Thereafter, in the third stage, five GPs were chosen in each block, yielding a total sample of 50 GPs. The criteria for the choice of districts, blocks and GPs in the respective stages are described below.

For the choice of districts, the study had banked on an earlier study of the Asian Development Research Institute (ADRI) which had grouped the 38 districts of Bihar into five zones based on their 'Social Capital Index'. Since the functioning of the GPs entails 'community initiatives', as distinct from 'individual efforts', the criterion of social capital was preferred in place of three other

indices (poverty, vulnerability and livelihood potential), for each of which the study by ADRI had done separate grouping exercise of the 38 districts. The Social Capital Index was constructed using four indicators; the rural literacy rate, the gender disparity in literacy rate, the number of self-help groups per one lakh population and number of PACS (Primary Agricultural Credit Societies) and Fishery Cooperatives per one lakh population. The grouping of the 38 districts into five categories (Much Above Average, Above Average, Average, Below Average and Much Below Average) is presented in Table 1.01 and one can see that the chosen sample districts are one from each group.

Table 1.01: Districts grouped by the index of Social Capital

Social Capital	Districts	Chosen District
Much Above Average (7 districts)	Aurangabad / Munger / West Champanan / Bhojpur / Rohtas / Gaya / Patna	Bhojpur
Above Average (8 districts)	Arwal / Jehanabad / Sheikhpura / Bhagalpur / Kaimur / Siwan / Buxar / Nalanda	Nalanda
Average (8 districts)	Begusarai / Muzaffarpur / Sheohar / Gopalganj / Nawada / Vaishali / Lakhisarai / Saran	Begusarai
Below Average (8 districts)	Banka / Jamui / Saharsa / Darbhanga / Khagaria / Samastipur / East Champanan / Madhubani	Saharsa
Much Below Average (7 districts)	Araria / Madhepura / Supaul / Sitamarhi / Kishanganj / Purnea / Katihar	Sitamarhi

For the choice of two blocks in each of the five districts, the study has chosen the criterion of general levels of prosperity — one from among relatively prosperous blocks and the other from among the disadvantaged ones. Finally, the selection of five GPs from each of the 10 sample

blocks was done randomly, yielding a total sample of 50 GPs. Table 1.02 presents the names of the chosen districts, blocks and GPs. One might note here that the PRIs in Bihar comprise of 38 Zilla Parishads, 533 Panchayat Samitis (one in each block) and 8,469 Gram Panchayats. The average number of villages per GP is 5.3, as there are 45,098 villages in Bihar.

Table 1.02: List of Sample Districts, Blocks and Gram Panchayats

Zilla Parishads	Panchayat Samitis	Gram Panchayats
Bhojpur	Agiawan (15/1,22,093)	Agiawan, Badgaon, Dilian, Karwasin, and Nonwar
	Udwantnagar (16/1,31,865)	Eraura, Choti Sasaram, Kusumha, Nawada Ben, and Udwantnagar
Nalanda	Bihar Sharif (20/3,94,435)	Muraura, Pachauri, Paroha, Sakraul, and Sigthu
	Silaw (14/1,23,030)	Barakar, Gorawan, Kariyanna, Nanand, and Pawadih
Begusarai	Naw Kothi (9/80,356)	Dafarpur, Hasanpur Bagar, Maheshwara, Naw Kothi, and Rajakpur
	Barauni (24/2,25,879)	Amarpur, Buthauli Mahna, Mallahipur North, and Pipra Dewas
Saharsa	Saharsa / Kahara (15/2,29,744)	Amarpur, Bangaun South, Chainpur, Diwari, and Padri
	Sonbarsha (21/1,76,336)	Khajuraha, Lagma, Raghunathpur, Shahpur, and Soha
Sitamarhi	Dumra (28/3,38,994)	Bhupobhairo, Bishanpur, ChakRajopatti, Khairwa, and Lagama
	Bokhara (11/1,03,778)	Banoul, Bhour, Bokhara Chakauti, Dumari, and Maksudanpur

Note: The figures in brackets indicate the number of Gram Panchayats in the respective Panchayat Samiti and the population of Panchayat Samiti, according to the 2001 census.

For collecting the primary data from 50 GPs, the study has used three questionnaires — one for Participatory Rapid Appraisal (PRA) in two villages in each panchayat; the second, a common questionnaire for the Mukhiya and two of the Ward Members in each GP; and a third questionnaire for the Panchayat Sachiv. Unfortunately, the PRA exercise could not be conducted in a second village in six GPs and the data here is based on 94 villages instead of 100. In case of Panchayat Sachiv again, one respondent is missing as after the transfer of the previous Panchayat Sachiv a new incumbent was yet to assume the office.

The analysis of the results of survey in the remaining chapters of the study follows the above division of primary data into three sets — data from PRA exercise, Mukhiya/Ward Member questionnaire and Panchayat Sachiv questionnaire, although many of the information are common to the three survey instruments.

The field survey for the study was conducted during April-August, 2009.

Structure of the report

After this Introductory, the report first focuses on the profile of the study area in Chapter II. To begin with, the study presents the findings of the data gathered from the PRA exercises in 94 villages. These data cover socio-economic profile of the population in the sample GPs/villages and, more importantly, the development infrastructure in those areas. Since PRA exercises were attended by a substantial number of villagers in all cases, it can be safely assumed that the responses do reflect the general opinion of the villagers regarding their felt problems and the way GPs are functioning there.

Admittedly, the functioning of the GPs depends on a number of factors, starting from legislative support, physical infrastructure, financial allocations or the nature of rural polity; but a pivotal role in all the operations of GPs is played by the elected functionaries, their socio-economic background, competencies and political attitudes. Chapter III of the report analyses this aspect of GPs in Bihar, based on the data collected from Mukhiyas and Ward Members. The structure of political power in rural areas of Bihar has undergone many changes, particularly during the last two decades and the discussion in Chapter III strongly reinforces this observation empirically.

For an enquiry into the nature of functioning of GPs, one can refer to the information collected during the PRA exercises (discussed in Chapter II), but Mukhiyas and Ward Members were equally eloquent about various limitations of the GPs, notwithstanding the fact that they are the principal functionaries of this lowest unit of self-governance. Since Mukhiyas and Ward Members have to interact with their electorate directly, they feel the pressure of an inadequately functioning

GP as much as do the villagers. In this background, Chapter IV presents the details about the functioning of the GPs, based on the responses of their elected functionaries.

Generally, the paid staff of a GP comprises of three persons — Panchayat Sachiv, Rozgar Sevak and a Nyaya Mitra, the third person receiving a small honorarium and not a full-time worker. Of these, Rozgar Sevak is entirely preoccupied with the work related to NREGA and the Nyaya Mitra with the quasi-judicial functions of GP. That leaves Panchayat Sachiv as the only person to look after the entire work of GP, covering administrative, financial and programme implementation responsibilities. The capacity, work pattern and perceptions of Panchayat Sachivs are, therefore, extremely relevant to analyse the functioning of GPs. Chapter V attempts this exercise based on the information collected from a questionnaire canvassed among Panchayat Sachivs.

Finally, Chapter VI collects the main conclusions of the study and then records a number of suggestions that should merit the attention of the state government as well as the World Bank.

CHAPTER II

PROFILE OF STUDY AREAS

The primary data for the study, as mentioned before, was collected from 50 Gram Panchayats (GPs) spread over five districts. The choice of districts was purposive in terms of their social capital indices and so was the choice of 10 blocks, based on their general levels of development, half of them relatively prosperous and the other half relatively disadvantaged. The 50 GPs, however, were chosen randomly, five each from the selected 10 blocks. In this chapter, a profile of the above study area is presented based largely on the data collected from the field survey.

The study had planned to conduct Participatory Rapid Appraisal (PRA) in two villages in each of the 50 sample GPs. However, due to unavoidable difficulties, such PRA exercises could not be conducted in six villages and, as such, the profile of the GPs presented here is based on the data from 94 villages instead of 100. In the Appendix, there are 23 tables (Table P1-P23) presenting the major information obtained from the PRA exercises for each of the districts separately as well as for the overall sample of 94 villages.

The credibility of the information collected from the PRA exercises depends substantially on the number of villagers attending the exercise. Fortunately, except for Nalanda where the PRA exercise was attended by only about 16 people, everywhere else the average attendance was large — 48 people for all the districts, the highest at 86 people being recorded at Bhojpur (Table P1). It is also satisfying to note that in about half of the PRAs (48.9 percent) the Mukhiya himself/ herself was present, and in about three-fourth of the PRAs (76.6 percent) the concerned Ward Members were also present. The attendance of the GP Sachiv may not be very necessary for an effective PRA exercise, but about one-sixth of the PRAs were attended by GP Sachiv (17.2 percent), the lowest in Nalanda (5.6 percent) and the highest in Sitamarhi (30.0 percent).

The present chapter presents a profile of the study area in terms its demographic characteristics, available development infrastructure, status of development administration and the extent of civil society organisations operating there. But before presenting that profile, one may describe the overall demographic, social and economic characteristics of the five districts, based on the available secondary data.

Profile of sample districts

The choice of sample districts, as mentioned before, was based on their social capital endowment. On this criterion, Bhojpur was found to have the highest social capital, followed by Nalanda, Begusarai, Saharsa and Sitamarhi. When one compares these districts in terms of their demographic characteristics a similar ranking is found to exist (Table 2.01). For example, the decadal growth of population (1991-2001) was much lower in Bhojpur (24.58 percent) and Nalanda (18.64 percent) than in other three districts — Begusarai (29.11 percent), Saharsa (33.03 percent) and Sitamarhi (32.58 percent). For Bihar as a whole, the decadal growth rate of population was 28.43 percent. As regards the composition of the population in terms of its religion-caste background, it is also observed that the share of the disadvantaged religion-caste groups (scheduled caste Hindus and Muslims) is the lowest in Bhojpur (22.7 percent) and it gradually increases to reach the maximum in Sitamarhi (33.2 percent). Similarly, the literacy rate for all is the highest in Bhojpur (59.8 percent) and the lowest in Saharsa (39.3 percent). Considering the level of urbanisation as an index of overall economic prosperity of the district, it is highest in Nalanda (14.9 percent) and lowest in Sitamarhi (5.7 percent).

Table 2.01: Demographic profile of sample districts

Characteristics	Bhojpur	Nalanda	Begusarai	Saharsa	Sitamarhi	Bihar
Population (million)	2.23	2.37	2.34	1.51	2.67	82.88
Density of Population (persons/sq km)	903	1006	1222	885	1214	880
Decadal Growth rate (1991-2001)	24.58	18.64	29.11	33.03	32.58	28.43
Sex Ratio (Females / 1000 males)	900	915	911	910	893	921
Scheduled Caste Population (%)	15.4	20.0	14.5	16.1	11.9	15.7
Muslim Population (%)	7.3	7.5	13.4	14.4	21.3	16.6
Urbanisation (%)	13.9	14.9	9.8	8.3	5.7	10.5
Literacy Rates (%)						
Male	74.8	66.9	59.7	82.0	51.0	60.3
Female	42.8	39.0	36.2	25.3	26.4	33.6
Persons	59.7	53.6	48.6	39.3	39.4	47.5

Note: All figures are based on 2001 Census

From the information on social and economic infrastructure in the sample districts (Table 2.02), it is not difficult to realise that the infrastructural inadequacies are closely related to their social and economic backwardness. Consider, for example, the availability of primary school in different districts — compared to 65.0 primary schools per one lakh of population in Bihar as a whole (which itself is inadequate), there are only 55.0 such schools in Sitamarhi, the most disadvantaged district. In Bhojpur, where the corresponding figure is 71.5, the situation is relatively better. In case of health-related infrastructure, the inter-district differences are again substantial. This difference is not so much in terms of Primary Health Centres or Hospitals, most of which were established in the immediate decades after independence, many hospitals being there even before that. But the later expansion in health infrastructure was mainly through the establishment of relatively less equipped Primary Health Sub-centres and this expansion process was very unequal across the districts; thus the number of Sub-centres per one lakh population varies from 20.0 (Nalanda) to only 1.3 (Sitamarhi). The existence of a commercial bank is an important part of the economic infrastructure and, on this account again, the inter-district variation is very wide; for a population of one lakh, there are 3.6 banks in Saharsa, surprisingly so since it is a backward district and only 0.2 in Sitamarhi.

Table 2.02: Social and Economic Infrastructure in Sample Districts

Infrastructure		Bhojpur	Nalanda	Begusarai	Saharsa	Sitamarhi	Bihar
Primary Schools	A	1594	1470	1338	875	1468	53847
	B	(71.5)	(62.0)	(57.2)	(57.9)	(55.0)	(65.0)
Hospitals	A	36	57	38	29	56	1834
	B	(1.6)	(2.4)	(1.6)	(1.9)	(2.1)	(2.2)
Primary Health Centre	A	13	20	18	12	14	484
	B	(0.6)	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.5)	(0.6)
Primary Health Sub-Centre	A	280	473	265	186	34	9558
	B	(12.5)	(20.0)	(11.3)	(12.3)	(1.3)	(11.5)
Commercial Banks	A	50	26	82	55	6	2118
	B	(2.2)	(1.1)	(3.5)	(3.6)	(0.2)	(2.6)
Post Office	A	201	395	402	115	174	9055
	B	(9.0)	(16.7)	(17.2)	(7.6)	(6.5)	(10.9)
Road Length	A	461	502	337	316	352	15658
	B	(18.4)	(20.9)	(17.7)	(18.6)	(16.0)	(16.6)

Note: A = Number for all infrastructure and kms for road length
B = Number per one lakh population for all infrastructure and kms per 100 sq km for road length

For transport facilities, the spread of road network is most relevant. For Bihar as a whole, this network is rather thin with only 16.6 kms of road per 100 sq kms of area. Among the districts, there are only marginal variations; the network is widest in Nalanda and the thinnest in Sitamarhi; with 20.9 and 16.0 kms of road, respectively per 100 sq kms of area. For communications, postal services are extremely important and one observes wide variations across the state in terms of the spread of postal network. Compared to 16.7 post offices per one lakh population in Nalanda, there are only 6.5 of them in Sitamarhi, the state average being 10.9 post offices.

Table 2.03: Panchayati Raj Institutions in Sample Districts

Institutions	Bhojpur	Nalanda	Begusarai	Saharsa	Sitamarhi	Bihar
No. of Zilla Parishads	1	1	1	1	1	38
No. of Panchayat Samitis	20	14	18	10	17	533
No. of Gram Panchayats	228	249	257	153	273	8469
No. of Villages	1243	1183	780	432	846	45098
Average no. of Villages per GP	5.5	4.8	3.0	2.8	3.1	5.3

Finally, one may note that, thanks to the legal provisions, the Panchayati Raj Institutions are equally wide in all the districts — a Zilla Parishad in all 38 districts and a Panchayat Samiti in all 533 Blocks; for Gram Panchayats, however, the villages are generally clustered and, thus, there are 8,469 Gram Panchayats for 45,098 villages in Bihar (Table 2.03) This implies that the average number of villages per Gram Panchayat is 5.3. This average figure, however, varies across the districts, depending on the average size of villages. The villages in Bhojpur have relatively less population and, consequently, average number of villages per Gram Panchayat is 5.5 there in contrast to Saharsa where the corresponding average stands at only 2.8 because the villages there are relatively larger in terms of their population.

Demographic Characteristics

For the demographic characteristics of the villages, the PRA had collected information on — size of the population, its distribution among the major religion-caste groups, their habitation pattern and finally, their landholdings.

The average number of households in the sample villages was 301 which will roughly imply a population of about 15-16 hundred (Table P1). This estimate appears to be quite reasonable if one takes into consideration the 2001 census data; population size was unusually large for villages in the Saharsa district where, because of extremely high density of population, the villages are generally larger. As a simple indicator of economic prosperity, the study had collected information on daily wages in different villages (Table P1). That the economic condition of the sample villages varies considerably is apparent from the fact that the average male wages for agricultural work ranges from Rs. 51.50 (Sitamarhi) to Rs. 70.00 (Nalanda). A similar pattern is also noticeable for female wage rates for agricultural work and male wage rates for construction works.

For analysing the religion-caste composition of the rural population, the study had divided the population into five groups — Upper Caste Hindus (four castes), Backward Caste Hindus (four castes), Extremely Backward Castes (about 108 castes), Scheduled Castes / Tribes (20 scheduled castes, and a few scheduled tribes, the latter being extremely small in number) and the Muslims. Since there are a large number of castes among which the population is divided, practically all the villages are multi-caste ones. The average number of castes per village for the entire sample is 13, ranging from 10 (Nalanda) to 14 (Bhojpur and Sitamarhi) (Table P2). Even in the face of such caste-diversity, however, it is quite common for a typical Bihar village to be dominated by a single caste or just 2-3 of them, the source of dominance being either their land endowment or their numbers or a combination of both. In the context of religion-caste hierarchy, it should also be noted that separate hamlets for scheduled caste households is a nearly universal phenomenon in Bihar and, on an average, there are 1.7 scheduled caste hamlets per village, the highest being in Saharsa (2.3 hamlets).

As regards the religion-caste composition of the population, the share of different groups are — Upper Caste Hindus (30.3 percent), Backward Caste Hindus (15.7 percent), Extremely Backward Caste Hindus (14.8 percent), Schedule Caste / tribes (14.8 percent) and Muslims (25.9 percent) (Table P2). From the knowledge of religious, caste-wise distribution that one has (based on a very old census of 1931), the upper caste Hindus appear to be over-represented in the sample, at the expense of backward and extremely backward caste Hindus; but one is still left with adequate

sample size for each religion-caste groups to analyse meaningfully their socio-economic status. Secondly, the variation among the five districts is substantial — whereas the share of the upper caste Hindus is largest in Saharsa (41.9 percent) - that of backward caste Hindus is in Nalanda (29.2 percent), extremely backward caste Hindus in Begusarai (18.2 percent), scheduled castes / tribes in Bhojpur (25.9 percent) and Muslims in Sitamarhi (33.5 percent).

An important indicator of the social cohesion or the absence of it among the different religion-caste groups is the location pattern of their residential house (Table P3). As expected, the upper caste, backward caste and extremely backward caste Hindu households are generally seen to stay at the main village, but in two districts (Nalanda and Begusarai), even the upper caste Hindu households are seen to distance themselves from backward or extremely backward Hindu households to some extent by staying at a separate colony in main village. The fact of a distanced location of houses is observed for about two-thirds (67.0 percent) of scheduled castes/tribes, the phenomenon being most pronounced in Begusarai and Saharsa. Such distanced habitation could be either a separate colony in the main village (54.3 percent) or in a hamlet away from the village (12.3 percent). For the Muslim households, a house in the main village is quite common (73.6 percent), but it generally happens in those villages where they constitute a majority, failing which they live in a separate colony in the main village (18.8 percent).

For the economic condition of households from different religion-caste groups, the study had collected information on 'Percentage of Households Living in Kuchcha Dwellings' and their landholding patterns. For all the religion-caste groups in all the districts, no less than 60.6 percent of the households are seen to live in kuchcha house, which indeed is very high, pointing to the extremely poor economic condition of the rural population in Bihar (Table P4). Among the different religion-caste groups, such poor housing condition is the least among the upper caste Hindus (37.3 percent) and highest among the extremely backward caste Hindus (81.4 percent). Among the districts, the situation is best in Nalanda (44.0 percent) and the worst in Sitamarhi (71.9 percent).

Since land constitutes the most important source of livelihood in rural Bihar, it is the extent of land endowment that possibly indicates best the relative economic position of different groups of

households. For the overall population in all the districts, it is interesting to note that no less than 59.3 percent of the rural households are landless (Table P5). For another one-fourth of the households (25.0 percent), the amount of owned land is less than one acre, making them only marginal farmers. Taking five acres of land as the minimum requirement for a decent livelihood, it is noticed that only 4.1 percent of the total households are fortunate to own it. When one compares the land endowment for different religion-caste groups, it emerges that even among the upper caste Hindu households landlessness pervades no less than one-fourth of such households (24.6 percent). The phenomenon of landlessness becomes wider as one goes down the caste-ladder and among the scheduled castes/ tribes it characterizes nine-tenths of the households (91.3 percent). Among the Muslim households, landlessness pervades 83.3 percent of the households, indicating that their economic condition is only slightly better than that of scheduled castes/ tribes and very close to that of extremely backward caste Hindu households. A comparison among the districts in terms of landholding pattern indicates that the land poverty is relatively more in Begusarai, Saharsa and Sitamarhi and less in Bhojpur and Nalanda. Not unexpectedly, the latter two districts also enjoy higher social capital than the remaining three districts.

Educational and Health Facilities

Next to opportunities for livelihood, the rural population is most desirous of adequate educational and health facilities in their own villages. Unfortunately, for both these critical facilities, the situation in Bihar is extremely poor. To consider first the educational facilities, it is noticed that there are less than two Government Primary Schools per village (Table P6). Surprisingly, the situation is relatively better in Saharsa, an extremely backward district, and worst in Nalanda, a relatively prosperous district. When one considers the existence of Government Secondary Schools, the situation is very pathetic, with only one such school for about five villages. Thus, one can safely conclude that the non-availability of secondary schools is more important a reason for low enrolment in standards 6-8 than other socio-economic or attitudinal factors that are often over-highlighted. The inadequate public provision of primary schools is only marginally compensated by the existence of some private schools; for secondary schools, however, the private schools are altogether absent.

The primary school system has recently received some policy and resource support because of the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA), funded largely by the central government. Consequently, the average number of teachers per school is at least 4.3, only marginally inadequate for a school that has five classes (Standards 1-5). But, in spite of the SSA, close to three-fourth of the schools (71.3 percent) have vacant positions and the situation is nearly the same across all the districts. In the Government Secondary Schools, the availability of teachers is relatively high, about 13.4 teachers per school and less than 10 percent of the schools having some vacant positions. For the primary schools, nearly all the teachers (92.6 percent) reside within the GP, but this advantage is not available to secondary schools, with only one-tenth of their teachers residing within the GP. One should note here that although the availability of teachers for existing secondary schools is not low, it cannot compensate for the non-existence of such schools in many villages.

In view of the paucity of schools, particularly secondary schools, it is not at all surprising to note that about one-fifth of the households (21.7 percent) do not send their children to attend schools, either government or private in rural Bihar (Table P7). As mentioned before, the private primary schools are only limited in number in rural areas and, as such, only a small fraction of the students (6.9 percent) attend such schools, leaving the government primary schools as still the largest provider of educational facilities in rural Bihar. If one had data on separate enrolment ratios for primary and secondary schools, it would have certainly indicated that the ratio is much smaller for the higher classes, largely because of the absence of adequate number of secondary schools. On being asked for the reasons for private schooling, the villagers had mentioned better facilities and better teaching in those schools. From a physical inspection of both government and private schools, it was found that the schooling infrastructure was poor even in private schools, and the government schools were of course poorer. The teaching of English was mentioned as the third important reason for choice of private schools, notwithstanding the fact that teachers there were hardly qualified to teach proper English.

For the health requirements, the villagers are rarely fortunate enough to have a sub-Centre or a PHC at their own or nearby village. Thus neither of these facilities appears to be the frequent choice of a villager for health services (Table P8). The government hospitals are, however,

preferred by the people of more than one-third of the villages for health services, partly because of the available facilities and secondly the good prescription of their doctors. But such government hospitals are generally far away from the villages and, for critical needs, they are left with no option than to approach a private practitioner; apart from their availability at a nearby place (37.3 percent), the private practitioners are also preferred for the facilities they offer (26.6 percent) and quality of their medical prescriptions (18.1 percent). Finally, in spite of offering only limited health services, the ICDS centres are widely preferred by many rural people, largely guided by the distance criterion (79.7 percent).

A broad comparison among the districts indicates that the Sub-centres and PHCs are least effective in Bhojpur, surprisingly a better-off region. It is only in Sitamarhi that these Centres are seen to attract some villagers. In case of government hospitals, those in Bhojpur and Saharsa seem to attract a large number of villagers, the situation being the worst in Nalanda. One should note here that both Ara (in Bhojpur) and Saharsa have been old district headquarters and they have relatively better district hospitals. In contrast, in the districts which were created later (Nalanda, Begusarai and Sitamarhi), the district hospitals are less equipped and attract fewer number of patents. Approaching a private practitioner for health requirements is, of course, a wide phenomenon in all the districts.

Electricity and Transport Facilities

In a state where availability of electricity is a problem even in urban areas, it is not surprising that only half the sample villages (51.1 percent) have this facility (Table P9). The extent of this facility, however, varies widely from as low as 21.1 percent in Bhojpur to 70.6 percent in Saharsa. But these figures are somewhat misleading, as the extension of the power distribution network up to the villages is no guarantee that the required power indeed reaches the villages. As is evident from the next part of the table, the actual power reaches less than five days a week even for as critical a need as irrigation; secondly, even in those days when the power is available, it is so for barely seven to eight hours in the main village and less than six hours in SC/ST hamlets.

For transportation facilities, the situation in rural Bihar is again extremely poor. The average distance of all the villages from the nearest bus stop is no less than 1.7 kms, ranging from 0.4 km in Nalanda to as high as 2.9 kms in Bhojpur (Table P10). To make things worse, very few villages, less than 10 percent, are fortunate to have a sheltered bus stop and this pattern prevails for all the districts. The provision of government transport services is again very limited, just 4.3 percent of the villages enjoying this privilege. The remaining villages are wholly dependent on private transport services which are almost invariably irregular and overcrowded. These private transport services operate only during the day, making transportation of people a difficult task. Such acute absence of transport facility, it may be noted, is not only a deterrent for movement of people, it prevents the integration of the rural economy with the nearby markets as well, resulting in poor returns to all economic activities in the village, be it agriculture or non-agriculture.

Major Problems of Villages

From the above descriptions of the sample areas, it is quite obvious that the people of rural Bihar suffer from a large number of economic and social problems. It is hardly necessary to conduct a field survey to identify those problems. However, the PRA schedule had prepared an exhaustive list of such problems and an exercise was conducted to know the relative intensity of those problems. These results of this exercise are presented in Table P11.

The 11 major heads for these problems were — Water, Health, Education, Road, Electricity, Unemployment, Sanitation, Irrigation, Liquor, Housing and Security. For the entire sample of 94 villages, the specific problems reported by at least 60 percent of the villages were the following — Water Logging (70.2 percent) and Poor Quality of Drinking Water (71.3 percent) under the major head Water; No Sub-Centre or a Closed Sub-centre (71.3 percent) under Health; Poor Quality of Teachers (67.0 percent) under Education; Poor Quality of Village Approach Road (74.5 percent) and Poor Quality of Roads within Village (75.5 percent) under Roads; Absence of Adequate Street Lights (85.1 percent) under Electricity; Not Enough Non-agricultural Employment within Village (72.3 percent) under Unemployment; Absence of Adequate Public/Private Toilets (95.7 percent) under Sanitation; Poor Quality of Irrigation Facilities (76.6 percent) and Absence of Irrigation Facility / Dependence on Monsoon (86.2 percent) under Irrigation; Not / Insufficient Government

Housing Scheme (96.8 percent) under Housing; and finally, safety of Minorities (72.3 percent) under Security. Except for water, for which the inter-district variation is large, the pattern of problem identification under other major heads is quite similar across the districts. One should also note here that the reporting of some of these problems is really intriguing, like the problem of public/ private toilets (in spite of the sanitation programmes being run for long), absence of irrigation facilities and dependence on monsoon (in spite of substantial investment in this field in early post-independence years) and insufficient government housing schemes (in spite of Indira Awas Yojana being run for several years).

Apart from requesting the villagers to mention whether they suffer from a particular problem (responses to which have been discussed above), they were also requested to rank their identified problem along a scale of one (most acute) to three (third most acute), the score 4 being given to a problem that was not mentioned. The average ranking of the different problems under each major head is presented in Table P12. If we take a rank of 2 or below as an indicator of very serious problems, the emerging list from Table P12 will almost wholly coincide with the list that had emerged from Table P11, as mentioned above.

Status of Development Administration

Although the condition of rural Bihar in terms of education, health, roads and other facilities is very poor, certain development activities are obviously undertaken there. Previously, such activities were undertaken largely by the district-level development administration, from the DRDA (District Rural Development Authority) to BDO (Block Development Officer) and presently, they are also supplemented by activities of the GPs. In the PRA exercise, to obtain an idea about the responsiveness of the development administration towards the existing problems in rural areas, the villagers were requested to report first, whether any activity has taken place in last 12 months for each of the problem areas and second, whether further action is needed in those areas. For different groups of problems, these responses are presented in Tables P13-P18.

Of the two responses — 'Percentage of villages where action was taken in last 12 months' and 'Percentage of villages where further action is needed', the first is obviously more important,

indicating as it does some actual progress. Taking the problems related to road infrastructure in less than half of the villages, some activity has been taken up recently — 45.7 percent reporting activities for approach / connection road and an equal percentage for roads in main village (Table P13). As is evident from corresponding figures for later tables, activities for roads - either approach or within the village - have been the widest in recent past. It should, however, be noted that activities for roads in SC/ST hamlets have been noticeably lower (22.3 percent).

In case of education, the only activity that has received the attention of the development administration is repair / construction of school buildings (39.4 percent) (Table P14). All other activities have been ignored by the development administration. Among the activities that have been ignored, the villagers are particularly desirous of the provision of educational materials and more government schemes for school uniforms and more teachers. Across the districts, the same pattern is observed, irrespective of their existing levels of economic and social development.

The health services for the rural people are probably more important than their educational needs as its absence is felt more acutely. But, unfortunately, the present development administration is highly unresponsive to this problem. Of the eight specific activities, on which responses were collected in the PRI exercises, none is found to have been undertaken even marginally (Table P15). The widest activity is reported for conducting health / immunisation camp and this too was undertaken in only 6.4 percent of villages. In view of the National Rural Health Mission (NRHM), one of the flagship programmes of the central government, it is rather disappointing that efforts for improving the rural health services are still minimal in Bihar.

For Water, Sanitation and Drainage, the extent of efforts by the development administration is only slightly higher than those for health facilities (Table P16). In the recent past, only one-fifth of the villages had seen activities for repair / construction of borewell (21.3 percent), and one-eighth for repair / construction of drains (12.8 percent) and another one-tenth for repair / construction of drains in SC/ST hamlet (10.6 percent). For all other activities, the percentage of villages reporting such activities is abysmally low. Among the districts, the efforts for improving the water/sanitation / drainage conditions were much higher in Bhojpur than in any of the remaining

districts. An atypical response was also recorded in Begusarai where half the villages had witnessed repair / construction of overhead tank, a rare activity everywhere else.

In case of facility for electricity, it is observed that in about one-third of the villages, streetlights have been provided in the village (34.0 percent) and the same facility has also been provided in SC/ST hamlets is about one-fifth of the villages (18.1 percent). These activities are the result of the technology of solar lights which have become popular in Bihar and possibly elsewhere in India. The guidelines for the Backward Region Grant Fund (BRGF) and Twelfth Finance Commission Allocations allow for solar lights as one of the permissible activities and, as such, this activity is quite wide in all the districts, except Begusarai. But one should note here that the solar lights provided till date are still inadequate and about one-fourth of the villages (26.6 percent) demand further action on it; for similar facilities in SC/ST hamlets, the demand is even more (46.8 percent). As regards activities for providing regular electricity in the villages, it is found to be almost absent everywhere.

Finally, one finds that efforts for enhancing irrigation facilities in the recent past have been very limited in sample villages. (Table P 18). In only one-fourth of the villages, such effort has been made (25.5 percent); the inter-district variation is very large with villages in Sitamarhi reporting no such effort and more than three-fourth of the villages in Bhojpur reporting some intervention (78.9 percent). That the irrigation facilities are an extremely-felt need of the villagers is indicated by nearly all the villages demanding wider efforts in this field. From the PRA exercises, it also emerges that irrigation services for SC/ST population is much less than for the general population.

Among various public services discussed above, it was clearly noted that it was the health services that was most inadequate. Admittedly, the absence of enough number of Sub-centres and PHCs is one of the causes of this inadequacy, but even the existing ones are often unable to play their expected role because of lack of efficiency of their staff. Looking for the reasons for such inefficiency, it was found out from the PRA exercises that except for the ICDS staff (most of whom stay in their respective villages - 88.3 percent) many of those who work in Sub-centres or PHCs stay away from their respective villages/GPs; in case of Sub-centres, staff members staying

within the village/GP is only about half (46.8 percent), and for PHCs the figure is even lower at only 29.8 percent (Table P19). Partly because of this residential pattern of staff and secondly of other reasons, the attendance of health functionaries is very irregular, except for the ICDS functionaries. As regards the Sub-centres, they do not exist in more than half of the villages (53.2 percent); in the existing ones less than 10 percent of the staff members attend their duties regularly (either everyday or almost every day). About three-fourth of the villages do not have a PHC nearby (70.2 percent) and the attendance of staff in the existing ones is again very irregular.

In the context of the efficiency of development functionaries, it should also be noted that it is not the health functionaries alone whose attendance is very irregular (Table P20). No less than 85.1 percent of the villagers reported that the Agricultural Extension Officers visit their villages less than once in a year. For Block Development Officers (BDO) and Child Development Programme Officer (CDPO), the corresponding figures are 71.3 percent and 61.7 percent. This pattern is same in all the districts, with only villagers in Bhojpur reporting slightly more frequent visits of both the BDO and the CDPO. It is only the Rojgar Sevaks, supervising the work under NREGA, who are seen to visit the villagers more frequently; about three-fourth of the villages had reported that they visit their villages at least once in a month.

Civil Society Organisations

In the recent decades, a number of Non-Government Organisations (NGO) started operating in both rural and urban areas to supplement the efforts of the government for development. Apart from providing some services directly, such civil society organisations also help the development process in at least two other ways — first, they often exert a moral pressure on the government machinery through their own performance (though there are many unscrupulous NGOs) and secondly, their activities often enthuse the villagers to participate in the development process through group or community actions, often facilitating the emergence of Community-Based Organisations (CBOs).

As regards the NGOs in the surveyed villages, they were seen to function in about only one-tenth of the villages (9.6 percent); although Bhojpur and Begusarai did not report any such

organisations, and about one-fourth of the villages in Saharsa had an NGO functioning (23.5 percent). In view of the wide range of rural problems, most of these NGOs were multi-focal, working simultaneously in the field of education, health, credit, marketing and legal help. The two issues receiving relatively less attention were women groups and SC/ST welfare. The presence of CBOs again was only marginal in sample villages, only about one-tenth of them reporting their existence (11.7 percent). The inter-district variation was substantial regarding presence of CBOs; at one hand, they were wholly absent in Sitamarhi and, on the other, about one-fourth of the villages in Bhojpur had at least one functioning CBOs. These organisations again had exhibited the same working pattern, covering simultaneously a number of fields.

The choice of the sample districts for the present study, as mentioned before, was based on the social capital index of various districts. In the PRA exercise also, a few questions were asked to know the extent of the social capital of the sample villages (Table P22). To the query whether the villages had Specialised Committees to supervise the development work, it was found to be abysmally low for both for Health Sanitation Committee and Village Monitoring Committee in all the districts. A limited number of villages, however, had reported the existence of Village Shiksha Samiti in all the districts, except Bhojpur. The only other indicator showing the existence of some social capital was the organisation of regular village festivals. For the entire sample, about half the villages had regular village festivals (47.9 percent); among the districts it was high in Nalanda, Begusarai and Sitamarhi, rather low in Saharsa and altogether absent in Bhojpur.

In spite of most of the villages in rural Bihar being multi-caste ones, the occurrence of caste conflict is rare here (5.3 of the villages reported it) and the occurrence of violence in such caste conflicts was even rarer (1.1 percent of the villages reported it). A reasonable amount of social capital, in the sample villages was, however, apparent since GPs at one hand and NGOs/ CBOs at the other had functioned here parallelly, without any conflict.

The Gram Sabhas play an extremely important role towards ensuring effective functioning of GPs. And it is the social capital of a typical village that facilitates regular sessions of Gram Sabha and meaningful transactions therein. Unfortunately, however, in no less than one-third of the sample

villages, no Gram Sabha was held in last 12 months; even where it was held, the time lapse since the last Gram Sabha is found to be no less than four months. That the GPs do not attach enough importance to Gram Sabhas is apparent from the fact that only 60.6 percentage of the villages reported that Gram Sabhas are announced adequately. It is often maintained by the functionaries of Public Distribution System (PDS) that the list of APL/ BPL members should be discussed in the Gram Sabhas and, in the sample villages, 61.7 percent of them had reported such a discussion; obviously, in view of the enormous importance of the list, it should have been discussed more widely. It is, however, satisfying to note that respondents in nearly all the villages (92.5 percent) consider Gram Sabha to be a useful institution.

CHAPTER III

PANCHAYATI RAJ FUNCTIONARIES

The entire system of PRIs consists of several components – its legal base, the extent of actual devolution of different functions to the PRIs by the respective state governments, the infrastructural and manpower facilities provided to the three tiers of the system (Gram Panchayats, Panchayat Samitis and Zilla Parishads), the financial allocations to various units and the overall socio-political scenario in the villages. But it must be conceded that it is the social, economic and political characteristics of the elected PRI functionaries that play the most crucial role in determining how effective these institutions could be. The present chapter is devoted to analyzing these characteristics for the 50 GPs that constitute the sample for the study. As mentioned before, the information base for the analysis that follows comprises the responses from 50 Mukhiyas (from 50 GPs) and 100 Ward Members (2 each from the 50 GPs).

Demographic Profile

The demographic characteristics on which information was collected for both Mukhiyas and Ward Members include — sex, age, religion/caste group, education, residential pattern, occupation, landholding, housing pattern and overall economic status as indicated by their possession of a selected list of household assets.

It is probably not necessary to discuss the sex of the Mukhiyas/Ward Members, as the legal provision determines that the available seats are divided equally between the two genders. Even in the case of religion/caste groups, their backgrounds are at least partially determined by legal provisions, since a proportional number of seats are reserved first for Scheduled Castes /Tribes (tribes are nearly absent in rural Bihar) and, secondly, for population belonging to the group 'Extremely Backward Caste Hindus'. Thus, in spite of their relatively less political strength, scheduled caste Hindus and extremely backward caste Hindus account for 18.0 and 12.0 percent, respectively, of the Mukhiya's post (Table M1). Among the remaining three religion-caste groups, both upper caste Hindus and backward caste Hindus are seen to occupy sizeable share of Mukhiya's post, leaving only the Muslims rather under-represented among the Mukhiyas. The

Muslims account for 16.5 percent of the population of Bihar. But their share in the post of Mukhiyas is lower at only 12.0 percent. In case of Ward Members, this phenomenon of under-representation of Muslims is even more pronounced, as only 7.0 percent of them are found to be Muslims. If one compares the distribution by religion-caste groups separately for Reserved and Open seats, the dominance of the upper and backward caste Hindus in open seats is seen to be even stronger. It is, however, interesting to note that scheduled caste Hindus, apart from winning the seats reserved for them, has won 5.5 percent of the open Mukhiyas seats. In case of Ward Members, it is seen that the share of both scheduled caste and extremely backward caste Hindus is much larger (compared to their share among the Mukhiyas), at the expense of both upper caste and backward caste Hindus (Table M2). This larger share of the traditionally disadvantaged castes is due to their winning many of the open seats — 27.3 percent by extremely backward caste Hindus and 12.1 percent by scheduled caste Hindus. These results clearly underline substantial political mobilization of different disadvantaged caste groups in Bihar during the recent decades. The average age of both Mukhiyas and Ward Members are just above 40 — 42.6 years for Mukhiyas and 43.5 years for Ward Members. Although the age profile is nearly same in all the districts for both Mukhiyas and Ward Members, their religion-caste profiles exhibit certain variations, reflecting the religion-caste composition of the local population.

The poor educational background of the elected Panchayat functionaries is often mentioned as one of the main factors behind the poor functioning of GPs. This observation is fully substantiated by the present study for both Mukhiyas and Ward Members. Barely one-fourth of the Mukhiyas have completed 10 years of education (26.0 percent), probably a minimum to understand the various administrative procedures and communications (Table M1). In case of Ward Members, the situation is still worse; only one-tenth of them had more than 10 years of schooling (11.0 percent) (Table M2). The district-wise variation here is only marginal, pointing to the fact that inadequate education of Panchayat functionaries is a general weakness, observed everywhere.

From the PRA exercise, it was observed that caste-wise segregation of house location is a wide phenomenon in rural areas of Bihar. From the pattern of the location of houses for Panchayat functionaries, this observation is reaffirmed; only about two-third of the elected functionaries

(either Mukhiyas or Ward Member) reside in main village (may be in different localities), another one-third residing in hamlets, some of them away from the village (Tables M1 and M2).

When one compares the demographic profile of male and female functionaries (Table M3), it is observed that the religion-caste profile of the male and female Mukhiyas are nearly the same. However, among the Ward Members, the share of upper caste females is substantially higher than of the upper caste males, indicating that the seats reserved for females are usually won by upper caste Hindus. As regards their comparative educational profile, the female Panchayat functionaries are quite expectedly seen to be less educated. But, very interestingly, the proportion of Panchayat functionaries with more than ten years of education is nearly the same for males and females. In other words, females with relatively better education are easily able to find adequate space in PRIs. It is often maintained that the purpose of reservation of seats for women candidates is actually defeated, as many of them become inoperative functionaries, some male members of their family operating on their behalf. This is found to be true to a large extent in rural Bihar; only one-fourth of the female elected representatives (23.1 percent of Mukhiyas and 29.2 percent of Ward Members) were reported to shoulder their own responsibility (Table M3). Interestingly, from a supplementary tabulation (not presented here), it was observed that such inoperative female Panchayat functionaries are as common among upper caste Hindus as among other disadvantaged religion-caste groups.

In terms of the occupational profile of Mukhiyas (Table M4), quite expectedly, it is observed that at least 38.0 percent of the Mukhiyas have agriculture as their primary occupation, 26.0 percent of them are casual labourers and another 22.0 percent have their own farm enterprise as their primary source of livelihood. For the Ward Members (Table M5), the primary occupational profile is nearly the same, except that 8.0 percent of them have salaried employment as their primary occupation. A secondary occupation is absent for 40.0 percent of the Mukhiyas and 45.0 percent of the Ward Members. For those Mukhiyas or Ward Members, who have a secondary occupation, it is largely agriculture.

Since agriculture provides the main livelihood opportunities for elected Panchayat functionaries, it is relevant to enquire how large is their land endowment. Separately for Mukhiyas and Ward members, this information is provided in Table M6. Taking five acres of land as the minimum for a decent living, 58.0 percent of the Mukhiyas are seen to enjoy this status. A comparison between the Mukhiyas elected against reserved and open seats further shows that the land endowment of the latter category is even higher. However, because of the provision of reservation for disadvantaged groups, at least one-fourth of the Mukhiyas are either landless or they are marginal farmers with less than one acre of land (26.0 percent). When one considers the sample of Ward Members, their land endowment is seen to be much lower and again more so for those Ward Members who have been elected against reserved seats. No less than 81.0 percent of all the Ward Members are either landless or marginal farmers, the corresponding figure for those elected in reserved and open seats are 85.1 percent and 72.7 percent, respectively.

In recent years, NREGA has opened up possibilities for substantial additional employment in rural areas and most villagers are desirous of obtaining a job card, including those who are Mukhiyas or Ward Members. It is interesting to note that 12.0 percent of the Mukhiyas and 51.0 percent of Ward Members had applied for a Job Card and, surprisingly, not all of them have received it. The success rate is 66.7 percent for the Mukhiyas and 74.5 percent for the Ward Members (Table M7). Further, 50.0 percent of the card-holding Mukhiyas and 65.8 percent of the card-holding Ward Members also report to have worked under NREGA (Table M8). One would have thought those elected functionaries who did not apply for a job card is because they do not need it, because of their relative affluence. This is indeed largely true, but it is interesting to note that about one-fifth of them (21.0 percent) did not apply for job cards because they did not know how to apply. And this ignorance is prevalent in all the districts, among all the religion-caste groups (except Muslims) and both the genders (Table M9). Technically, an application for a Job Card should be submitted to the Rojgar Sevak (a government official) and that option was exercised by 14.9 percent of the applicants, but many applicants had submitted their application to Mukhiya or Panchayat Sachiv who, in turn, must have handed over those applications to the Rojgar Sevak (Table M10). Finally, it is found that the applicants had to spend Rs 10.30 on an average for applying for a Job Card, largely for a photograph; some applicants also had paid money to officials/middlemen, albeit a small amount for getting a Job Card (Table M11).

As mentioned before, towards knowing the economic condition of Mukhiyas/Ward Members, the questionnaire had collected information on their housing conditions (Tables M12-M15). In this context, it is first noticed that nearly all the elected Panchayat functionaries, both Mukhiyas and Ward Members, live in self-owned houses (Table M12). Only a small number of them (2.0 percent for Mukhiyas and 8.0 percent of Ward Members) have got these houses through a government scheme, most likely Indira Awas Yojna (IAY). But the difference between the economic conditions of Mukhiyas and Ward Members becomes apparent when one considers the toilet arrangements in their houses (Table M13) — while 78.0 percent of the Mukhiyas are seen to have private toilets, the corresponding figure for Ward Members is only 15.0 percent. These private toilets are of various types, but mostly they are pit or durable-pit toilets. Secondly, these private toilets are almost wholly built by the house owners (not under a government scheme) and they are also not a recent phenomenon (Table M14). In terms of their year of installation, three-fourth of them were built more than five years ago (Table M15).

The land endowment of the elected Panchayat functionaries has already been analysed before, but the details of these endowments are presented in Tables M17-M19. Among Mukhiyas, 53.0 percent are reported to have some land, with average amount of owned land being 8.7 acres. Both the practices of leasing in and leasing out are prevalent among them and the average size of their operational holding is only slightly less at 8.6 acres. The land endowment for Mukhiyas is noticeably high in Nalanda district (average size of 16.3 acres) and upper caste Hindu Mukhiyas (average size 14.9 acres). It is also noticed from the table that most of this land (91.9 percent) has irrigation facilities. Among the Ward Members (Table M17), 53.0 percent of them are having some land, but the average size of the landholding is only 0.9 acres; the practice of leasing in is wider among them, making the average size of their operational holding 1.1 acres. Although the amount of land is very small, it is fortunately almost wholly irrigated. As regards the sources of irrigation, it is mainly tubewell, 88.4 percent of the Mukhiyas and 83.0 percent of the Ward Members mentioning it as their main source of irrigation (Table M18). On being asked about the quality of their land in terms of fertility, majority of the functionaries (60.5 percent of the Mukhiyas and 54.7 percent of Ward Members) thought it to be of average quality. Another one-third of them (32.5 percent Mukhiyas and 34.0 percent Ward Members) felt that the fertility of

their land was above average and only a small percentage of them felt that their land was of less than average fertility.

For carrying out the agricultural operations, Mukhiyas had considerable endowment of farm implements, both traditional and modern (Table M20). As selected indicators, one may note that no less than 36.0 percent of them had tractors and 52.0 percent of them had pump for irrigation. The endowment of farm implements was particularly high in Bhojpur and Nalanda. Since the land endowment was very low for Ward Members, it is not surprising to find that their possession of farm implements was also very low. Animal husbandry is a widely found supplementary source of livelihood for rural households, be they land rich or land poor. In the study village, this was found to be very true; about half the elected functionaries (48.0 percent Mukhiyas and 43.0 percent Ward Members) had cows/buffaloes. The extent of animal husbandry through upkeep of goats/sheep and poultry was relatively more among the Ward Members because, with their relatively lower land endowments, maintenance of cows/buffaloes as a source of secondary income was difficult for them.

Ownership of different types of household assets is yet another sensitive indicator of a household's economic status. The considerable difference between the economic conditions of Mukhiyas and Ward Members is again revealed through the figures on percentage of them owning different household assets (Table M22). For inexpensive assets like charpoy/bed, shoes or bicycles, the difference may not be much, but it becomes substantial when one takes into expensive assets. For example, compared to 82.0 percent of this Mukhiyas, only 30.0 percent of the Ward Members have a pressure cooker them in their houses. Similarly, for fans, the figures are 76.0 percent (Mukhiyas) and 21.0 percent (Ward Members). For even costlier assets (like radio / cassette player, television, etc) the same economic distance is observed between the Mukhiyas and Ward members (Table M 23). For example, nearly all the Mukhiyas have a television (28.0 percent a B/W television and another 62.0 percent a colour television), but among the Ward Members the coverage is only 15.0 percent. The same pattern is also observed for radio / cassette player, motor cycle and other modern household assets. Thanks to the spread of mobile phones, this facility is

enjoyed by no less than 61.0 percent of the Ward Members, the coverage being even wider at 96.0 percent for Mukhiyas.

Towards knowing the economic conditions of Mukhiyas and Ward Members, the survey had also enquired the food availability for their households. To the question whether they had adequate food available throughout the year, 92.0 percent of the Mukhiyas had answered in the affirmative (Table M 24), indicating their relatively better economic condition. For the Ward Members, the corresponding figure stands at only 46.0 percent, obviously because of their low landholding and low income from available non-land occupations (Table M 25). For Ward Members belonging to the scheduled caste Hindus, the food security is even lower - only 19.2 percent of them having adequate availability of food throughout the year.

The government's response to the low food security of most rural households is its Public Distribution System (PDS), under which separate ration cards are issued for BPL (below poverty level) and APL (above poverty level) households. The households holding BPL cards enjoy higher subsidy for the purchase of food from PDS. Among the Mukhiyas, nearly all of them have their cards, mostly belonging to APL category (Table M24). In case of Ward Members again, the possession of a ration card is nearly universal, but one-tenth of them have got an APL card, although they claim themselves to be eligible for a BPL card. If such improper allocation, an APL card in place of a legitimate BPL card, is found for even a Ward Member, one can imagine how wide could be the phenomenon for other poor rural households.

Political Behaviour

The PRIs are essentially an extension of the institutions of Parliament (at the national level) and Assemblies (at the state level). The members to both these bodies are chosen through political elections where different political parties are recognised organisations. Although the elections to PRIs are not fought using party identifications or symbols, one cannot detach normal political competition from the entire process. Thus, most contestants in PRI elections have their own political identity and many of them also aspire to contest election to higher bodies after joining a

political party of their choice. For an adequate understanding of the working of the PRIs, it is therefore desirable to know the political behaviour of the elected Panchayat functionaries.

For the sample of Panchayat functionaries of the present study, it is to be noted that their political awareness is very high, many of them reporting correctly the dates of the last election (i.e. Parliamentary elections of 2009). Among the Mukhiyas, such respondents were 98.0 percent and, for Ward Members again, an appreciably high figure of 82.0 percent (Table M26). It is also noted from the table that engagement with the Panchayat elections is a long-time practice for many elected Mukhiyas; some of them had contested more than once (28.0 percent) and some of them had also served that post more than once (16.0 percent). Among the Ward Membes, such continued engagement with Panchayat elections is much less but not altogether absent.

The provision of reservation of some of the posts of Mukhiyas and Ward Members for females, scheduled castes and extremely backward castes does restrict the scope of political competition in Panchayat elections; but the scope for elections to unreserved seats is also quite large, as indicated by the figures in Tables M27 and M28, presenting the distribution of elected Panchayat functionaries among the open and different types of reserved seats. In case of both Mukhiyas and Ward Members, open seats account for about one-third of the total seats. Secondly, one should also remember that even for reserved seats the political competition may be limited, but not fully absent. In the last two column of Table M25, it is noted that only 8.0 percent of the Mukhiyas and 22.0 percent of the Ward Members are elected unopposed.

For many of the elected functionaries, as mentioned before, engagement with Panchayat election is a long-run phenomenon. This observation is further substantiated when one notes that no less than 62.0 percent of the present Mukhiyas and 52.0 percent of the present Ward Members are desirous of re-contesting the elections (Table M29). Another 20.0 percent of the Mukhiyas and 30.0 percent of the Ward Members are as yet undecided and at least some of them may opt to re-contest. Thus, the desire to participate in the political process at the grassroot level is very high among the present group of elected Panchayat functionaries. When one analyses this responses about desire to plan next election for Mukhiyas and Ward Members belonging to various religion-

caste groups, it clearly emerges that such a desire is deeper for Mukhiyas from the extremely backward castes and Muslims (Table M30). Both these groups, as many political observers would maintain, have experienced substantial political mobilisation in the recent past. For the Ward Members, however, the desire to re-contest is broadly equal among all the religion-caste groups. If one considers the responses of elected Panchayat functionaries regarding desire to re-contest for two genders, not much difference is found (Table M31).

When a person decides to contest Panchayat elections, it could be either because of his/her own initiative or a response to the request of an important person or a group of persons. The present survey had tried to find out which of these possible sources had indeed enthused the Mukhiyas and Ward Members to contest the last election. The responses are tabulated in Table M32 (district-wise), Table M33 (religion-caste group-wise) and Table M34 (gender-wise). From all these tables, it emerges that self-initiation has been the most important impetus for the elected functionaries to contest the elections, and this pattern holds good for all the districts, religion-caste groups and two genders. However, it should be noted that self-initiation was the impetus for 54.0 percent by the Mukhiyas and 61.0 percent of the Ward Members. That leaves a considerable number of elected Panchayat functionaries who had joined the electoral fray for various other reasons. The tables mention ten such possible reasons, each of which may be insignificant singly, but together they are very relevant.

Although political aspirations are fairly wide among the elected Panchayat functionaries, the practice of affiliation to a particular political party is not always found. People often postpone the choice of a political party till they politically establish themselves. In the present sample of Panchayat functionaries, it was found that about half of the Mukhiyas (52.0 percent) and one-fifth of the Ward Members (22.0 percent) have affiliation to a political party (Table M35). Among the districts, there was not much variation regarding tendency for political affiliation, but among the religion-caste groups, the tendency was relatively higher among Panchayat functionaries from among the extremely backward castes and Muslims. Between the two genders, male functionaries again had a higher tendency for political affiliation. As regards the choice of parties, Janata Dal (United) and left parties were the foremost, 29.2 percent of the functionaries being affiliated to the former and 33.3 percent to the latter. It may be noted here that the former is presently the ruling

party in Bihar, in coalition with the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP). The political activities in rural Bihar are highly informal and as such it is not easy for politically-minded people to participate in different political activities, except in the time of elections. One, therefore, finds that the percentage of elected Panchayat functionaries undertaking different political activities is rather low for all types of activities. It ranges from 14.0 percent (Writing pamphlets) to only 25.3 percent (Going to rallies/Giving speeches) (Table M36).

For people with political aspirations, it is quite common to be a part of a number of elected / public bodies to spread their political networks. The present study had, therefore, tried to find out how many of the elected Panchayat functionaries were members of other bodies or how many of them had a member of their families in some position in a political party (Table M37). Since most of these functionaries are rather young (around 42-43 years) and there are not many local bodies in rural areas, such practice of networking was rather limited among them. Only 6.0 percent of the Mukhiyas and 8.0 percent of the Ward Members were members of at least one more local body. Even after taking into account their family members, such a tendency for networking was found to be limited.

As an indicator of the political consciousness of elected Panchayat functionaries, they were asked to name such political figures as local MLA, local MP, Chief Minister, Prime Minister and the President. The percentage of respondents who could name them correctly is very high for local MLA (84.0 percent), local MP (73.3 percent) and Chief Minister (88.0 percent), but it is still not a universal phenomenon. For Prime Minister and President, the corresponding figures are even lower, 68.0 percent and 56.0 percent, respectively. On being asked whether they have seen those persons at least in picture (if not in person), the percentage of affirmative answers were obviously lower, but not substantially so. As the last indicator of political behaviour of elected Panchayat functionaries, they were asked whether they had voted in last election — PRI, State Assembly, Parliament and Cooperatives. Except for elections for the cooperatives, the practice of exercising their voting rights was either universal or nearly so (Table M39). The fact that most of them had not voted in the cooperative election is largely because they are probably not members of any of the local cooperative.

CHAPTER IV

FUNCTIONING OF GRAM PANCHAYATS

From the description of the social, economic and political characteristics of the elected Panchayat functionaries, as presented in the previous chapter, one can easily identify a number of factors that stand in the way of an efficient functioning of the GPs. When other limiting factors are added, like poor infrastructure or inadequate manpower, the problems of the GPs are likely to become even more challenging. These problems are felt not only by the villagers, but often by the elected functionaries themselves. Thus, in response to a large number of queries regarding the functioning of GPs, the elected functionaries did not at all hide those problems, just to ensure a positive image of theirs. This chapter notes and analyses the responses of the elected functionaries regarding various dimensions of the GP functioning covering social audit forums or Gram Sabhas, capacity of the elected functionaries, patterns of participation and finally, the responses of the GP and development administration, in general, to various problems faced by the rural people.

Social Audit Forum and Gram Sabha

Under the Panchayati Raj, Social Audit Forums and Gram Sabhas are two different concepts. While the former is supposed to act as a supervisory or evaluatory body, the latter is mainly meant to facilitate participation of villagers in GP's functioning. The two roles might be overlapping to some extent but are essentially differentiable. Unfortunately, in many of the GPs where the present survey was conducted, this difference was not understood by the villagers or even by the elected Panchayat functionaries. As such, whenever the respondents were asked to provide information on the Social Audit Forums, they have often done it for the Gram Sabhas.

Some basic information about these Social Audit Forums, as presented by the Panchayat functionaries, is presented in Table M40-M42. It is disturbing to note that no less than 84.7 percent of the respondents maintain these meetings are never held. Secondly, even when such meetings are held, they are rarely (10.0 percent) attended by the respondents. The average attendance in these meetings, whenever they are held, is only 161 persons. The average number of

voters, all of whom are members of Gram Sabha, was 927 in the sample villages. This implies that Gram Sabha meetings are attended by barely one-sixth of its eligible members.

Since the majority of the elected Panchayat functionaries had not attended these Social Audit Forums, they did not know how information about these meetings is given to the villages. But from the responses coming from a limited number of respondents, it appears that the source of information is either the Gram Sabha meeting or the words of mouth (latter recorded as no response) (Table M41). The responses are very similar for the respondents from all the districts, all the religion-caste groups and both the genders. From the next table (Table M42), it can be noted that Social Audit Forums are generally chaired by the Mukhiya.

Because of poor educational levels of the elected Panchayat functionaries, they are quite often unaware about the statutory requirements of the functioning of GPs. Even for such an elementary event like a Gram Sabha and General Body meetings, it was found that only 29.3 percent of the respondents were knowledgeable about the statutory requirement for the former; for General Body meeting, the corresponding figure was abysmally low at 7.3 percent (Table M43). The remaining respondents either had wrong knowledge about it or did not have any information at all. It should be further noted that such wide ignorance was prevalent even among elected functionaries from upper caste Hindus and the male functionaries.

It is often maintained that the functioning of the GPs is constrained by the lack of participation of the villagers. That might be true but it appears that the participation of even the elected Panchayat functionaries is also limited, both in the GP itself as well as other activities closely related to the GP functioning. Except for Gram Sabhas, at least one of which was attended by 84.0 percent of the respondents, their participation in most other meetings is rather limited (Table M44). For other meetings organised by GP, only about one-third of the respondents (35.3 percent) are reported to have attended at least one of them in the last one year. Further, there are 6.7 percent of the respondents who have not attended any meeting in the last year. Here again, this low participation pattern is observed for respondents from all the districts, all the religion-caste groups and both the genders. That the attendance in a Gram Sabha by the Mukhiyas/Ward Members is very wide is also indicated by the figures in the next table (Table M45) which shows that nearly all of them had

heard about the Gram Sabha and attended at least one of its meetings. The average number of Gram Sabha meetings attended last year is 4.6 for the Mukhiyas and 3.7 for the Ward Members. As regards the source of information for Gram Sabha meeting, various methods are used, the two most important sources being Mukhiyas/GP Members and 'Dug-Dug' announcement. Quite expectedly, formal channels like a notice board or public announcement are rarely effective in the study areas of rural Bihar. The main reason for attending the Gram Sabha for the elected Panchayat functionaries was their membership (93.4 percent) (Table 47). On being asked to mention a second reason, they have mostly mentioned 'encouragement by the Mukhiya' (30.9 percent) and 'discussed issues were important' (32.4 percent).

For proper functioning of the GPs, adequate infrastructural facilities are very important and a Panchayat Bhavan is a minimum requirement for such facilities. Unfortunately, only about half the GPs (48.0 percent) have this facility of holding their meetings in their own buildings. Another one-fourth of them (28.0 percent) manage to hold their meetings in some government building and the remaining ones have to look for make-shift arrangements that sometimes include Mukhiya's house.

Knowledge and Awareness of Elected Functionaries

That the extent of knowledge and awareness of various dimensions of GP functioning among Panchayat functionaries is rather inadequate was indicated before in the context of the statutory requirements of Gram Sabha and the General Body meeting. This observation is further substantiated when one considers their knowledge and awareness about other dimensions of GP functioning.

Among all the welfare programmes that GP implements, those under NREGA (National Rural Employment Guarantee Act) are most important. Not only does this programme enjoy a considerable financial base, its potential beneficiaries include the largest section of the population, including some Mukhiyas and Ward Members. It is, therefore, not surprising to find that nearly all the Mukhiyas (98.0 percent) are aware of the programme and, even among the Ward Members, this awareness is very wide (72.0 percent) (Table M49). The source of information for this all

important programme is very varied, but the newspapers have been the most important source for Mukhiyas (26.0 percent) and Mukhiyas in turn for the Ward Members (47.0 percent).

A mere awareness about the NREGA does not, however, guarantee that the elected functionaries were also having the knowledge about different provisions of the programme. On the specific knowledge about the 'number of days of employment available under NREGA', it was found that Mukhiyas almost invariably knew about it (98.0 percent), but only two-third of the Ward Members (64.0 percent) was in the same position (Table M50). The extent of ignorance among Ward Members was the most in Nalanda district, increasingly so from the lower caste groups and Muslims and, finally, among the females. As regards their knowledge about the permissible wage rate, even the Mukhiyas had shown some ignorance, only 70.0 percent of them being able to mention the correct wage rate; among the Ward Members, the corresponding figure was expectedly lower at 47.0 percent (Table M 51). Under NREGA, it is the workers' responsibility to demand work; this is relatively simple information about the programme and, as such, this information was available with 90.0 percent of the Mukhiyas and 64.0 percent of the Ward Members (Table M52 and M 53). Yet another important provision under NREGA relates to the maximum period within which an applicant for wage employment has to be provided the same, failing which the authority is mandated to pay the applicant an unemployment allowance. Here again, it was observed that Mukhiyas are generally aware about this provision, 90.0 percent of them displaying correct or near correct knowledge; among the Ward Members, however, the awareness was much lower, only 43.0 percent displaying correct or near correct knowledge. This ignorance about the prescribed waiting period for employment among the Ward Members was much above average in Nalanda and Sitamarhi districts, increasingly wider among those from lower caste Hindus and Muslims, and noticeably higher for female Ward Members

The employment programmes under NREGA have been operational for several years and the Panchayat functionaries are thus expected to know who exactly the major beneficiaries of the programme are. The present survey shows that nearly all the Mukhiyas knew very well that the programme was meant to mainly benefit the casual labourers (Table M 55). Among the Ward Members, this correct perception about the expected beneficiaries was shared by about only two-

thirds of them (64.0 percent); the remaining Ward Members were unaware about the expected beneficiaries but, fortunately, they did not have a wrong perception (Table M 56).

Broadly speaking, one can conclude from the above analysis on NREGA-related information that Mukhiyas are adequately knowledgeable about them, although such knowledge was lacking for a substantial number of Ward Members. One should note here that all these information about the NREGA is required by all beneficiaries desiring the same and many of them probably have it. But as members of GP, the Mukhiyas and Ward Members should be even more knowledgeable about the actual functioning of this programme in their respective GPs. A minimum knowledge about this programme is probably the amount of financial allocation for it and the respondents were asked to quote the amount for the current as well as the last year. Table M57 presents the percentage of Panchayat functionaries (Mukhiya and Ward Member taken together) who gave correct and incorrect responses, along with those who could not respond to the query at all. Unfortunately, only 14.0 percent of the elected Panchayat functionaries knew correctly about the allocations under NREGA for the current year. It is almost certain that most of these knowledgeable functionaries were Mukhiyas and only a few of them were Ward Members. It is worthwhile to further note that nearly 64.0 percent of the functionaries did not have any idea about the NREGA allocations, correct or incorrect, which could possibly be termed as their indifference. Only 22.0 percent of the Panchayat functionaries mentioned an incorrect amount as NREGA allocation for the current year, indicating their ignorance. The responses regarding the NREGA allocations for previous year displayed the same pattern of indifference and ignorance. Among the five districts, such ignorance was relatively less in Bhojpur and Nalanda; but neither the religion-caste background of the Panchayat functionaries nor their gender mattered when it came to the knowledge about NREGA allocations.

Besides NREGA, two other sources from which the GPs receive substantial financial allocations are BRGF (Backward Region Grant Fund) and grants under FC12 (Twelfth Finance Commission). The extent of knowledge of the Panchayat functionaries about the allocations from these sources is presented in Table M 58 (BRGF) and Table M 59 (FC 12). Not surprisingly, the elected Panchayat functionaries display an equal amount of ignorance for yearly allocations from both those sources. Indeed, the percentage of functionaries giving correct, incorrect and no response for the three

allocations (NREGA, BRGF and FC 12) are very close to each other, largely suggesting that one has either correct information about all the three allocations or about none of them.

Although not directly related to the functioning of GPs, the Right to Information (RTI) Act has become one of the important instruments through which public institutions are probed and interrogated, hoping to make them transparent and efficient. The knowledge about this Act is, therefore, necessary for the elected Panchayat functionaries. It is interesting to observe that no less than 46.0 percent of them have at least heard about it and a substantial number of them (37.0 percent) also knew correctly about its objective and main provisions (Table M 60). In view of rather inadequate educational background of the Panchayat functionaries, this level of knowledge about RTI is quite appreciable. Interestingly further, about one-fourth of the respondents reported that they have tried to use it (23.3 percent) and one-fifth of them at least knew someone who had tried to use it (20.0 percent). Looking for variations in the extent of knowledge among Panchayat functionaries with different characteristics, it is noticed that the extent of knowledge is relatively more in Begusarai; secondly, apart from the upper caste Hindu functionaries, Muslim functionaries too are relatively more aware of RTI; finally, male functionaries are also more knowledgeable about RTI than their female counterparts.

Even in these days of radio, television and other forms of mass media, the newspaper continue to be one of the most important sources of various information, including those related to development programme or functioning of the PRIs. But low literacy levels of people, coupled with limited penetration of the print media, make newspapers a weak source of information in the rural areas. In the sample villages, an average Panchayat functionary read newspaper just two days a week. Even upper caste Hindu Panchayat functionaries were found to read newspapers about 3-4 days per week, which indicates media's limited reach.

Pattern of Participation

The mandatory General Body meetings of the GPs are the primary mode of participation of the elected Panchayat functionaries in its functioning. It is there that various problems of the GPs are discussed and through consensus or voting the priorities are fixed for the GP's interventions. This is also the forum where the implementation of the various programmes is evaluated and corrective

actions are planned where operational deficiencies are noticed. In this perspective, the decision-making process in the GPs should be a collective one, not monopolised by any single functionary. In the sample villages, when the respondents were asked to identify who indeed is the decision-maker in the GP, no less than 88.7 percent have identified the Mukhiya to be the sole decision-maker (Table M61). If one adds to that 2.7 percent of the respondents who have identified Mukhiya's spouse or a member of the family to be the sole decision-maker (obviously the cases where the Mukhiya is an inoperative female), the Mukhiyas' share crosses 90 percent. This is clearly an evidence of undemocratic domination, frustrating the efforts for people's participation that PRIs are supposed to promote.

Even in the face of Mukhiyas dominating the decision making process of the GPs, it is quite possible that the GPs follow, even if superficially, some of the standard norms or statutory prescriptions for GP functioning. In the present survey, no less than 14 questions were asked to know to what extent these norms/ requirements are followed. The responses to these questions are presented in Table M62. The deficiencies are observed in all those 14 dimensions of GP functioning, but it is relatively more in the following areas — (i) minutes of the General Body are generally not displayed in the notice board, (ii) many of the formally made decisions of the meeting are ignored for implementation, (iii) statutory Standing Committees are generally not formed and, even when formed, their meetings are not held, (iv) Panchayat Sachiv is generally not available either in his office or even the GP area and finally, (v) Panchayat Sachiv is often reluctant to provide information to the villagers on rules/ programmes/ circulars. From other responses, it appears that the participation of Ward Members in the General Body meeting is substantial, though not very wide and the attending member also include women or those from socially disadvantaged groups; but the deliberations in the General Body have much less impact on the final decision regarding prioritisation, fund allocation or implementation.

That the elected Panchayat functionaries are desirous of contributing to the process of local governance is indicated by their other activities, besides attending the General Body meetings. A substantial number of them keep meeting PS Pramukh (65.3 percent), ZP Adhyaksha (34.0 percent), Block Development Officer (86.0 percent), District Magistrate (33.3 percent) and MLA (52.0 percent) (Table M63). Not only their request for a meeting is generally granted, they are also

often able to succeed in getting their work done through such meetings. It is quite likely that many of these works relate to their personal or political interest, but it is also likely that development issues also form a part of the interactions between the elected Panchayat functionaries and those from higher Panchayat bodies, government officials and political leaders. As regards the frequency of visits of the elected functionaries to higher Panchayat bodies and government offices, the Mukhiyas visit the Block headquarters about eight to nine times a month and ZP headquarters two to three times a month (Table M64). For Ward Members, the frequency is much less; they visit the Block headquarters about two to three times a month, but rarely the ZP headquarters.

The challenges faced by the elected Panchayat functionaries for their effective functioning are many. On being asked to rank those challenges in terms of their intensities, the Mukhiyas have mentioned most the following four — management of programme (22.0 percent), lack of cooperation of government officials (16.0 percent), inadequate finance for PRIs (14.0 percent) and village politics guided by narrow self-interest (12.0 percent) (Table M65). It is, however, important to note that none of them has mentioned 'lack of participation of elected functionaries' as one of the challenges, although that was widely observed in the sample villages. The Ward Members, on being asked to rank their problems, have come out with a similar response — management of programmes (20.0 percent), dominance by Mukhiya (17.0 percent), village politics guided by narrow self-interest (12.0 percent) and inadequate finance for PRIs (10.0 percent). The dominance by Mukhiya is the new member of this ranking list which is relevant for Ward Members alone. However, that the lack of cooperation of government officials is also a major problem was corroborated by many Ward Members (7.0 percent) underlying its substantial negative role.

Development Problems and Response Patterns

In PRA exercises, the results of which are discussed in Chapter II, an attempt was made to rank different problems faced by people in sample villages. To the elected Panchayat functionaries, the same request was made to obtain an independent idea about the same issue. Since the problems vary considerably across the regions, the responses in different districts are not uniform; but the problems appearing to be most serious can be broadly identified from the aggregated data. Asked to identify three most severe problems (ranked 1,2 or 3), the respondents had identified 11 problems — drinking water, connectivity of the village, pucca roads within village, electricity /

solar light, drainage, irrigation facilities, education health, functioning of GPs, attitude of government officials and unemployment / migration. As an overall index of severity of problems, the present study takes the percentage of respondents who have identified it as a problem, either with rank 1, or rank 2 or rank 3. These percentages are presented in Table M67.

For the overall sample, it is observed that the most severe problem is drinking water (54.7 percent), followed by electricity / solar light (50.2 percent), connectivity of village (42.7 percent), functioning of GP (41.3 percent) and irrigation facilities (26.0 percent). Of these, the problem of drinking water is rather paradoxical, since availability of potable water in Bihar is very high. About half of the elected functionaries, surprisingly, could not identify the agency which is responsible to address those problems. Possibly, they were of the opinion that the responsibility is divided among many agencies and no particular one can be held as the sole agency. But those who did name a single agency had largely identified the Gram Panchayat as the defaulter (Table M68). This was true for all the three major problems, which varied across the villages/ districts. In a supplementary enquiry, the respondents were asked to identify the responsible agency for seven specific problems — roads inside village, streetlights in the village, Anganwadi, Health Sub-Centres, Primary School, Drinking Water and Temple/Mosques in village. That the Gram Panchayats are the principal agency to address most of these problems was apparent from their responses to this supplementary query (Table M 69). For five out of those seven specific problems, a high percentage of respondents (more than 60 percent) had held GP to be the responsible agency. The exception was made for Health Sub-Centres for which the state government was identified as equally responsible and village temple / mosques for which CBOs were expected to play their desired role.

To know whether the villagers felt more deprived for any of those seven facilities, compared to others, they were asked to state whether their own facilities were better than, same as or worse than in the next village. Since the poor service conditions are a general phenomenon across all the regions in Bihar, it was found that in majority of the cases, the Panchayat functionaries consider the conditions in their own village as same in the next one (Table M70). If the conditions are reported to be better or worse than in the next village, it is very likely that the differences are only marginal. It also emerged from the survey that the villagers expect all these facilities to be improved by the GP or other government agencies; they had rarely made any contribution to solve

these problems, except marginally provide free labour for the construction of roads inside the village (Table M71).

To judge the effectiveness of the functioning of the GPs, the respondents were asked how often different services were rendered in their GPs. The list had included 12 services, of which three were not particularly relevant — sanitary inspection of public toilet, sanitary inspection of water tank and cleaning of irrigation channels, as these facilities were generally absent. For six services (cleaning water accumulation, spraying for mosquitoes, cleaning streets/ roads, cleaning of drains, cleaning of garbage sites and chlorination of drinking water), it was reported that these services are never done in more than half the villages (Table M72). Even where it was done, it was a very infrequent service. Finally, in case of three other services (testing of drinking water, cleaning of drinking water source and cleaning drinking water channels), the activity was practically nil everywhere.

For all those 12 services mentioned above the respondents were again asked to identify the responsible agency. Here the responses were at variance with the responses mentioned in Table M69. Most of the respondents have identified the state government for all these services which probably is not very rational (Table M73). It appears that the Panchayat functionaries are rather confused about the division of responsibilities between the GPs and the state government and holds the two agencies equally responsible for the rural problems, and mentions one of them alternatively between one occasion and the next. The same tendency to alternatively hold GP and state government as responsible for different problems is also apparent from the figures in Table M74, which presents the perception of the Panchayat functionaries regarding the responsible agency for nine activities related to education, health and construction in the villages. But broadly speaking, the role of GP is underlined for primary school, roads within GP and construction of GP office; for all other activities, the state government is held responsible, either justifiably or otherwise.

CHAPTER V

PANCHAYAT SACHIVS

Contrary to the PRIs that were elected in 2001 elections, those which have been elected in 2006 enjoy much larger importance for the obvious reason that the financial devolution to all the three tiers of the system is now considerable. There are as many as three sources for this financial resources — NREGA, BRGF and FC12. The GPs are now required to implement a number of development programmes, specific projects under which are decided by the GP functionaries themselves. In spite of the general guidelines for each of those funds, there is substantial autonomy to choose projects, depending on the local needs. The management of these programmes obviously needs manpower but, unfortunately, the GPs are seriously constrained on this account. There are only three paid functionaries in a GP — a Panchayat Sachiv, a Rojgar Sevak and a Nyaya Mitra. The responsibility of the Rojgar Sevak is restricted to implementation of NREGA alone and Nyaya Mitras are part-time workers taking care of quasi-judicial functions of GPs. That leaves the Panchayat Sachiv as the sole person responsible for all other development programmes. In this background, it is very necessary to know the background of the Sachivs, his work patterns and his perceptions about the problem and responses.

Socio-economic Background

Looking at the religion-caste background of the Panchayat Sachivs, it is found that 22.4 percent of them are from among the upper caste Hindus, 30.6 percent backward caste Hindus, 10.2 percent extremely backward caste Hindus and the remaining 36.7 percent scheduled castes. Thanks to the provision of reservation for the last category, their share is substantial, but extremely backward caste Hindus are substantially under-represented among the Panchayat Sachivs. Unfortunately again, none of them is a Muslim (Table S1), in spite of the fact that Muslims account for 16.5 percent of Bihar's population. As regards their educational background, all of them have passed secondary, but no less than 38.8 percent of them have passed just secondary examination which is probably the minimum requirement for the wide responsibilities that they shoulder. Since many of them are from disadvantaged social groups, about two-fifths of them (40.8 percent) are seen to live in hamlets away from the village, which may not be within the GP. Indeed, a large number of

them (87.7 percent) live outside the GP, which must be affecting their professional efficiency. Since Panchayat Sachivs receive a salary for their full-time job, salaried employment is the primary occupation for nearly all of them (95.9 percent). But a large number of them (79.6 percent) have agriculture as their secondary occupation (Table S2).

Most of the Panchayat Sachivs, as mentioned before, live away from the GPs they serve. Their mode of daily communication, therefore, is an important determinant of their functioning. Fortunately, 34.7 percent of them have a two-wheeler and another 32.6 percent a bicycle to do the daily traveling, but about one-third of them have to depend on various other modes of travel to reach their work place (Table S3). Since public transport facility is very poor in rural Bihar, such modes of travelling are obviously an obstacle for their efficient functioning. Since many of the Panchayat Sachivs do not work in a GP where their ancestral or regular house is located, they are required to rent one. In the sample villages, therefore, only 38.8 percents of the Panchayat Sachivs are reported to live in a self-owned house (Table S4). The government scheme for rural housing is now quite wide and one notices that at least 10.2 percent of the Panchayat Sachivs have been beneficiaries of such schemes.

As an indicator of the economic conditions of the Panchayat Sachivs, it is found that most of them (87.8 percent) have their own private toilets, mostly the pit/double pit variety (Table S5). As regards landholding, it is again found that most of them have some land (81.6 percent), the average amount of land being 3.9 acres, a reasonable endowment by local standards. Since Panchayat Sachivs do not live in their own village, the practice of leasing out land is quite among them and, consequently, the average size of their operational holding is much less at 3.3 acres (Table S6). Most of this land is irrigated (97.0 percent) and, as indicated by the figures in Table S7, the main source of irrigation for their land is tube well. Thanks to the cash earnings from their job, they are able to make private investments for irrigation purposes. To cultivate the land properly, the Panchayat Sachiv households also own adequate farm implements, many of them modern implements like fodder cutting machine (24.5 percent) and irrigation pumps (34.7 percent) (Table S8). As regards possession of livestock, about half of them maintain cows / buffaloes (51.0

percent), but thanks to their government job, supplementing agricultural income through that from animal husbandry is rather limited in Panchayat Sachiv households.

When one tries to judge the economic status of Panchayat Sachiv households through the extent of the possession of different households' assets, it is noticed that their average status is much better than that of overall rural population. The possession of ordinary assets like charpoy/bed, shoes, pressure cooker, watches/clocks is very wide among them (Table S9). Even if one takes into consideration relatively expensive household assets, the economic condition of the Panchayat Sachiv households is quite decent— for example, 71.4 percent of them have radio/cassette players and 67.3 percent have motorcycle/scooter. A (mobile) phone has now become almost a necessity even in rural areas and 97.9 percent of Panchayat Sachivs enjoy this facility.

Naming and recognizing important political functionaries is possibly not a part of the socio-economic background of Panchayat Sachivs but, just to compare their general level of awareness with those of elected Panchayat functionaries, Table S10 presents the percentage of Panchayat Sachivs who could name correctly the important political leaders and also had seen them at least in pictures. The presented figures indicate that the general level of awareness is very high for the Panchayat Sachivs. For those belonging to the extremely backward caste Hindus and Scheduled Castes, however, some deficiency was noticed which is unexpected because all of them have at least passed secondary education and are holding an important government job.

Knowledge and Awareness

It was earlier noticed that the proper functioning of the GPs is greatly hampered by lack of knowledge and awareness among the elected Panchayat functionaries about different legal provisions of the relevant Act. It is rather surprising to observe that such ignorance about the legal provisions is extensive even among the Panchayat Sachivs (Table S11) Only 44.3 percent of the Panchayat Sachivs could correctly mention the statutory requirements of a Gram Sabha and only 14.3 percent for the General Body Meeting. Other responses were incorrect and at some cases substantially so. And this level of ignorance is not limited to Panchayat Sachivs who are from relatively disadvantaged social groups, but pervaded even those who had upper caste background.

The lack of knowledge about the GP functioning among the Panchayat Sachivs is further revealed when one considers their response to the query about allocations for three major programmes — NREGA, BRGF and FC12. These responses are presented in Table S12 (NREGA), Table S13 (BRGF) and Table S14 (FC12). For the current year, correct amounts were mentioned by only 12.2 percent (NREGA), 32.6 percent (BRGF) and 38.8 percent (FC12) of the Panchayat Sachivs. Admittedly, the NREGA operations are managed by the Rojgar Sevak and the Panchayat Sachivs may not be aware of the details, but they must be interacting with the Rojgar Sevak very regularly and, in this background, their wide ignorance is surprising. Secondly, in case of BRGF and FC12, it is the Panchayat Sachivs themselves who maintain the records and yet only less than 40 percent of them could quote the correct figures. It appears that the accounts of GP are kept very poorly and, consequently, even the *de facto* accountants (i.e. Panchayat Sachivs) are unable to provide correct information. The only information about which the Panchayat Sachivs were reasonably well informed was the RTI Act (Table S15). No less than 97.9 percent had heard about it and 79.6 percent also knew its objectives and broad provisions. It was also found from the survey that reading of a newspaper is a quite regular habit of the Panchayat Sachivs — the average number of days per week when they read newspaper is 6.1.

Work Patterns

Before an analysis of the work pattern of Panchayat Sachivs, one might first discuss how they perceive the working of the GPs in terms of its decision-making process. That the decision-making process of the GPs is completely dominated by the Mukhiyas (or a surrogate one when the female Mukhiya is inoperative) is reiterated by the Panchayat Sachivs also. No less than 95.9 of them maintained that Mukhiyas control the GPs fully (Table S16). Social Audit Forums are a second instrument by which the functioning of a GP could be improved. The distinction between a Social Audit Forum and Gram Sabha is often not understood by the villagers, as was mentioned before. But Panchayat Sachivs know the difference and, on being asked 'how often are Social Audit Forums held', 87.8 percent of them maintained that they are never held (Table S17). This response should be considered as more authentic regarding the status of those Forums in rural Bihar. Secondly, the responses also brought out that, even where it is held, it is held very rarely, sometimes less than once in a year. However, whenever such a meeting was held, Panchayat

Sachivs had cared to attend it. The average attendance in Social Audit Forum was 156 persons, ranging from 47 in Bhojpur to 235 in Nalanda.

Apart from attending social Audit Forums, a rare phenomenon though, Panchayat Sachivs are also seen to attend Gram Sabhas. All of them have attended at least one Gram Sabha and very likely most of the meetings of Gram Sabha (Table S18). Indeed, taking into account the recent past, the average number of Gram Sabha meetings attended last year by Panchayat Sachivs is 3.6, which is quite satisfactory. Apart from the Gram Sabhas, they also attend a number of other meetings, as reported in Table S19. While their attendance in Gram Sabhas is universal (100.0 percent), the same in a few other meetings is very wide — meetings organised by BDO or other government official (85.7 percent), Aam Sabha (73.5 percent) and meetings organised by GPs (49.0 percent).

From the responses from the elected Panchayat functionaries, it was earlier noted that absence of a Panchayat Bhavan is a serious constraint in many GPs. The Panchayat Sachivs also record the same information — 53.0 percent of them maintaining that their Gram Sabhas are held in a Panchayat Bhavan and another 24.5 percent reporting a government building as the venue. In all other cases, make-shift arrangements are required for holding the meetings (Table S20).

In course of work, a Panchayat Sachiv is expected to interact with a number of other functionaries — from higher PRIs, government administration and political leaders. This is indeed done extensively by the Panchayat Sachivs. In order of intensity, their interaction is the highest with BDO (100.0 percent), PS Pramukh (89.8 percent) and the District Magistrate (59.2 percent) (Table S21). The average number of visits per month paid by Panchayat Sachivs to the Block headquarter is 6.7, which is substantial (Table S22). Unfortunately, the traveling costs for these visits are not borne by the government; on an average, it is Rs. 26 a month. For those Panchayat Sachivs who work far away from the Block headquarters, the expenses must be much higher and so is the time required to make those visits.

For a more detailed idea about the work pattern of Panchayat Sachivs, one may first note that the average number of GPs served by him is 1.6, implying that about half of them serve two GPs, not just one (Table S23). Since a typical village has very limited facilities for health, education and

other basic services, the Panchayat Sachivs prefer to reside away from the GP headquarters; on an average, the distance between their residence and headquarters for the first GP is 13.2 kms and, for the second GP (if any) it is even higher at 14.4 kms. Bearing in mind that the road conditions are poor in most rural areas of Bihar and the public transport is very limited, travelling such a distance is itself a problem for many Panchayat Sachivs. The average time required to cover this distance is 30 minutes for the first GP headquarters and 37 minutes for the second one. For those Panchayat Sachivs who serve two GPs, it is obviously necessary to divide their working days between the two. They are found to do it unequally, allocating 3.5 days per week for the first GP (which is his principal charge) and 1.5 days per week for the second GP (which is an additional charge for him). This is obviously a major constraint for those GPs which are not served by a full-time Panchayat Sachiv.

As an important dimension of Panchayat Sachiv's work pattern, they were also asked to identify two major problems that they face in course of discharging their responsibilities. Their responses to the query are presented in Table S24. For the entire sample, the Panchayat Sachivs have mentioned 'excessive load of work' as their foremost problem, no less than 40.8 percent of them mentioning it as their first problem. Two other problems affecting considerably their efficiency is 'lack of office building' and 'effective management of programmes', mentioned by 20.0 and 10.2 percent of them, respectively. From the responses regarding their second major problem in course of discharging their official responsibilities, it emerges that they find it often difficult to work properly in the face of the 'dominance of the elected functionaries'. Since both Mukhiyas and Ward Members lack adequate education and knowledge and most of them also lack working experience, it is very likely for the Panchayat Sachivs to find their higher status in the decision making process as a major deterrent in their work.

Perception about Problems and Responses

For an effective functioning of the GPs, it is very desirable that the people in general, their elected Panchayat functionaries and finally the paid functionaries like Panchayat Sachiv or BDO share a common perception about the major local problems. In PRA exercise, the villagers had identified a large number of problems, many of which were also underlined as rather severe for them (Tables

P11 and P12). According to the perception of Mukhiyas and Ward Members, the list of severe problems became rather shorter, but they still identified at least five problems as very serious — drinking water, electricity/ solar light, connectivity of villages, functioning of GPs and, finally, irrigation facilities (Table M67). This perception of the elected Panchayat functionaries is also broadly shared by the Panchayat Sachivs, although some changes are noticed regarding the ranking of the problems (Table S25). According to them, the six major problems in order of their severity are — electricity/solar light (mentioned by 59.1 percent of them), drinking water (42.6 percent), functioning of GP (36.9 percent), irrigation facilities (22.4 percent), education (22.4 percent) and, finally, connectivity of villages (18.4 percent).

Just as elected Panchayat functionaries were asked to reveal their perception about the quality of facilities in their own villages compared to the next village, the Panchayat Sachivs were also asked to reveal theirs. It is very likely that if the functionaries, either elected or paid, perceive the conditions in their own villages to be worse than in the next village, they might be more responsive to remove or lessen the problems. From the responses of the Panchayat Sachivs, however, it appears that they generally consider the conditions in their respective villages to be as poor as in the next one (Table S26). For example, in terms of roads inside village, no less than 65.3 percent of them consider the conditions to be same as next village, only 22.4 percent consider it to be better than the next village and the remaining 8.2 percent consider it to be worse than the next village. This pattern of response, as mentioned before, is because the poor quality of facilities in rural areas is a general phenomenon, not restricted selected districts, blocks or Gram Panchayats.

Unfortunately, in spite of the poor status of various services in the rural areas of Bihar, the response of the GPs or other development agencies to improve these is very limited. In some cases, provision of adequate services may demand some investment expenditure to erect the required physical infrastructure, but many of the services actually require only regular maintenance activities. These maintenance services are often well within the financial and organisational capacities of the GPs and yet they are often found seriously lacking. As an illustration, the Panchayat Sachivs were asked to report how frequent are the health-related

services in their GPs and the response are presented in Table S27. Out of the 12 listed services, 3 were not relevant for most GPs (sanitary inspection of public toilet, sanitary inspection of water tank and cleaning of drinking water tank/channels); for the remaining 9 services, they were either never done or done very rarely.

Apart from identifying the problems, the Panchayat Sachivs were also asked to identify the person or agency responsible for them. It is interesting to note the difference in the responses between the two groups of functionaries, as presented in Table M68 (for elected functionaries) and Table S28 (for Panchayat Sachivs). When one compares the figures in these two tables, it is found that the elected functionaries are either unable to identify the responsible person/agency or identify the GP itself as the same. Their tendency to put the blame on others, be it higher Panchayat bodies or the government officials or the political leaders is rather absent. In contrast, the Panchayat Sachivs have largely identified other government officials as the agency responsible for the various problems of the rural people, thereby disowning the responsibilities of GPs of which they are an important part.

The responses presented in Table S28 refer to the most, second most and third most serious problems faced by the villagers which, of course, vary across the villages. As such, these responses do not relate to a specific problem. The Panchayat Sachivs were, therefore, asked the same question, viz., responsible person/agency for different problems or facilities, naming each of them specifically (e.g., roads inside the village or functioning of primary schools, etc.). It was then that they were probably able to see reason and then hold GPs responsible for many of the facilities. For infrastructural facilities, the GPs are generally identified as the most responsible agency for roads inside village, streetlights in the village, Anganwadi, primary school and drinking water; only for the health sub-centre, the state government is found an equally responsible agency and CBOs (Community-Based Organisation) for the temple/mosques in the villages (Table S29). For health related services again, Panchayat Sachivs generally divided the responsibility between the GPs and state government; however, for those facilities which were altogether absent (like public toilet, water tank, etc.), the state government was held responsible (Table S30). This response pattern indicates that, according to the Panchayat Sachivs, the installation of a facility is primarily the responsibility of the state government and its maintenance is to be ensured jointly by the GP and the state government. For another group of activities related to education and construction, the

Panchayat Sachivs are of the opinion that GPs are the responsible agency for the primary schools, roads within the GPs and construction of a Panchayat Bhavan; for other activities like education on health and sanitation, building of watersheds and construction of water tanks, the responsibility is largely on the state government (Table S31).

Towards an evaluation of the functioning of Gram Sabha, the Panchayat Sachivs were asked several questions and their responses to the query are presented in Table S32. It appears that, compared to the opinion of the villagers (as expressed in the PRA exercises) or that of the elected representatives, the Panchayat Sachivs are relatively less critical of the functioning of Gram Sabhas (Table S32). They generally maintain that the meetings of the General Body of GP are not very infrequent, the level of participation of the Ward Members is at least moderate and, finally, the decisions of the General Body are also widely implemented. The villagers, it may be noted, have different opinion on all these issues. The Panchayat Sachivs have, however, expressed dissatisfaction for two dimensions of GP's functioning — first, the Standing Committees have generally not been formed and their meetings, if at all formed, are irregular; secondly, the villagers are not adequately informed about the activities of the GPs.

Since substantial financial allocations are made to GPs in any case, they do undertake a number of development activities. In the face of inadequate meetings of Gram Sabhas and General Body of GPs, the decisions about various activities may not be very democratic, but GPs are certain to undertake some of them just to utilise the available financial resources. According to the responses of the Panchayat Sachivs, it emerges that the most widely undertaken activity by the GPs is road construction, reported by 79.6 percent of them (Table S33). Three other important activities, in descending order of frequency are — functioning of primary school (67.3 percent), construction/renovation of GP office (38.8 percent) and functioning of PHC or Sub-Centre (34.7 percent). A comparison with the responses of villagers and elected Panchayat functionaries on the same query suggests that the Panchayat Sachivs seem to be overstating the activities of GPs in both education and health. Further, one can also note from the table that the problem of drinking water, very widely felt by villagers, has received extremely limited attention by the GPs.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Bihar was one of the Indian states where PRIs were introduced in the early years after independence. The first election was held in 1952 and thereafter regularly until 1978 for the Gram Panchayats, 1979 for Panchayat Samitis and 1980 for Zilla Parishads. The elected bodies were allowed to continue even after the completion of their mandated term of five years and it was only in 1997 that the repeated extensions of their terms were stopped through an order of the judicial authority. Although the 73rd Amendment of the Constitution, making formation of a three-tier system of PRIs a mandatory practice, was made in 1993, the state government did not honour the Act until 2001 when, again through a judicial intervention, the elections to the PRIs were held after a lapse of 23 years. After five years, the usual term for PRIs, another election was held in 2006, the winners of which are the current members of Zilla Parishads, Panchayat Samitis and Gram Panchayats.

From the policies of the state government on PRIs, as is evident from its administrative and financial decisions in recent years, it is quite obvious that it is committed to strengthening the system. At one hand, the state government has transferred many of the responsibilities to the PRIs out of 29 heads that are listed in the Bihar Panchayat Raj Act, 2006 and on the other it is providing substantial financial resources to the PRIs to discharge those responsibilities. Proceeding further, the state government is interacting with the World Bank to initiate a programme which could improve the autonomy, capacity and accountability of the PRIs. Specially, the objectives of the programme encompass — (a) Improvement of PRI governance in select districts to implement government's anti-poverty schemes and undertake discretionary development initiatives that are responsive to community needs and (b) Improvement of the policy and administrative environment for an efficient functioning of the PRIs. In this perspective, the present study aims to analyse the political and socio-economic background of PRI functionaries so that the planned interventions of the state government, with the cooperation and support of the World Bank, are indeed appropriate.

The study is based on the primary data collected from 50 Gram Panchayats, spread over five districts of the state. The choice of districts was based on their Social Capital Indices, available from an earlier study. Since the functioning of GPs demands 'community initiatives', as distinct from 'individual efforts', the criterion of social capital was preferred in place of other possibilities. The chosen districts in descending order of their social capital endowment were — Bhojpur, Nalanda, Begusarai, Saharsa and Sitamarhi. In each district, two Blocks were chosen, one relatively prosperous and the other from among the disadvantaged ones. Finally, the choice of five GPs from each of the 10 sample Blocks was done randomly, yielding a sample of 50 GPs.

For collecting the primary data, the study has used three questionnaires — one for Participatory Rapid Appraisal (PRA) in two villages in each GP; the second, a common questionnaire for the Mukhiyas and two of the Ward Members in each GP; and a third questionnaire for the Panchayat Sachivs. In all, the information base for the present study comprises data from 94 PRA exercises (in six GPs, it could be conducted in only one village), 50 Mukhiya questionnaires, 100 Ward Members questionnaires and 49 Sachiv questionnaire (one of the GPs did not have a Sachiv, the previous incumbent being recently transferred). The main conclusions of the study cover the socio-economic background of the GP functionaries, levels of their knowledge and awareness, the infrastructural and manpower endowment of the GPs, perceptions of different functionaries about the major problems faced by the villagers and, finally, the functioning of the GPs.

As regards the socio-economic background of GP functionaries, one may first note that the 2001 PRI elections was indeed a turning point for the electoral empowerment of extremely backward caste people of Bihar. Until that election, they were not taken into any political cognisance, despite numbering about one-third of the population. In 2001 elections, they could register their presence in the emerging political power structure of the state which was earlier almost wholly dominated by the upper caste and backward caste Hindus. A second important outcome of 2001 elections was that, although the backward and extremely backward caste Hindus emerged strong from this election, the upper caste Hindus or the traditional elites were seen to retain a substantial part of their earlier political power at the grass root level, in contrast the structure of political power structure at the state-level. In 2006 elections, the extremely backward caste Hindus were given the

advantage of reservation, the scheduled castes and females enjoying such advantage even before. Due to this multiple reservations — for females, scheduled castes and extremely backward caste Hindus, nearly two-thirds of the seats in PRIs are now reserved, some of them actually doubly reserved like a seat being so for a female belonging to the extremely backward castes. All these provisions now ensure that the religion-caste composition of the PRIs is now fairly close to the same for the overall population. The primary data of this study corroborates it fully, both for Mukhiyas and Ward Members. However, in case of Panchayat Sachivs, provision for such reservation is not there; as such, only about one-tenth of the Panchayat Sachivs were from among the extremely backward caste Hindus and, even more unfortunately, Muslim Panchayat Sachivs were altogether absent in the study sample.

Because of the provision of the reservation, the economic background of the elected Panchayat functionaries, either a Mukhiya or a Ward Member, varied considerably. Just as at one end, there were elected functionaries having substantial amount of land pursuing agriculture as their primary occupation, there were others at the opposite end who were poor agricultural labourers. Among the Mukhiyas, about one in eight were landless; among the Ward Members, every second one was so. It is, therefore, not surprising to note that a small number of Mukhiyas and many of the Ward Members were holders of NREGA Job Card and had also worked under the programme. Since a process of election is involved in PRIs, it was observed that a large percentage of elected Panchayat functionaries, be they from upper or lower strata of the society, had political ambitions and were using their present position as a starting point for building political capital. With an average age of about 40-45 years, they could certainly wait for some years to move ahead in the political ladder.

If one considers the level of knowledge and awareness of the Panchayat functionaries, it clearly emerges as one of the major limitations of the system. Only about one-fourth of the Mukhiyas had completed their secondary education, possibly a minimum for them to understand the official documents and communications. Among the Ward Members, those who have completed secondary education were only about one-tenth. Many of these functionaries thus largely lacked information about the contents of the PRI Act and Rules and the various government documents to

guide the functioning of the GPs. Admittedly, even with their limited literacy, the information gap could be bridged through adequate training and constant information-feed from the Panchayat Sachivs, but such arrangements were wholly absent. It is very surprising to find that such ignorance about legal and administrative provisions of GP functioning is not restricted to elected Panchayat functionaries alone, the Panchayat Sachivs also lacked many information, although their level of knowledge and awareness is substantially higher. At his position, one would expect him to be not only fully conversant with all the relevant information, but a regular source of information for the elected functionaries and the villagers as well.

As a unit of local self-governance, the GPs are now required to perform many functions. These include implementation of a number of development programmes funded by allocations from FC12, BRGF and NREGA; a number of other welfare programmes of the state government; many supervisory or monitoring functions for primary school, PHC (or Sub-centre), Anganwadi etc; and finally, the organisational and administrative functions. For all these work, a GP is endowed with only three paid functionaries — Panchayat Sachiv, Rojgar Savak and a Nyaya Mitra. The last named one is a part-time worker devoted to quasi-judicial responsibilities of the GP and the Rojgar Sevak takes care of NREGA programmes alone. That leaves Panchayat Sachivs with all the other works, any help from the elected functionaries being optional and very limited. This is a serious constraint for the proper functioning of GPs. To make the situation even worse, about half of the Panchayat Sachivs are required to serve two GPs and the second GPs obviously suffer more due to this overloading of work for the Panchayat Sachiv. Beside adequate manpower, GPs also require an office building where official work could be done, records could be kept, meetings and discussion could be held and villagers could come to meet the functionaries. Unfortunately, such an office building is available for only half of the GPs, with or without adequate furniture. This is again a major constraint, preventing the affected GPs to perform their assigned roles.

The PRIs are an important vehicle for the empowerment of the people at the grassroots, but these institutions also need to justify their existence through responsive and efficient governance at the local level. This entails implementation and monitoring of a number of development programmes, which could gradually lessen the development deficits in rural areas. These deficit span a number

of fields which can be broadly grouped under four groups — water, roads and power, livelihood opportunities and health/education facilities. All these problems are so wide that it is not easy for the villagers to rank them in terms of intensity. But with their living experience, they are often able to identify specific points of intervention for either the GPs or other development personnel of the state government. In the perception of the elected Panchayat functionaries, the intensity of the various problems faced by the villagers is probably not as high as mentioned by the villagers, but the former are also aware of these problems. Interestingly, when one takes into account the responses of the Panchayat Sachivs, the problems of the villagers are perceived to be of even lesser intensity. This trend is reflective of lesser sensitivity of elected functionaries and Panchayat Sachivs about the rural problems which makes the GPs less responsive to the local development needs.

For an effective functioning of the GPs, it is very necessary that their functionaries have an adequate understanding of the respective roles of the GPs and other offices of the state government, like the Block Development Office or other line departments. Unfortunately, the GP functionaries are often unable to identify their own responsibilities and those of the state government. Thus, they often hold the state government responsible for many of the rural problems which they themselves could easily address with their own resources. Broadly speaking, one would hold the state government responsible for a problem if a required facility (like a primary school or a Primary Health Centre or Sub-centre) is non-existent; but if such a facility is present, it is the responsibility of the GP to ensure that it functions properly. Interestingly, the tendency to blame the state government for different problems is more among the Panchayat Sachivs than among the elected Panchayat functionaries.

That the GPs are not able to discharge their responsibilities are because of several reasons, discussed above. But the way the GPs function is also an equally important determinant of their efficiency. These functional dimensions include the regularity of the meetings of Gram Sabha, Social Audit Forum and the General Body; the extent of participation of the villagers/ elected functionaries in those meetings; and the extent to which decisions of these bodies are actually implemented by Mukhiyas and Panchayat Sachivs. It emerges from the present study that Gram

Sabha meetings are rare and meetings of the Social Audit Forums are even rarer. One can possibly ignore these lapses as conducting such meetings where all villagers are expected to attend is a rather difficult exercise. But meetings of the General Body, at least four of which are a mandatory requirement, are also not regular. Even when they are held, the decisions taken in those meetings are not fully implemented, the actual activities of the GPs being decided by the Mukhiyas. In the face of such undemocratic functioning of the GPs, it is not surprising to find that the level of participation of the Ward Members in General Body meeting of the GPs is rather limited. Yet another serious limitation of the GP's functioning is the lack of transparency, leading to villagers being in dark about the deliberations in the General Body meeting regarding the choice of and financial allocations for different programmes.

The state government, while planning its interventions for strengthening the PRIs, should first note that the PRIs in Bihar are still a nascent phenomenon. Those which were formed after 2001 elections had only a legal existence, devoid of both an agenda and financial support. Taking the 2006 elections as the de facto starting point for PRIs in Bihar, the system is just three years old and it suffers from a number of difficulties, some infrastructural, others organisational or resource-related. But one can easily observe that PRIs have already made some contribution towards rural development and secondly, it has substantially empowered the rural society, notably its hitherto marginalised sections. The general disposition of the rural people towards the PRIs is very positive, far from an attitude of frustration that they generally have for the state administration. In this background, a changed organisational and operational scenario for PRIs is not only desirable, but feasible as well with an appropriate policy and resource support from the state government.

Table P1 : Village Summary Information

Item	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusarai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Av. No. of Households	165	189	297	528	281	301
Av. No. of SC Hamlets	1.3	1.8	2.1	2.3	1.0	1.7
Av. No. of Voters	554	718	902	1484	837	927
Wage Rate						
Agriculture (Male)	53.70	70.00	68.50	54.10	51.50	59.60
Agriculture (Female)	33.40	60.30	45.50	41.20	36.70	43.20
Construction (Male)	65.30	145.0	125.50	93.80	83.00	102.30
Construction (Female)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Av. No. of Adult Respondents who attended from PRA						
	85.7	15.7	42.6	54.3	42.3	48.2
Percentage of Villages where PRA was attended by						
Mukhiya	73.7	55.6	30.0	47.1	40.0	48.9
Ward Members	48.9	44.4	100.0	82.4	75.0	76.6
GP Sachiv	26.3	5.6	15.0	5.9	30.0	17.0

Table P2 : Average Number of Households per Village for Different Religion and Caste Groups

Item	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusarai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Av. Number of Castes per Village	14.0	10.3	13.7	13.1	14.0	13.1
Av. Number of Households per Village						
Upper Caste (H)	61.3 (37.1)	49.4 (26.1)	99.8 (33.6)	221.4 (41.9)	52.7 (18.8)	91.2 (30.3)
Backward Caste (H)	29.9 (18.1)	55.3 (29.2)	31.5 (10.6)	78.2 (14.8)	53.1 (18.9)	47.4 (15.7)
Extremely Backward Caste (H)	26.5 (16.0)	10.8 (5.7)	55.9 (18.2)	51.5 (9.8)	42.8 (15.2)	39.7 (13.2)
Scheduled Caste / Tribe	42.9 (25.9)	39.2 (20.7)	41.3 (13.9)	59.2 (11.2)	38.0 (13.5)	44.7 (14.8)
Muslims	24.8 (15.0)	34.4 (18.2)	68.4 (23.0)	117.6 (22.3)	94.2 (33.5)	78.1 (25.9)
All Religion and Caste Groups	165.4 (100.0)	189.1 (100.0)	296.9 (100.0)	527.9 (100.0)	280.8 (100.0)	301.1 (100.0)

Note : Figures in brackets indicate percentage share of Religion and caste Groups in the village

Table P3 : Percentage Distribution of Households of Different Religion and Caste Groups by Location of Their House

Religion and Caste Groups / House Locations	Bhojpur (N=19)	Naland a (N=18)	Begusa rai (N=20)	Sahars a (N=17)	Sitamar hi (N=20)	AI (N=94)
Upper Caste (H)						
Spread out in the Main village	100.0	68.4	38.7	80.9	100.0	78.7
Separate Colony in the Main Village	—	31.6	61.3	4.8	—	19.1
In Hamlet Away from the Village	—	—	—	14.3	—	2.2
Backward Caste (H)						
Spread out in the Main village	100.0	96.3	90.1	100.0	98.8	97.1
Separate Colony in the Main Village	—	3.7	9.9	—	1.2	2.9
In Hamlet Away from the Village	—	—	—	—	—	—
Extremely Backward Caste (H)						
Spread out in the Main village	98.6	100.0	88.9	82.7	96.4	93.2
Separate Colony in the Main Village	1.3	—	11.1	13.8	2.4	5.9
In Hamlet Away from the Village	—	—	—	3.4	1.2	0.8
Scheduled Caste / Tribe						
Spread out in the Main village	41.1	42.3	11.5	23.8	47.2	33.0
Separate Colony in the Main Village	48.2	28.8	82.7	74.6	35.8	54.7
In Hamlet Away from the Village	10.7	28.8	5.8	1.6	19.0	12.3
Muslims						
Spread out in the Main village	100.0	90.9	40.0	58.8	90.0	73.6
Separate Colony in the Main Village	—	9.1	60.0	35.3	10.0	25.3

In Hamlet Away from the Village	—	—	—	5.9	—	1.1
All Religion / Caste Groups						
Spread out in the Main village	87.2	78.9	65.3	69.2	87.5	77.9
Separate Colony in the Main Village	10.5	13.0	33.6	27.7	8.9	18.8
In Hamlet Away from the Village	2.2	8.1	1.1	3.1	3.6	3.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table P4 : Percentage of Households of Different Religion and Caste Groups Living in Kachcha Dwellings

Religion and Caste Groups	Percent Living in Kachcha Dwelling					
	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusar ai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Upper Caste (H)	32.8	24.8	46.4	29.8	55.3	37.3
Backward Caste (H)	52.7	32.3	51.4	69.7	62.7	56.4
Extremely Backward Caste (H)	70.9	60.7	77.2	89.0	90.0	81.4
Scheduled Caste / Tribe	63.6	64.1	54.7	46.7	75.0	58.9
Muslims	45.7	51.7	76.5	86.0	70.8	74.5
All Religion / Caste Groups	54.5	44.0	62.3	59.9	71.9	60.6

Table P5 : Percentage Distribution of Households of Different Religion and Caste Groups by Their Landholdings

Religion and Caste Groups / Landholding Sizes	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusarai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Upper Caste (H)						
No Land	15.0	13.1	38.1	21.8	26.3	24.6
Upto 1.0 acre	29.8	30.9	23.9	43.4	37.3	34.4
1.0 – 5.0 acre	41.6	43.5	20.7	23.1	25.1	24.5
5.1 – 10.0 acre	12.4	6.2	8.3	9.7	6.8	9.2
Above 10.0 acre	1.2	6.3	9.0	2.0	4.4	4.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Backward Caste (H)						
No Land	14.8	27.0	65.8	52.0	51.9	37.5
Upto 1.0 acre	74.7	37.5	19.8	22.0	28.2	42.9
1.0 – 5.0 acre	10.1	28.7	11.8	18.4	14.8	15.5
5.1 – 10.0 acre	0.4	5.0	2.0	6.7	3.9	3.3
Above 10.0 acre	—	1.7	0.6	1.0	1.2	0.7

Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Extremely Backward Caste (H)						
No Land	84.8	68.3	87.6	90.1	82.4	85.7
Upto 1.0 acre	11.7	20.7	8.63	4.8	14.3	10.0
1.0 – 5.0 acre	3.3	10.0	3.6	4.7	2.5	3.8
5.1 – 10.0 acre	0.1	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.7	0.4
Above 10.0 acre	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	—	0.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(Continued)

Table P5 : (Concluded)

Religion and Caste Groups / Landholding Sizes	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusa rai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Scheduled Caste / Tribes (H)						
No Land	91.2	85.1	86.4	97.6	90.9	91.3
Upto 1.0 acre	7.7	11.6	11.3	2.0	6.9	7.1
1.0 – 5.0 acre	1.0	3.0	2.2	0.2	2.1	1.5
5.1 – 10.0 acre	0.1	0.2	—	0.1	0.0	0.1
Above 10.0 acre	—	0.0	—	0.0	—	0.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Muslims						
No Land	82.9	60.9	85.9	89.7	80.4	83.3
Upto 1.0 acre	9.9	13.7	9.9	8.7	13.4	11.2
1.0 – 5.0 acre	7.2	15.6	3.2	1.4	3.8	3.8

5.1 – 10.0 acre	—	6.9	1.0	0.0	1.4	1.2
Above 10.0 acre	—	2.9	—	—	0.9	0.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
All Religion / Caste Groups						
No Land	38.0	47.3	72.7	63.9	67.5	59.3
Upto 1.0 acre	47.6	26.3	14.3	19.1	20.0	25.0
1.0 – 5.0 acre	12.3	21.0	8.5	11.8	9.0	11.6
5.1 – 10.0 acre	2.1	3.5	2.4	4.3	2.4	3.0
Above 10.0 acre	0.1	1.8	2.1	0.8	1.0	1.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table P6 : Information on Educational Facilities in GP

Item	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusar ai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Average Number of Schools per GP						
Government (Primary)	1.9	1.1	1.1	2.9	1.8	1.7
Government (Secondary)	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	—	0.2
Private (Primary)	0.3	0.2	0.7	0.2	0.6	0.4
Private (Secondary)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total	2.4	1.5	2.1	3.3	2.4	2.3
Average Number of Teachers per School						
Government (Primary)	3.8	4.0	6.3	3.2	4.2	4.3
Government (Secondary)	12.3	6.7	17.5	13.0	—	13.4
Private (Primary)	13.5	3.3	8.8	7.0	4.5	6.6

Private (Secondary)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Percentage of Schools Having Vacant Positions						
Government (Primary)	78.9	72.2	65.0	70.6	70.0	71.3
Government (Secondary)	10.5	16.7	5.0	11.8	—	8.5
Private (Primary)	5.3	5.6	0.0	5.9	5.0	4.3
Private (Secondary)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Percentage of Teachers Living within GP						
Government (Primary)	94.7	88.9	85.0	100.0	95.0	92.6
Government (Secondary)	10.5	16.7	15.0	11.8	—	10.6
Private (Primary)	5.3	11.1	45.0	5.9	45.0	24.4
Private (Secondary)	—	—	—	—	—	—

Table P7 : Extent of Private Schooling Practices in Sample Villages

Item	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusar ai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Percentage Distribution of Families by the Schooling Practices of their Children						
Sending Children to Government Schools	79.0	71.7	68.0	77.9	71.2	71.4
Sending Children to Private Schools	2.6	4.6	12.0	0.6	13.2	6.9
Not Sending Children to Schools	18.4	23.7	20.0	21.5	15.6	21.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Reasons for Private Schooling (Percentage of Villages Mentioning the Reason)						
Private Schools Teach English	100.0	0.0	0.0	58.8	5.0	31.9
Private School Teacher is Always Present	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
Private School has Better Facilities	100.0	0.0	45.0	58.8	5.0	41.5

Private School Teaching Better	100.0	16.7	20.0	64.7	55.0	51.1
Average Monthly Fee in Private School	150.0	76.7	153.9	125.0	169.6	135.0

Table P8 : Percentage of Villages Mentioning Different Reasons for Their Choice of Health Facilities

Health Facility / Reasons for Choice	Percentage of Villages Mentioning the Reasons					
	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusa rai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Sub-Centre						
Closest Available	10.5	22.3	15.0	17.6	10.0	14.9
Best Quality of Staff	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.9	25.0	17.1
Best Facilities	5.3	5.6	5.0	5.9	30.0	10.7
Good Prescriptions	0.0	5.6	0.0	5.9	0.0	2.2
Cheapest	5.3	5.6	5.0	5.9	0.0	4.3
PHC						
Closest Available	0.0	11.1	10.0	0.0	10.0	6.4
Best Quality of Staff	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	3.2
Best Facilities	5.3	0.0	15.0	5.9	35.0	12.8
Good Prescriptions	5.3	5.6	5.0	17.6	0.0	6.4
Cheapest	0.0	11.2	0.0	11.8	0.0	4.2

Govt. Hospital						
Closest Available	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	20.0	4.7
Best Quality of Staff	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.0	3.2
Best Facilities	94.7	5.6	15.0	29.4	25.0	34.0
Good Prescriptions	100.0	11.1	15.0	35.3	10.0	34.0
Cheapest	5.3	11.1	10.0	47.1	10.0	16.0
Pvt. Practitioner						
Closest Available	94.8	33.3	5.0	47.1	10.0	37.3
Best Quality of Staff	0.0	16.7	0.0	5.9	10.0	6.4
Best Facilities	0.0	11.1	45.0	35.3	40.0	26.6
Good Prescriptions	0.0	5.6	35.0	17.7	30.0	18.1
Cheapest	5.3	0.0	10.0	0.0	5.0	4.3
ICDS Centre						
Closest Available	100.0	61.1	90.0	70.6	75.0	79.7
Best Quality of Staff	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	1.1
Best Facilities	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Good Prescriptions	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cheapest	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.9	5.0	3.2

Table P9 : Information of Availability of Electricity in Sample Villages

Facility / Availability	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusa rai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	AI
						(N=94)
Percent of Villages Having Electricity	21.1	61.1	70.0	70.6	35.0	51.1

Av. No. of hours per day when Electricity is Available						
Main Village	8.0	13.4	5.7	6.1	3.7	7.5
SC/ST Hamlet	2.0	6.1	6.1	6.3	5.0	5.8
Av. no. of days per week when electricity is available for irrigation						
Main Village	—	4.7	—	4.0	—	4.7
SC/ST Hamlet	5.7	6.5	3.1	4.2	4.5	4.6

Table P10 : Information about Availability of Public Transport in Sample Villages

Item	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusar ai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Distance to Nearest Bus Stop (km.)	2.9	0.4	1.9	2.1	1.1	1.7
Percentage Distribution of Villages by Type of Bus Stop						
Sheltered	0.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	15.0	6.4
Partially Sheltered	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1
Not Sheltered	100.0	88.9	85.0	100.0	85.0	91.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Percentage of Villages having Facility of						
Government Buses	0.0	5.6	0.0	11.8	5.0	4.3
Government Mini Vans / Jeeps	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Government (Other Vehicles)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Private Busses	68.4	77.8	100.0	64.7	80.0	78.7
Private Mini Vans / Jeeps	94.7	50.0	50.0	76.5	30.0	59.6
Private (Other Vehicles)	100.0	0.0	0.0	35.3	5.0	27.7
Timing of Buses						
Av. Timing of First Bus (a.m.)	6.00	5.50	5.50	6.20	6.10	6.00
Av. Timing of Last Bus (p.m.)	5.50	7.50	7.20	7.20	7.50	7.20

Table P 11 : Percentage of Villages Reporting Various Problems

Issues / Problems	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusa rai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Water						
Water Logging	21.1	55.6	85.0	88.0	100.0	70.2
Poor Quality Drinking Water	0.0	88.9	85.0	94.1	90.0	71.3
Health						
No sub-centre/sub-centre closed	78.9	72.2	85.0	47.1	70.0	71.3
No AWW / AWC– No Counseling / Nutritious Food	21.1	50.0	50.0	5.9	60.0	38.3
No PHC / PHC Closed	0.0	22.2	20.0	29.4	30.0	20.2
Poor Quality of Health Facility in village	31.6	72.3	15.0	76.5	30.0	43.6
Poor Quality of Health Facility in General	84.2	38.9	10.0	41.2	25.0	39.4
Doctor / Nurse Not Coming/Staying in Village	73.7	16.7	30.0	29.4	45.0	39.4
Access to Health Facility Difficult because of Poor Transport	15.8	16.7	0.0	35.3	20.0	17.0
Education						
Teacher Quality Poor	47.4	61.1	60.0	88.2	80.0	67.0
Too Few Classes / Higher Grades Classes Not Existing	0.0	27.8	30.0	29.4	50.0	27.7
Not Enough Teachers / No Subject-wise Teachers	42.1	44.4	25.0	5.9	20.0	27.7
Access to Higher Education Difficult because of Poor Transport	5.3	16.7	5.0	41.2	30.0	19.1
Not Enough Facilities in Schools	73.7	27.8	25.0	52.9	45.0	44.7
No AWW/ AWC – No Elementary / Pre school education	0.0	33.3	30.3	0.0	15.0	16.0
Teachers Attendance Irregular	42.1	11.1	30.0	29.4	25.0	27.7

(Continued)

Table P 11 : (Continued)

Issues / Problems	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusar ai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Road						
Poor Quality of Village Approach Road	89.5	77.8	50.0	82.4	75.0	74.5
Poor Quality of Roads in Village	94.7	38.9	80.0	88.2	75.0	75.5
No Connectivity to Main Road	5.3	11.1	20.0	5.9	10.0	10.6
Problem of Accessibility to Approach Road during Monsoons	21.1	55.6	50.0	47.1	65.0	47.9
Electricity						
No / Not Enough Streetlights	100.0	97.4	80.0	70.6	80.0	85.1
Irregular Electricity / Inadequate Hours of Supply	84.2	61.1	40.0	47.1	35.0	53.2
Insufficient / No electricity for Agriculture / Irrigation	5.3	44.4	45.	64.7	45.0	40.4
Voltage Problem	15.8	27.8	55.0	58.8	20.0	35.1
Unemployment						
Access to Outside Village Employment Difficult because of Poor Transport	0.0	72.2	50.0	17.6	55.0	39.4
Not Enough Non-Agr. (e.g. Factories / industries) Employment in Village	84.2	66.7	35.0	100.0	80.0	72.3
Other Problems	0.0	5.6	0.0	41.2	0.0	8.5
Sanitation / Toilets						
No Public / Private toilets / Insufficient Toilets	100.0	100.0	85.0	100.0	95.0	95.7
Insufficient Drains	21.1	77.8	10.0	82.4	60.0	48.9
Quality of Drains in Village Poor	5.3	94.4	40.0	17.6	75.0	46.8
Poor Maintenance of Existing of Public Toilets	5.3	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1

(Continued)

Table P 11 : (Concluded)

Issues / Problems	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusar ai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Irrigation						
Poor Quality of Irrigation Facilities	100.0	88.9	65.0	82.0	50.0	76.6
No Irrigation / Complete Dependence on Rainfall	84.2	88.9	65.0	100.0	95.0	86.2
Number of Irrigation Channels Insufficient	89.5	38.9	0.0	52.9	10.0	37.2
Liquour						
Presence of Liquour Shop in Village	0.0	16.7	10.0	5.9	10.0	8.5
<u>Good Quality Liquour Not Available</u>	78.9	0.0	5.0	11.8	0.0	19.1
Alcoholism / Drunkenness	21.1	38.9	10.0	29.4	40.0	27.7
Illicit Liquour Consumption	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	1.1
Housing						
Not Enough <i>Pucca</i> Houses	89.5	88.9	10.0	41.2	70.0	59.6
Not / Insufficient Government Housing Schemes	97.7	94.4	95.0	100.0	100.0	96.8
Security						
Crime in Village	23.3	11.1	35.0	23.5	20.0	23.4
Violent Disputes	89.5	0.0	0.0	5.9	5.0	20.2
Lack of Cooperation	68.4	38.9	10.0	47.1	25.0	37.2
Safety of Minorities	57.9	66.7	80.0	82.3	75.0	72.3
Eve Teasing	100.0	16.7	5.0	41.2	0.0	31.9
Gambling	5.3	33.3	10.0	11.8	5.0	12.8

Table P12 : Current Average Ranking of the Problems in Different Districts

Issues / Problems	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusar ai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Water						
Water Logging	3.4	2.8	1.9	3.0	2.1	2.5
Poor Quality Drinking Water	4.0	2.1	2.3	1.8	2.4	2.5
Health						
No sub-centre/sub-centre closed	1.8	2.3	1.6	2.6	1.9	2.0
No AWW / AWC– No Counseling / Nutritious Food	3.8	2.9	3.1	3.9	3.0	3.3
No PHC / PHC Closed	4.0	3.6	3.6	3.3	3.3	3.5
Poor Quality of Health Facility in village	3.2	2.5	4.1	2.2	3.4	3.0
Poor Quality of Health Facility in General	2.5	3.4	3.8	3.3	3.5	3.3
Doctor / Nurse Not Coming/Staying in Village	2.9	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.2	3.4
Access to Health Facility Difficult because of Poor Transport	3.7	3.8	4.0	3.5	3.7	3.7
Education						
Teacher Quality Poor	3.1	2.4	2.6	1.6	2.1	2.4
Too Few Classes / Higher Grades Classes Not Existing	4.0	3.3	3.4	3.4	2.8	3.4
Not Enough Teachers / No Subject-wise Teachers	3.3	3.2	3.5	3.9	3.5	3.5
Access to Higher Education Difficult because of Poor Transport	3.9	3.6	3.8	3.3	3.3	3.6
Not Enough Facilities in Schools	2.2	3.4	3.5	3.2	3.3	3.2
No AWW/ AWC – No Elementary / Pre school education	4.0	3.4	3.3	4.0	3.8	3.7
Teachers Attendance Irregular	3.2	3.9	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.5

Note : In the ranking scale, 1 represents most serious problems, higher figures denoting lesser intensity of the given problem.

(Continued)

Table P12 : (Continued)

Issues / Problems	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusar ai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Road						
Poor Quality of Village Approach Road	1.7	1.9	2.9	1.9	2.2	2.1
Poor Quality of Roads in Village	1.8	3.3	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.2
No / Not Enough Streetlights	2.9	2.2	2.0	2.9	2.7	2.5
No Connectivity to Main Road	3.9	3.9	3.6	3.9	3.9	3.8
Problem of Accessibility to Approach Road during Monsoons	3.8	3.3	3.1	3.5	3.0	3.2
Electricity						
No / Not Enough Streetlights	1.3	2.2	1.7	2.6	1.8	1.9
Irregular Electricity / Inadequate Hours of Supply	2.1	2.6	2.9	2.8	3.1	2.7
Insufficient / No electricity for Agriculture / Irrigation	3.9	2.9	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.3
Voltage Problem	3.8	3.5	2.7	2.5	3.6	3.2
Unemployment						
Access to Outside Village Employment Difficult because of Poor Transport	4.0	2.3	2.8	3.6	2.5	3.0
Not Enough Non-Agr. (e.g. Factories / industries) Employment in Village	1.5	2.4	2.9	1.0	1.7	1.9
Other Problems	4.0	3.8	4.0	2.9	4.0	3.8
Sanitation / Toilets						
No Public / Private toilets / Insufficient Toilets	1.5	1.3	1.5	1.0	1.2	1.3
Insufficient Drains	3.6	2.6	3.8	2.3	2.9	3.1
Quality of Drains in Village Poor	3.8	2.4	3.1	3.7	2.7	3.2
Poor Maintenance of Existing of Public Toilets	3.8	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.9

Note : In the ranking scale, 1 represents most serious problems, higher figures denoting lesser intensity of the given problem.

(Continued)

Table P12 : (Concluded)

Issues / Problems	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusar ai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Irrigation						
Poor Quality of Irrigation Facilities	1.1	1.9	2.2	2.3	2.6	2.0
No Irrigation / Complete Dependence on Rainfall	2.5	2.1	2.2	1.3	1.6	1.9
Number of Irrigation Channels Insufficient	2.7	3.2	4.0	3.4	3.8	3.4
Liquour						
Presence of Liquour Shop in Village	4.0	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.8
<u>Good Quality Liquour Not Available</u>	1.6	4.0	3.8	3.8	4.0	2.6
Alcoholism / Drunkenness	3.8	2.9	3.9	3.5	2.9	3.4
Illicit Liquour Consumption	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.0
Housing						
Not Enough <i>Pucca</i> Houses	2.1	2.4	3.8	3.1	2.3	2.7
Not / Insufficient Government Housing Schemes	1.3	1.7	1.2	1.1	1.3	1.3
Security						
Crime in Village	3.4	3.8	3.1	3.3	3.5	3.4
Violent Disputes	1.5	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.96	3.5
Lack of Cooperation	2.6	3.0	3.8	2.9	3.4	3.1
Safety of Minorities	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Eve Teasing	2.6	3.6	3.8	3.2	4.0	3.4
Gambling	3.9	3.2	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.8

Note : In the ranking scale, I represents most serious problems, higher figures denoting lesser intensity of the given problem.

Table P13 : Extent of Activities for Public Goods and Services in Sample Villages (Road Infrastructure)

Services / Activities	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusa rai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Approach / Connection Road to Nearby Towns Constructed / Improved						
AT	31.6	55.6	35.0	58.8	50.0	45.7
FA	63.2	83.3	90.0	23.5	70.0	67.0
Roads in Main Village Constructed / Improved						
AT	73.7	55.6	35.0	29.4	35.0	45.7
FA	73.7	77.8	90.0	88.2	75.0	80.9
Roads in SC/ST Hamlet of Village Constructed / Improved						
AT	42.1	27.8	10.0	11.8	20.0	22.3
FA	84.2	44.4	30.0	64.7	35.0	51.1

Note : AT = Percentage of villages where some action was taken in Last 12 months
 FA = Percentage of villages where further Action is needed

Table P14 : Extent of Activities for Public Goods and Services in Sample Villages (Education)

Services / Activities	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusa rai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Repair / Construction of School Building						
AT	42.1	33.3	45.0	17.6	55.0	39.4
FA	57.9	72.2	85.0	11.8	90.0	64.9
Provision of Educational Materials for Schools						
AT	21.1	27.8	15.0	0.0	25.0	18.1
FA	78.9	55.6	55.0	82.4	50.0	63.8
Provide Salaries to Teachers						
AT	0.0	22.2	0.0	0.0	10.0	6.4
FA	0.0	27.8	5.0	5.9	5.0	8.5
Lobbied for Government Schemes / Uniforms / More Teachers						
AT	15.8	5.6	20.0	0.0	10.0	10.6
FA	94.7	22.2	30.0	91.1	55.0	58.5
Donated Land for School Building						
AT	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	2.1
FA	0.0	11.1	5.0	11.8	15.0	8.5

Note : AT = Percentage of villages where some action was taken in Last 12 months

FA = Percentage of villages where further Action is needed

Table P15 : Extent of Activities for Public Goods and Services in Sample Villages (Health)

Services / Activities	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusarai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Repair / Construction of Health Sub-Centre						
AT	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	1.1
FA	0.0	66.7	70.0	23.5	85.0	50.0
Repair Construction of PHC						
AT	5.3	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	2.1
FA	0.0	5.6	25.0	5.9	35.0	14.9
Repair / construction of Anganwadi Centre (AWC)						
AT	5.3	5.6	0.0	0.0	5.0	3.2
FA	0.0	16.7	30.0	0.0	45.0	19.1
Provision of Salaries to Doctors / Nurse / AWW						
AT	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
FA	15.8	0.0	10.0	35.3	10.0	13.8
Provision of House / Facilities to Doctor / Nurse						
AT	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
FA	63.2	38.9	25.0	41.2	55.0	44.7
Conducting Health / Immunization Camp						
AT	10.5	5.6	10.0	0.0	50.0	6.4
FA	100.0	50.0	70.0	88.2	60.0	73.4
Lobbied for Better Health Services						
AT	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
FA	5.3	11.1	35.0	0.0	30.0	17.0
Donated Land for Health Facilities						
AT	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
FA	0.0	5.6	5.0	0.0	0.0	2.1

Note : AT = Percentage of Villages where some action was taken in Last 12 months

FA = Percentage of Villages where Further Action is Needed

Table P16 : Extent of Activities for Public Goods and Services in Sample Villages (Water/Sanitation/Drainage)

Services / Activities	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusarai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Repair / Construction of Borewell						
AT	26.3	38.9	10.0	17.6	15.0	21.3
FA	68.4	83.3	75.0	94.1	100.0	84.0
Repair Construction of Overhead Tank						
AT	0.0	5.6	50.0	0.0	0.0	2.1
FA	0.0	50.0	10.0	17.6	20.0	19.1
Improvement of Surrounding of Water Sources						
AT	36.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.4
FA	100.0	11.1	30.0	88.2	45.0	54.3
Other Activities Related to Water						
AT	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
FA	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
Repair / Improvement / Construction of Drains in main Village						
AT	21.1	22.2	20.0	0.0	0.0	12.8
FA	63.2	77.8	70.0	41.2	95.0	70.2
Repair / Improvement / Construction of Drain in SC/ST Hamlet						
AT	15.8	16.7	10.0	11.8	0.0	10.6
FA	68.4	44.4	20.0	88.2	35.0	50.0
Cleaning / Disinfections of Drains						
AT	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
FA	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	5.0	4.3
Construction of Toilets						
AT	15.8	5.6	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.3
FA	100.0	11.1	55.0	88.2	95.0	70.2

Note : AT = Percentage of villages where some action was taken in Last 12 months
FA = Percentage of villages where further Action was needed

Table P17 : Extent of Activities for Public Goods and Services in Sample Villages (Electricity)

Services / Activities	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusa rai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Construction of Streetlights in Main Village						
AT	42.1	27.8	0.0	76.5	30.0	34.0
FA	84.6	55.6	40.0	94.1	95.0	73.4
Construction of Streetlights in SC/ST Hamlet						
AT	0.0	27.8	0.0	47.1	20.0	18.1
FA	68.4	33.3	20.0	94.1	55.0	53.2
Provision of Electricity of Households in Main Village						
AT	0.0	27.8	0.0	5.9	0.0	6.4
FA	94.7	44.4	35.0	82.4	75.0	66.0
Provision of Electricity to Households in SC/ST Hamlets						
AT	0.0	22.2	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.3
FA	42.1	27.8	15.0	47.1	30.0	31.9
Lobbied for More Regular Supply of Electricity for Household						
AT	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
FA	5.3	11.1	60.0	23.5	35.0	27.7
Lobbied for More Regular Supply of Electricity for Agriculture						
AT	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
FA	0.0	5.6	30.0	0.0	35.0	14.9

Note : AT = Percentage of villages where some action was taken in Last 12 months

FA = Percentage of villages where further Action was needed

Table P18 : Extent of Activities for Public Goods and Services in Sample Villages (Irrigation)

Services / Activities	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusa rai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Improvement / Construction of Irrigation Channels in main Village						
AT	78.9	16.7	5.0	29.4	0.0	25.5
FA	100.0	94.4	75.0	100.0	100.0	93.6
Improvement / Construction of Irrigation Channels in SC/ST Hamlet						
AT	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
FA	52.6	27.8	10.0	5.9	15.0	22.3
Lobbied for Improvement / Construction in Irrigation Facilities						
AT	21.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3
FA	73.7	16.7	50.0	82.4	30.0	50.0

Note : AT = Percentage of villages where some action was taken in Last 12 months

FA = Percentage of villages where further Action was needed

Table P19 : Information on the Functioning of Government Health Functionaries

Item	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusar ai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Percentage of Villages where Health Functionary Lives in Village / GP						
Sub- Centre Staff	94.7	27.8	50.0	64.7	0.0	46.8
PHC Staff	94.7	100.0	10.0	47.1	100.0	29.8
ICDS Centre Staff	100.0	72.2	95.0	94.1	80.0	88.3
Percentage Distribution of Villages by Regularity of Attendance (Sub-Centre Staff)						
<u>Every day</u>	10.5	—	—	11.8	—	4.3
Almost Everyday	5.3	—	—	11.8	—	3.2
1-3 Times a Week	57.9	—	—	35.3	—	18.1
Occasionally / Rarely	21.1	27.8	50.0	5.9	—	21.3
No Functionary	5.3	72.2	50.0	35.3	100.0	53.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Percentage Distribution of Villages by Regularity of Attendance (PHC Staff)						
<u>Every day</u>	5.3	—	—	11.8	—	3.2
Almost Everyday	10.5	—	—	23.5	—	6.4
1-3 Times a Week	15.8	—	—	11.8	—	5.3
Occasionally / Rarely	63.1	—	10.0	—	—	14.9
No Functionary	5.3	100.0	90.0	52.9	100.0	70.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Percentage Distribution of Villages by Regularity of Attendance (ICDS Centre Staff)						
<u>Every day</u>	100.0	55.6	95.0	88.2	80.0	84.0
Almost Everyday	—	11.1	—	—	—	2.1
1-3 Times a Week	—	—	—	—	—	—

Occasionally / Rarely	—	5.6	—	5.9	—	2.2
No Functionary	—	27.8	5.0	5.9	20.0	11.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table P20 : Information on Frequency of Visits by Development Functionaries to the Villages

Development Functionaries / Frequency of Visit	Percentage of Distribution of Frequency					
	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusarai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Agricultural Extension Officer						
At Least once Week	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
About Once a Month	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.9	5.0	3.2
About Twice a Year	10.5	5.6	0.0	5.9	0.0	4.3
About Once a Year	10.5	0.0	0.0	29.4	0.0	7.4
Rarely	78.9	94.4	95.0	58.8	95.0	85.1
Block Development Officer (BDO)						
At Least once Week	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
About Once a Month	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.8	0.0	2.1
About Twice a Year	0.0	16.7	0.0	11.8	15.0	8.5
About Once a Year	36.8	0.0	15.0	23.5	15.0	18.1
Rarely	63.2	83.3	85.0	52.9	70.0	71.3
Child Development Programme Officer						
At Least once Week	0.0	5.6	5.0	0.0	0.0	2.1
About Once a Month	10.5	5.6	5.0	23.5	5.0	9.6
About Twice a Year	31.6	11.1	5.0	17.6	5.0	13.8
About Once a Year	36.8	0.0	10.0	5.9	10.0	12.8
Rarely	21.1	77.8	75.0	53.0	80.0	61.7
Rojgar Sevak						
At Least once Week	36.8	27.8	60.0	52.9	35.0	42.6

About Once a Month	42.1	22.2	15.0	29.4	15.0	24.5
About Twice a Year	10.6	5.6	0.0	11.8	10.0	7.4
About Once a Year	10.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	3.2
Rarely	0.0	44.4	25.0	5.9	35.0	22.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table P21 : Information on Existence of NGOs or CBOs in Sample Villages

Development Functionaries/ Frequency of Visit	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusar ai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Percentage of Village with a NGO Functioning there	0.0	16.7	0.0	23.5	10.0	9.6
Percentage of NGOs Working in Different fields						
Education	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Health	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	11.1
Women's Groups	0.0	33.3	0.0	25.0	100.0	44.4
Credit	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Marketing	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Legal Help	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
SC/ST Welfare	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	11.1
Percentage of Villages with a CBO Working there	26.3	5.6	10.0	17.6	–	11.7
Percentage of CBOs Working in Different fields						
Education	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	–	100.0
Health	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	–	100.0

Women's Groups	60.0	100.0	–	–	–	36.4
Credit	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	–	100.0
Marketing	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	–	100.0
Legal Help	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	–	100.0
SC/ST Welfare	–	–	–	33.3	–	9.1

Table P22 : Information of Social Capital in Sample Villages

Indicators	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusarai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Percentage of Village where Specialized Committees Exist						
Vidyalay Siksha Samiti	—	22.2	15.0	23.5	30.0	18.1
Health Sanitation Committee	—	—	—	5.9	—	1.1
Village Monitoring Committee	—	—	—	5.9	10.0	3.2
Percentage of Village Reporting Conflict between GP and NGO/CBO	5.3	—	—	—	—	1.1
Percentage of Villages where a GP Member's is also Member of Traditional Panchayat	—	33.3	—	17.6	40.0	18.1
Percentage of Villages having Regular Village Festivals	—	88.9	60.0	29.4	60.0	47.9
Percentage of Villages Reporting Caste/Other Conflict	—	11.1	10.0	—	5.0	5.3
Percentage of Villages Reporting Violence in Caste/Other Conflicts	—	5.5	—	—	—	1.1

Table P23 : Functioning of Gram Sabha

Indicators	Bhojpur (N=19)	Nalanda (N=18)	Begusarai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=17)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	All Districts (N=94)
Percentage of GPs where no Gram Sabha was held in last 12 months	36.8	11.1	50.0	35.3	40.0	35.1
Average Lapse of Time since Last Gram Sabha (months) where it was held in last 12 months	3.5	4.6	3.5	5.0	5.7	4.2
Percentage of Villages where Gram Sabha was Announced Adequately	63.1	77.8	55.0	64.7	45.0	60.6
Percentage of Village where APL/BPL list was discussed in Gram Sabha	63.1	77.8	55.0	52.9	60.0	61.7
Percentage of Village where Gram Sabha are considered useful	100.0	88.9	100.0	88.2	85.0	92.5

Table M 1 : Demographic Profile of Mukhiyas

Characteristics	Districts					Category of Mukhiya		All Districts (N=50)
	Bhojpur (N=10)	Nalanda (N=10)	Begusarai (N=10)	Saharsa (N=10)	Sitamarhi (N=10)	Elected in Reserved Seat (N=32)	Elected in Open Seat (N=18)	
Percentage Distribution of Sex								
Male	50.0	70.0	40.0	40.0	60.0	28.1	94.4	52.0
Female	50.0	30.0	60.0	60.0	40.0	71.9	5.6	48.0
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Percentage Distribution of Religion and Caste								
Upper Caste (H)	40.0	20.0	30.0	60.0	10.0	25.0	44.4	32.0
Backward Caste (H)	20.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	10.0	18.7	38.9	26.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H)	10.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	30.0	18.7	0.0	12.0
Scheduled Caste (H)	30.0	30.0	10.0	0.0	20.0	25.0	5.5	18.0
Muslims	0.0	0.0	10.0	20.0	30.0	12.5	11.1	12.0
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Average Age (Years)	45.9	38.5	41.7	40.3	46.4	44.2	39.7	42.6
Percentage Distribution by Years of Education								
Nil	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	3.1	5.5	4.0
1-5	30.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	30.0	21.9	5.5	6.0
6-10	50.0	60.0	40.0	70.0	50.0	56.2	50.0	54.0
Above 10	20.0	40.0	50.0	10.0	10.0	18.7	38.9	26.0

All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Percentage Distribution by Location of House								
SC/ST Hamlet	10.0	30.0	10.0	0.0	20.0	12.5	16.6	14.0
SC/ST Locality	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	3.1	0.0	2.0
Other Caste Locality	60.0	70.0	90.0	60.0	60.0	65.6	72.2	68.0
Hamlet away from main village	30.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	10.0	18.7	11.1	16.0
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table M 2 : Demographic Profile of Ward Members

<u>Characteristics</u>	Districts					Category of Ward Member		All Districts (N=100)
	Bhojpur (N=20)	Nalanda (N=20)	Begusa-rai (N=20)	Saharsa (N=20)	Sitamarhi (N=20)	Elected in Reserved Seat (N=67)	El (N=33)	
Percentage Distribution of Sex								
Male	55.0	50.0	60.0	40.0	45.0	28.4	93.9	50.0

Female	45.0	50.0	40.0	60.0	55.0	71.6	6.1	50.0
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Percentage Distribution of Religion and Caste								
Upper Caste (H)	15.0	10.0	15.0	25.0	5.0	13.4	15.1	14.0
Backward Caste (H)	40.0	10.0	5.0	35.0	10.0	13.4	33.3	20.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H)	25.0	30.0	50.0	25.0	35.0	35.8	27.3	33.0
Scheduled Caste (H)	10.0	45.0	30.0	15.0	30.0	32.8	12.1	26.0
Muslims	10.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	4.5	12.1	7.0
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Average Age (Years)								
	40.6	42.3	43.8	45.7	44.9	43.7	43.1	43.5
Percentage Distribution by years of Education								
Nil	5.0	15.0	0.0	35.0	30.0	23.9	3.0	17.0
1–5	30.0	40.0	60.0	20.0	30.0	43.3	21.2	36.0
6–10	55.0	30.0	25.0	30.0	40.0	28.3	51.5	36.0
Above 10	10.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	0.0	4.5	24.2	11.0
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Percentage Distribution by Location of House								
SC/ST Hamlet	5.0	25.0	0.0	5.0	10.0	10.4	6.1	9.0
SC/ST Locality	10.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	8.9	0.0	6.0
Other Caste Locality	55.0	60.0	95.0	35.0	55.0	58.2	63.6	60.0
Hamlet away from main village	30.0	0.0	5.0	60.0	30.0	22.4	30.3	25.0
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table M 3 : Gender Differences in the Demographic Profile of Mukhiyas / Ward Members

Characteristics	Mukhiyas		Ward Members	
	Male (N=26)	Female (N=24)	Male (N=50)	Female (N=50)
Percentage Distribution by Religion and Caste				
Upper Caste (H)	30.8	33.3	8.0	20.0
Backward Caste (H)	23.1	29.2	22.0	18.0

Extr. Backward Caste (H)	15.4	8.3	30.0	36.0
Scheduled Caste (H)	19.2	16.7	30.0	22.0
Muslims	11.5	12.5	10.0	4.0
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Percentage Distribution by Years of Education				
Nil	11.5	4.1	6.0	8.0
1-5	7.7	37.5	24.0	22.0
6-10	53.9	29.2	40.0	40.0
Above 10	26.9	29.2	30.0	30.0
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Percentage Distribution by Who Shoulders Her Official Responsibility				
Self	—	23.1	—	29.2
Other Family Members	—	73.0	—	62.5
Other Caste Member	—	3.8	—	4.2
Other GP Member	—	0.0	—	4.2
All	—	100.0	—	100.0

Table M 4 : Occupational Profile of Mukhiyas

Characteristics	District					Category of Mukhiya		<u>All Districts</u> (N=50)
	Bhojpur (N=10)	Nalanda (N=10)	Begusarai (N=10)	Saharsa (N=10)	Sitamarhi (N=10)	Elected in Reserved Seat (N=32)	Elected in Open Seat (N=18)	

Percentage Distribution by Primary Occupation								
Agriculture	50.0	30.0	40.0	20.0	50.0	39.3	36.4	38.0
Animal Husbandry fishing, etc.	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	2.0
Casual Labour (Agr. or Non Agr.)	20.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	10.0	28.5	22.8	26.0
Own Farm enterprises (Dairy, Poultry, etc.)	20.0	20.0	30.0	20.0	20.0	28.5	13.6	22.0
Salaried Employment	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Non Agr. enterprises (Trade, Artisan's works, etc.	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	3.6	4.5	4.0
Other Occupations	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	18.2	8.0
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Percentage Distribution by Secondary Occupation								
Agriculture	40.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	30.0	34.4	33.3	34.0
Animal Husbandry fishing, etc.	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	2.0
Casual Labour (Agr. or Non Agr.)	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	30.0	6.2	11.1	8.0
Own Farm enterprises (Dairy, Poultry, etc.)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Salaried Employment	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	6.2	5.5	6.0
Non Agr. enterprises (Trade, Artisan's works, etc.	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	5.5	2.0
Other Occupations	10.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	6.2	11.1	8.0
No Secondary Occupation	30.0	40.	40.0	70.0	20.0	43.8	33.3	40.0
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table M 5 : Occupational Profile of Ward Members

Characteristics	District	Category of Ward Member
------------------------	-----------------	------------------------------------

	Bhojpur (N=20)	Nalanda (N=20)	B (N=20)	Saharsa (N=20)	Sitama- rhi (N=20)	Elected in Reserved Seat (N=67)	Elected in Open Seat (N=33)	<u>All Districts</u> (N=100)
Percentage Distribution by Primary Occupation								
Agriculture	35.0	15.0	40.0	15.0	25.0	25.4	27.3	26.0
Animal Husbandry fishing, etc.	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	1.5	3.0	2.0
Casual Labour (Agr. or Non Agr.)	20.0	40.0	20.0	30.0	25.0	28.3	24.2	27.0
Own Farm enterprises (Dairy, Poultry, etc.)	25.0	25.0	20.0	25.0	25.0	26.8	18.2	24.0
Salaried Employment	10.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	7.5	9.1	8.0
Non Agr. enterprises (Trade, Artisan's works, etc.)	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	2.0
Other Occupations	5.0	10.0	15.0	10.0	15.0	10.4	12.1	11.0
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Percentage Distribution by Secondary Occupation								
Agriculture	35.0	45.0	35.0	35.0	40.0	43.3	27.3	38.0
Animal Husbandry fishing, etc.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Casual Labour (Agr. or Non Agr.)	10.0	5.0	20.0	5.0	0.0	4.5	15.1	8.0
Own Farm enterprises (Dairy, Poultry, etc.)	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	1.0
Salaried Employment	0.0	0.0	15.0	10.0	0.0	4.5	6.0	5.0
Non Agr. enterprises (Trade, Artisan's works, etc.)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other Occupations	5.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	2.9	3.0	3.0
No Secondary Occupation	45.0	50.0	25.0	45.0	60.0	43.3	48.5	45.0
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table M 6 : Percentage Distribution of Mukhiyas and Ward Members by Their Cultivable Landholdings.

Landholding Categories (acres)	Districts					Category of Mukhiya/Ward Member		<u>All Districts</u> (N=50/100)
	Bhojpur (N=10/20)	Nalanda (N=10/20)	B (N=10/20)	Saharsa (N=10/20)	Sitamarhi (N=10/20)	Elected in Reserved Seat (N=32/67)	Elected in Open Seat (N=18/33)	
Mukhiyas								
Landless	10.0	10.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	15.6	5.5	12.0
0.1–1.0	20.0	10.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	21.9	0.0	14.0
1.1–2.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	9.4	0.0	6.0
2.1–5.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	10.0	6.2	16.7	10.0
5.1–10.0	30.0	20.0	50.0	20.0	20.0	21.9	38.9	28.0
Above 10.0	30.0	40.0	10.0	50.0	20.0	25.0	38.9	30.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Avg. Landholding	8.9	16.3	3.7	8.3	6.1	6.2	13.1	8.7
Ward Members								
Landless	40.0	40.0	75.0	30.0	50.0	47.8	45.4	47.0
0.1–1.0	40.0	35.0	10.0	45.0	40.0	37.3	27.3	34.0
1.1–2.0	20.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	8.9	12.1	10.0
2.1–5.0	0.0	15.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	6.0	9.1	7.0
5.1–10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	1.0

Above 10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	1.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Avg. Landholding	0.4	1.0	0.5	1.5	1.2	0.7	1.4	0.9

Note : The first value of N refers to Mukhiyas and the second value to the Ward Members.

Table M 7 : Information about Job Cards Held by Respondents (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)

Characteristic of Respondents	Applied for Job Card (%)		Received Job Cards		Job Card having photograph (%)	
	M	WM	M	WM	M	WM
District						
Bhojpur (N= 10/20)	20.0	60.0	100.0	83.3	50.0	50.0
Nalanda (N= 10/20)	—	30.0	—	33.3	—	—
Begusarai (N= 10/20)	20.0	35.0	50.0	71.4	—	100.0
Saharsa (N= 10/20)	10.0	80.0	—	81.2	—	30.0
Sitamarhi (N= 10/20)	10.0	50.0	100.0	80.0	100.0	25.0
Religion/Caste						
Upper Caste (H) (N= 16/14)	—	57.1	—	75.0	—	50.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=13/20)	—	55.0	—	81.8	—	11.1
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N= 6/33)	16.7	42.4	—	78.6	—	45.5
Scheduled Caste (H) N=(9/26)	44.4	61.5	100.0	62.5	50.0	60.0
Muslims (N= 6/7)	16.7	28.6	—	100.0	—	50.0
Gender						
Male (N= 26/50)	11.5	46.0	100.0	78.3	66.7	38.9
Female (N= 24/50)	12.5	56.0	33.3	71.4	—	45.0
All Respondents (N=50/100)	12.0	51.0	66.7	74.5	50.0	42.1

- Note :
1. M = Mukhiya / WM = Ward Member
 2. The first value of the N refers to Mukhiya and the second value for the Ward Members.
 3. For 'Received Job Cards' and 'Job Cards having Photographs', the values of N are for relevant respondents.

Table M 8 : Information about Working Under NREGA by Respondents (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)

Characteristic of Respondents	Worked Under NREGA (%)		Entries in Job Card (%)	
District				
Bhojpur (N= 10/20)	50.0	80.0	100.0	100.0
Nalanda (N= 10/20)	—	—	—	—
Begusarai (N= 10/20)	—	40.0	—	100.0
Saharsa (N= 10/20)	—	69.2	—	88.9
Sitamarhi (N= 10/20)	100.0	75.0	100.0	100.0
Religion/Caste				
Upper Caste (H) (N= 16/14)	—	83.3	—	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=13/20)	—	55.6	—	100.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N= 6/33)	—	63.6	—	100.0
Scheduled Caste (H) N=(9/26)	50.0	60.0	100.0	100.0
Muslims (N= 6/7)	—	100.0	—	50.0
Gender				
Male (N= 26/50)	66.7	61.1	100.0	100.0
Female (N= 24/50)	—	70.0	—	92.9
All Respondents (N=50/100)	50.0	65.8	100.0	96.0

Note : 1. M = Mukhiya / WM = Ward Member

2. For worked under NREGA and entries in job card the values of N are for relevant respondents.

Table M 9 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents Not Applying for Job Card by Reasons for Not Applying (Mukhiyas & Ward Members)

Characteristic of Respondents	Reasons for Not Applying						Total
	No need	Not Interested in Type of Work	Disabled	Unlikely to Get card after applying	Don't know How to apply	Others	
District							
Bhojpur (N=14)	—	35.7	42.8	—	21.4	—	100.0
Nalanda (N=6)	16.7	50.0	—	—	33.3	—	100.0
Begusarai (N=9)	22.2	55.5	—	—	22.2	—	100.0
Saharsa (N=17)	29.4	17.6	5.9	11.8	23.5	11.8	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=11)	9.1	36.4	—	36.4	9.1	9.1	100.0
Religion/Caste							
Upper Caste (H) (N=8)	—	62.5	—	—	37.5	—	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=11)	27.3	27.3	18.2	9.1	18.2	—	100.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=15)	20.0	33.3	6.7	13.3	26.7	—	100.0
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=20)	10.0	35.0	15.0	10.0	15.0	15.0	100.0
Muslims (N=3)	33.3	—	33.3	33.3	—	—	100.0
Gender							
Male (N=26)	15.4	46.1	7.7	7.7	19.2	3.8	100.0
Female (N=31)	16.1	25.8	16.1	12.9	22.6	6.4	100.0

All Respondents (N=57)	15.8	3.5	12.3	10.5	21.0	5.3	100.0
-------------------------------	------	-----	------	------	------	-----	-------

Table M 10 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents who Have Applied for Job Card by Person to whom Applied (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)

Characteristic of Respondents	Person to whom Applied						Total
	GP Adhyaksha	GP Adhyaksha Spouse	Ward Member	GP Secretary	Govt. Officials	Other	
District							
Bhojpur (N=13)	38.5	—	7.7	53.8	—	—	100.0
Nalanda (N=6)	50.0	—	—	33.3	—	16.7	100.0
Begusarai (N=7)	—	—	—	14.3	—	85.7	100.0
Saharsa (N=12)	33.3	25.0	—	8.3	25.0	8.3	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=9)	22.2	—	—	11.1	44.4	22.2	100.0
Religion/Caste							
Upper Caste (H) (N=6)	50.0	—	—	33.3	—	16.7	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=10)	30.0	20.0	—	20.0	10.0	20.0	100.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=12)	16.7	8.3	8.3	8.3	25.0	33.3	100.0
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=16)	37.5	—	—	37.5	6.2	18.7	100.0
Muslims (N=3)	—	—	—	33.3	66.7	—	100.0
Gender							
Male (N=21)	23.8	9.5	—	28.6	9.5	28.6	100.0
Female (N=26)	34.6	3.8	3.8	23.1	19.2	15.4	100.0

All Respondents (N=47)	29.8	6.4	2.1	25.5	14.9	21.3	100.0
-------------------------------	------	-----	-----	------	------	------	-------

Table M 11 : Average Expenses Incurred by Respondents for Applying for Job Card (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)

Characteristic of Respondents	Average Expenses (Rs.)						
	Xeroxing	Photograph	Transport	Payments to officials / GP members	Payments to middle men	Other	Total
District							
Bhojpur (N=13)	—	0.80	0.50	—	—	—	1.30
Nalanda (N=6)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Begusarai (N=7)	2.30	2.80	0.70	—	—	1.70	7.50
Saharsa (N=12)	1.00	7.50	3.70	1.50	2.70	1.30	17.70
Sitamarhi (N=9)	0.30	18.00	6.70	—	—	6.70	25.10
Religion/Caste							
Upper Caste (H) (N=6)	—	0.70	—	—	—	—	0.70
Backward Caste (H) (N=10)	0.60	3.00	2.10	0.60	—	1.20	7.60
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=16)	1.80	4.90	0.50	—	0.80	—	7.90
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=3)	0.60	23.70	6.90	0.70	1.40	1.50	24.80
Muslims	—	2.70	1.10	—	—	—	3.80
Gender							
Male (N=21)	1.10	6.40	0.50	0.30	—	0.30	8.50
Female (N=26)	0.40	9.30	4.20	0.30	1.10	1.00	12.20

All Respondents (N=47)	0.70	7.80	2.30	0.30	0.50	0.60	10.30
-------------------------------	------	------	------	------	------	------	-------

Table M 12 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Housing Pattern.

Characteristic of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents Living in Self Owned House		Percentage of Respondents whose House was built under a govt. scheme	
	M	WM	M	WM
District				
Bhojpur (N=10/20)	90.0	90.0	10.0	5.0
Nalanda (N=10/20)	100.0	100.0	—	—
Begusarai (N=10/20)	100.0	100.0	—	20.0
Saharsa (N=10/20)	100.0	100.0	—	15.0
Sitamarhi (N=10/20)	100.0	100.0	—	—
Religion / Caste				
Upper Caste (H) (N=16/14)	100.0	100.0	—	—
Backward Caste (H) (N=13/20)	100.0	95.0	—	—
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=6/33)	100.0	100.0	—	9.1
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=9/26)	88.9	96.2	11.1	19.2

Muslims (N=6/7)	100.0	100.0	—	—
Gender				
Male (N=26/50)	96.2	98.0	3.8	6.0
Female (N=24/50)	100.0	98.0	—	10.0
All Respondents (N=50/100)				
	98.0	98.0	2.0	8.0

- Note :**
1. M = Mukhiya / WM = Ward Member
 2. The first value of the N refers to Mukhiya and the second value for the Ward Members.

Table M 13 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Toilet Facilities in Their Dwellings.

Characteristic of Respondents	Mukhiya			Ward Member			All
	Open Area	Public Toilet	Private Toilet	Open Area	Public Toilet	Private Toilet	
District							
Bhojpur (N=10/20)	40.0	—	60.0	90.0	5.0	5.0	100.0
Nalanda (N=10/20)	—	—	100.0	85.0	—	15.0	100.0
Begusarai (N=10/20)	10.0	—	90.0	75.0	—	25.0	100.0
Saharsa (N=10/20)	30.0	—	70.0	85.0	5.0	10.0	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=10/20)	30.0	—	70.0	80.0	—	20.0	100.0
Religion / Caste							
Upper Caste (H) (N=16/14)	18.7	—	81.3	50.0	7.1	42.9	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=13/20)	—	—	100.0	80.0	—	20.0	100.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=6/33)	50.0	—	50.0	93.9	—	6.1	100.0
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=9/26)	44.4	—	55.6	92.3	3.8	3.8	100.0

Muslims (N=6/7)	16.7	—	83.3	71.4	—	28.6	100.0
Gender							
Male (N=26/50)	26.9	—	73.1	84.0	2.0	14.0	100.0
Female (N=24/50)	16.7	—	83.3	82.0	2.0	16.0	100.0
All Respondents (N=50/100)							
	22.0	—	78.0	83.0	2.0	15.0	100.0

Table M 14 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents using Private Toilets by Type of Toilet and Related Information.

Characteristic of Respondents	Type of Toilet					Percent of Private Toilets Built	
	Flush	Bowl / Bucket	Pit / Double Pit	Other's	All	Under Govt. Scheme	After Last GP Election
District							
Bhojpur (N=7)	—	—	100.0	—	100.0	14.3	28.6
Nalanda (N=13)	46.2	53.8	—	—	100.0	—	—
Begusarai (N=14)	7.1	—	85.7	7.1	100.0	—	—
Saharsa (N=9)	—	11.1	44.4	44.4	100.0	11.1	11.1
Sitamarhi (N=11)	18.2	9.1	72.7	—	100.0	—	9.1
Religion / Caste							
Upper Caste (H) (N=19)	15.8	10.5	63.1	10.5	100.0	5.3	5.3
Backward Caste (H) (N=17)	17.6	23.5	47.0	11.8	100.0	—	—

Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=5)	—	—	80.0	20.0	100.0	—	—
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=6)	33.3	33.3	33.3	—	100.0	16.7	16.7
Muslims (N=7)	14.3	14.3	71.4	—	100.0	—	28.6
Gender							
Male (N=26)	30.8	15.4	53.8	—	100.0	3.8	11.5
Female (N=28)	3.6	17.8	60.7	17.8	100.0	3.6	3.6
All Respondents (N=54)							
	16.7	16.7	57.4	9.2	100.0	3.7	7.4

Table M 15 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents Using Private Toilets by Year of Installation.

Characteristic of Respondents	Year of Installation				
	Within 1 Year	1 – 3 Years	3 – 5 Years	5+ Years	All
District					
Bhojpur (N=7)	14.3	14.3	14.3	57.1	100.0
Nalanda (N=13)	—	—	7.7	92.3	100.0
Begusarai (N=14)	—	7.1	14.3	78.6	100.0
Saharsa (N=9)	11.1	—	22.2	66.7	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=11)	9.1	—	18.2	72.7	100.0
Religion / Caste					
Upper Caste (H) (N=19)	5.3	5.3	5.3	84.2	100.0

Backward Caste (H) (N=17)	—	—	29.4	70.6	100.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=5)	—	—	—	100.0	100.0
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=6)	16.7	—	33.3	50.0	100.0
Muslims (N=7)	14.3	14.3	—	71.4	100.0
Gender					
Male (N=26)	7.7	3.8	7.7	80.8	100.0
Female (N=28)	3.6	3.6	21.4	71.4	100.0
All Respondents (N=54)					
	5.5	3.7	14.8	75.9	100.0

Table M 16 : Information on Landholding of Mukhiyas.

Characteristic of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents Owning Land	Average Amount of Land (acres)				Area Irrigated (acres)
		Owned	Leased In	Leased Out	Operational Land	
District						
Bhojpur (N=10)	90.0	8.9	0.7	0.5	9.1	9.0 (98.9)
Nalanda (N=10)	90.0	16.3	—	0.6	15.7	13.6 (86.6)
Begusarai (N=10)	70.0	3.7	—	—	3.7	2.7 (73.0)
Saharsa (N=10)	100.0	8.4	0.8	0.9	8.3	8.3 (100.0)
Sitamarhi (N=10)	80.0	6.1	0.4	0.5	6.0	6.0 (100.0)
Religion / Caste						
Upper Caste (H) (N=16)	100.0	14.9	—	0.9	14.0	12.6 (90.0)

Backward Caste (H) (N=13)	100.0	9.5	0.5	0.6	9.4	8.7 (92.6)
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=6)	66.7	1.3	1.5	—	2.8	2.2 (78.6)
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=9)	55.6	1.5	0.2	—	1.7	1.5 (88.2)
Muslims (N=6)	83.3	8.6	—	0.3	8.3	8.3 (100.0)
Gender						
Male (N=26)	84.6	10.3	0.4	0.7	10.0	9.6 (96.0)
Female (N=24)	87.5	6.9	0.3	0.3	6.9	6.9 (100.0)
All Respondents (N=50)	86.0	8.7	0.4	0.5	8.6	7.9 (91.9)

Note : The bracket figure in last column indicates area irrigated as percentage of operational land.

Table M 17 : Information on Landholding of Ward Members

Characteristic of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents Owning Land	Average Amount of Land (acres)				Area Irrigated (acres)
		Owned	Leased In	Leased Out	Operational Land	
District						
Bhojpur (N=20)	60.0	0.4	1.0	—	1.4	1.3 (92.9)
Nalanda (N=20)	60.0	1.0	—	—	1.0	1.0 (100.0)
Begusarai (N=20)	30.0	0.5	—	—	0.5	0.5 (100.0)
Saharsa (N=20)	35.0	1.5	0.3	—	1.8	1.6 (88.9)
Sitamarhi (N=20)	50.0	1.2	0.1	—	1.3	1.3 (100.0)
Religion / Caste						

Upper Caste (H) (N=24)	78.6	1.4	0.3	—	1.7	1.7 (100.0)
Backward Caste (H) (N=20)	85.0	1.6	0.8	—	2.4	2.1 (87.5)
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=33)	45.5	0.6	0.1	—	0.7	0.7 (100.0)
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=26)	30.8	0.3	0.1	—	0.4	0.3 (75.0)
Muslims (N=7)	28.6	1.9	0.2	—	2.1	1.9 (90.5)
Gender						
Male (N=50)	52.0	1.1	0.3	—	1.4	1.3 (92.9)
Female (N=50)	54.0	0.8	0.2	—	1.0	1.0 (100.0)
All Respondents (N=100)	53.0	0.9	0.3	—	1.1	1.0 (96.2)

Note : The bracket figure in last column indicates area irrigated as percentage of operational land.

Table M 18 : Percentage Distribution of Landowning Respondents by Their Main Source of Irrigation.

Characteristic of Respondents	Mukhiya				Ward Member			
	Main Source of Irrigation				Main Source of Irrigation			
	Tube well	Canal	Others	Total	Tube well	Canal	Others	Total
District								
Bhojpur (N=10/20)	44.4	55.5	—	100.0	50.0	50.0	—	100.0
Nalanda (N=10/20)	100.0	—	—	100.0	100.0	—	—	100.0
Begusarai (N=10/20)	100.0	—	—	100.0	83.3	—	16.7	100.0
Saharsa (N=10/20)	100.0	—	—	100.0	100.0	—		100.0
Sitamarhi (N=10/20)	100.0	—	—	100.0	80.0	—	20.0	100.0

Religion / Caste								
Upper Caste (H) (N=16/24)	93.7	6.2	—	100.0	90.9	9.1	—	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=13/20)	92.3	7.7	—	100.0	76.5	17.6	5.9	100.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=6/33)	75.0	25.0	—	100.0	80.0	13.3	6.7	100.0
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=9/26)	60.0	40.0	—	100.0	87.5	—	12.5	100.0
Muslims (N=6/7)	100.0	—	—	100.0	100.0	—	—	100.0
Gender								
Male (N=26/50)	90.9	9.1	—	100.0	80.8	11.5	7.7	100.0
Female (N=24/50)	85.7	14.3	—	100.0	85.2	11.1	3.7	100.0
All Respondents (N=50/100)	88.4	11.6	—	100.0	83.0	11.3	5.7	100.0

Table M 19 : Percentage Distribution of Landowning Respondents by Fertility of Their Holdings (Mukhiyas and Ward Members).

Characteristic of Respondents	Mukhiyas Reporting Their land to be			Ward Member Reporting Their Land to be			All
	More Fertile than Average	Average	Less Fertile than Average	More Fertile than Average	Average	Less Fertile than Average	
District							
Bhojpur (N=10/24)	44.4	33.3	22.2	50.0	41.7	8.3	100.0
Nalanda (N=10/24)	44.4	55.5	—	58.3	33.3	8.3	100.0
Begusarai (N=10/24)	28.6	57.1	14.3	16.7	83.3	—	100.0

Saharsa (N=10/24)	10.0	90.0	—	7.7	69.2	23.1	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=10/24)	37.5	62.5	—	30.0	60.0	10.0	100.0
Religion / Caste							
Upper Caste (H) (N=16/24)	18.7	75.0	6.2	36.4	54.5	9.1	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=13/20)	53.8	38.5	7.7	29.4	52.9	17.6	100.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=6/33)	25.0	50.0	25.0	33.3	60.0	6.7	100.0
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=9/26)	40.0	60.0	—	50.0	37.5	12.5	100.0
Muslims (N=6/7)	20.0	80.0	—	—	22.2	—	77.7
Gender							
Male (N=26/50)	45.4	50.0	4.5	34.6	53.8	11.5	100.0
Female (N=24/56)	19.0	71.4	9.5	33.3	55.5	11.1	100.0
All Respondents (N=50/100)							
	32.5	60.5	7.0	34.0	54.7	11.3	100.0

Table M20 : Percentage of Respondents Owning Different Farm Implements (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)

Farm Implements	Bhojpur (N=10/20)	Nalanda (N=10/20)	Begusarai (N=10/20)	Saharsa (N=10/20)	Sitamarhi (N=10/20)	All Districts (N=50/100)
Mukhiya						
Ploughing Implements	—	30.0	—	20.0	10.0	12.0
Cart	—	10.0	—	—	10.0	4.0
Tractor	40.0	70.0	10.0	30.0	30.0	36.0
Thresher	40.0	80.0	10.0	—	30.0	32.0
Fodder Cutting Machine	80.0	60.0	—	10.0	30.0	36.0
Generator	10.0	20.0	30.0	10.0	20.0	18.0

Other Machineries	40.0	30.0	10.0	30.0	10.0	24.0
Pump for Irrigation	70.0	90.0	30.0	30.0	40.0	52.0
Ward Member						
Ploughing Implements	10.0	10.0	—	5.0	10.0	7.0
Cart	—	—	—	5.0	—	1.0
Tractor	5.0	5.0	—	5.0	10.0	5.0
Thresher	—	5.0	—	15.0	10.0	6.0
Fodder Cutting Machine	30.0	5.0	10.0	—	—	9.0
Generator	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other Machineries	10.0	—	—	—	—	2.0
Pump for Irrigation	20.0	15.0	10.0	15.0	5.0	13.0

Table M 21 : Percentage of Respondents Owning Different Livestock

Livestock		Bhojpur (N=10/20)	Nalanda (N=10/20)	Begusarai (N=10/20)	Saharsa (N=10/20)	Sitamarhi (N=10/20)	All Districts (N=50/100)
Mukhiya							
Cows / Buffaloes	P	70.0	50.0	30.0	40.0	50.0	48.0
	N	3.0	1.4	1.7	2.2	1.4	2.0
Goats / Sheep	P	10.0	—	—	20.0	—	6.0
	N	3.0	—	—	22.5	—	16.0

<u>Poultry</u>	P	10.0	—	—	—	10.0	4.0
	N	7.0	—	—	—	11.0	9.0
Ward Member							
Cows / Buffaloes	P	65.0	40.0	25.0	45.0	40.0	43.0
	N	1.1	1.6	2.4	2.1	1.1	1.6
Goats / Sheep	P	10.0	40.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	19.0
	N	1.0	3.2	11.0	1.7	1.3	3.7
<u>Poultry</u>	P	10.0	—	5.0	—	—	3.0
	N	47.0	—	5.0	—	—	17.3

Note : P = Percentage of Respondents Owning, N = Average Number of Livestock

Table M 22 : Percentage of Respondents Owning Different Household Assets (Part I)

Household Assets		Bhojpur (N=10/20)	Nalanda (N=10/20)	Begusarai (N=10/20)	Saharsa (N=10/20)	Sitamarhi (N=10/20)	All Districts (N=50/100)
Charpoy / Bed	M	90.0	90.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.0
	WM	95.0	85.0	95.0	95.0	100.0	94.0
Shoes	M	90.0	90.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.0
	WM	75.0	65.0	55.0	95.0	95.0	77.0

<u>Pressure Cooker</u>	M	80.0	80.0	80.0	100.0	70.0	82.0
	WM	10.0	20.0	15.0	5.0	25.0	30.0
Fans	M	60.0	100.0	90.0	70.0	60.0	76.0
	WM	10.0	30.0	35.0	15.0	15.0	21.0
Bicycle	M	70.0	60.0	70.0	60.0	80.0	68.0
	WM	60.0	65.0	55.0	50.0	70.0	60.0
Pressure Lamps / Petroma	M	30.0	70.0	70.0	40.0	70.0	56.0
	WM	5.0	10.0	20.0	50.0	—	8.0
Watches / Clocks	M	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	70.0	94.0
	WM	35.0	55.0	75.0	70.0	40.0	55.0
<u>Sewing Machine</u>	M	60.0	40.0)	70.0	30.0	60.0	52.0
	WM	5.0	5.0	20.0	5.0	—	7.0

Note : M = Mukhiya / WM = Ward Member

Table M 23 : Percentage of Respondents Owning Different Household Assets (Part II)

Household Assets		Bhojpur (N=10/20)	Nalanda (N=10/20)	Begusarai (N=10/20)	Saharsa (N=10/20)	Sitamarhi (N=10/20)	All Districts (N=50/100)
Radio / Cassette Player	M	50.0	90.0	80.0	40.0	70.0	66.0
	WM	15.0	50.0	20.0	20.0	30.0	27.0
Black/White Television	M	40.0	30.0	40.0	20.0	10.0	28.0

	WM	10.0	25.0	—	5.0	—	8.0
<u>Colour Television</u>	M	50.0	90.0	50.0	70.0	50.0	62.0
	WM	—	20.0	10.0	5.0	—	7.0
Motorcycle / Scooter / Moped	M	70.0	100.0	80.0	70.0	80.0	80.0
	WM	5.0	20.0	5.0	15.0	15.0	12.0
Motor Car	M	20.0	30.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	16.0
	WM	—	5.0	—	—	—	1.0
Refrigerator	M	—	20.0	10.0	—	20.0	10.0
	WM	5.0	—	—	—	—	1.0
Washing Machine	M	—	20.0	10.0	—	30.0	12.0
	WM	5.0	—	—	—	—	1.0
<u>Telephone</u>	M	100.0	90.0	90.0	100.0	100.0	96.0
	WM	70.0\	55.0	60.0	60.0	60.0	61.0
<u>Desert Cooler</u>	M	—	30.0	10.0	20.0	20.0	16.0
	WM	—	—	5.0	—	—	1.0

Table M 24 : Information about Availability of Food throughout the Year and Possession of BPL/APL Ration Cards for the Respondents (Mukhiyas).

Characteristic of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents with Food Availability throughout year	Percentage of Respondents				
		Eligible for BPL and Get Card	Eligible for APL and Get Card	Did Not Get Card for Eligible Category	Don't Know Eligibility Criterion	All

District						
Bhojpur (N=10)	90.0	30.0	70.0	—	—	100.0
Nalanda (N=10)	100.0	—	90.0	10.0	—	100.0
Begusarai (N=10)	70.0	10.0	80.0	—	10.0	100.0
Saharsa (N=10)	100.0	10.0	90.0	—	—	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=10)	100.0	10.0	90.0	—	—	100.0
Religion / Caste						
Upper Caste (H) (N=16)	93.7	6.3	93.7	—	—	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=13)	84.6	—	92.3	7.7	—	100.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=6)	100.0	16.7	66.7	—	16.7	100.0
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=9)	88.9	33.3	66.7	—	—	100.0
Muslims (N=6)	100.0	16.7	83.3	—	—	100.0
Gender						
Male (N=26)	92.3	11.5	84.6	3.8	—	100.0
Female (N=24)	91.7	12.5	83.3	—	4.2	100.0
All Respondents (N=50)						
	92.0	12.0	84.0	2.0	2.0	100.0

Table M 25 : Information about Availability of Food throughout the Year and Possession of BPL/APL Ration Cards for the Respondents (Ward Members)

Characteristic of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents with Food Availability throughout year	Percentage of Respondents				
		Eligible for BPL and Get Card	Eligible for APL and Get Card	Did Not Get Card for Eligible Category	Don't Know Eligibility Criterion	All

District						
Bhojpur (N=20)	45.0	75.0	20.0	5.0	—	100.0
Nalanda (N=20)	35.0	55.0	35.0	10.0		100.0
Begusarai (N=20)	40.0	50.0	35.0	15.0	—	100.0
Saharsa (N=20)	65.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	—	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=20)	45.0	60.0	25.0	10.0	5.0	100.0
Religion / Caste						
Upper Caste (H) (N=24)	78.6	50.0	42.9	7.1	—	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=20)	70.0	45.0	45.0	10.0	—	100.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=33)	39.4	60.0	30.3	9.0	—	100.0
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=26)	19.2	76.9	11.5	7.7	3.8	100.0
Muslims (N=7)	42.8	57.1	14.3	28.6	—	100.0
Gender						
Male (N=50)	40.0	64.0	28.0	6.0	2.0	100.0
Female (N=50)	52.0	56.0	30.0	14.0	—	100.0
All Respondents (N=100)	46.0	60.0	29.0	10.0	1.0	100.0

Table M 26 : Selected Information on Political Behaviour of Respondents

Characteristic of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents			
	Reporting correctly date of last election	Contested for the post more than once	Served the post more than once	Elected unopposed to the post

	M	WM	M	WM	M	WM	M	WM
District								
Bhojpur (N=10/20)	100.0	100.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	45.0
Nalanda (N=10/20)	90.0	55.0	40.0	5.0	40.0	0.0	10.0	5.0
Begusarai (N=10/20)	100.0	80.0	30.0	5.0	20.0	5.0	0.0	15.0
Saharsa (N=10/20)	100.0	95.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	30.0
Sitamarhi (N=10/20)	100.0	80.0	20.0	15.0	20.0	10.0	0.0	15.0
Religion / Caste								
Upper Caste (H) (N=16/14)	93.7	78.6	18.7	7.1	6.2	7.1	25.0	14.2
Backward Cast (H) (N=13/20)	100.0	95.0	46.2	—	38.5	—	—	20.0
Extr. Backward Cast (H) (N=6/33)	100.0	75.8	16.7	3.0	—	3.0	—	24.2
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=9/26)	100.0	84.6	11.1	3.8	—	—	—	19.2
Muslims (N=6/7)	100.0	71.4	50.0	28.6	33.3	44.3	—	42.9
Gender								
Male (N=26/50)	96.2	90.0	50.0	10.0	26.9	4.0	7.7	22.0
Female (N=24/50)	100.0	74.0	4.2	—	4.2	2.0	8.4	22.0
All Respondents (N=50/100)								
	98.0	82.0	28.0	5.0	16.0	3.0	8.0	22.0

Note : 1. M = Mukhiya / WM = Ward Member
2. The first figure for N refers to Mukhiyas and the second for Ward Member.

Table M 27 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by the Category for which the Position is Reserved (Mukhiyas)

Characteristic of Respondents	Category for which the position is reserved						
	SC Female	SC General	EBC Female	EBC General	Female	Un reserved	Total

District							
Bhojpur (N=10)	10.0	10.0	—	10.0	40.0	30.0	100.0
Nalanda (N=10)	10.0	20.0	—	—	20.0	50.0	100.0
Begusarai (N=10)	10.0	—	—	10.0	40.0	40.0	100.0
Saharsa (N=10)	—	—	10.0	10.0	50.0	30.0	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=10)	10.0	10.0	20.0	20.0	10.0	30.0	100.0
Religion / Caste							
Upper Caste (H) (N=16)	—	—	—	—	50.0	50.0	100.0
Backward Cast (H) (N=13)	—	—	—	—	46.2	53.8	100.0
Extr. Backward Cast (H) (N=16)	—	—	16.7	66.7	16.7	—	100.0
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=9)	44.4	44.4	—	—	—	11.1	100.0
Muslims (N=6)	—	—	33.3	16.7	16.7	33.3	100.0
Gender							
Male (N=26)	—	15.4	—	19.2	—	65.4	100.0
Female (N=24)	16.7	—	12.5	—	66.7	4.2	100.0
All Respondents (N=150)	8.0	8.0	6.0	10.0	32.0	36.0	100.0

Table M 28 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by the Category for which the Position is Reserved (Ward Members)

Characteristic of Respondents	Category for which the position is reserved
--------------------------------------	--

	SC Female	SC General	EBC Female	EBC General	Female	Un reserved	Total
District							
Bhojpur (N=20)	—	—	20.0	5.0	30.0	45.0	100.0
Nalanda (N=20)	5.0	40.0	25.0	5.0	10.0	15.0	100.0
Begusarai (N=20)	5.0	5.0	15.0	10.0	20.0	45.0	100.0
Saharsa (N=20)	10.0	5.0	15.0	5.0	35.0	30.0	100.0
Sitamarhi	20.0	10.0	25.0	5.0	10.0	30.0	100.0
Religion / Caste							
Upper Caste (H) (N=14)	—	—	—	—	64.3	35.7	100.0
Backward Cast (H) (N=20)	—	—	—	—	45.0	55.0	100.0
Extr. Backward Cast (H) (N=33)	—	—	54.5	15.2	3.0	27.3	100.0
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=26)	30.8	46.2	—	—	7.7	15.4	100.0
Muslims (N=7)	—	—	28.6	14.3	—	57.1	100.0
Gender							
Male (N=50)	—	22.0	—	12.0	—	66.0	100.0
Female (N=50)	16.0	2.0	40.0	—	42.0	—	100.0
All Respondents (N=100)							
	8.0	12.0	20.0	6.0	21.0	33.0	100.0

Table M 29 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Plans Regarding Recontesting for Present GP Position in Next Election by Districts

Plans for Recontesting	Bhojpur (N=10/20)	Nalanda (N=10/20)	Begusarai (N=10/20)	Saharsa (N=10/20)	Sitamarhi (N=10/20)	All Districts (N=50/100)
Mukhiyas						
<u>Yes</u>	70.0	30.0	60.0	70.0	80.0	62.0
No/Not Interested	10.0	20.0	—	20.0	10.0	12.0
No/Position Reserved for other group	—	—	10.0	—	—	2.0
No/Will Contest other Political Post	—	—	10.0	—	—	2.0
No/Too Much Work	—	—	—	—	—	—
No/Other GP Members Not Interested	—	—	—	—	—	—
No/ Villagers Not Interested	—	—	—	—	—	—
No/Some Family Member will contest	—	—	—	10.0	—	2.0
Don't Know/Can't Say	20.0	50.0	20.0	—	10.0	20.0
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Ward Members						
<u>Yes</u>	60.0	25.0	60.0	60.0	55.0	52.0
No/Not Interested	—	20.0	—	15.0	25.0	12.0
No/Position Reserved for other group	—	—	15.0	—	—	3.0
No/Will Contest other Political Post	5.0	—	—	5.0	—	2.0
No/Too Much Work	—	—	—	—	—	—
No/Other GP Members Not Interested	—	—	—	—	—	—
No/Villagers Not Interested	5.0	—	—	—	—	1.0
No/Some Family Member will contest	—	—	—	—	—	—
Don't Know/Can't Say	30.0	55.0	25.0	20.0	20.0	30.0
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note : The first figure for N refers to Mukhiyas, the second for Ward Members.

Table M 30 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Plans Regarding Recontesting for Present GP Position in Next Election by Religion/Caste Groups

Plans for Recontesting	UC (H) (N=16/14)	BC (H) (N=13/20)	EBC (H) (N=6/33)	SC (H) (N=9/26)	Muslim (N=6/7)	All Religion/ Caste (N=50/100)
Mukhiyas						
<u>Yes</u>	56.3	53.8	83.3	44.4	100.0	62.0
No/Not Interested	25.0	—	—	22.2	—	12.0
No/Position Reserved for other group	6.2	—	—	—	—	2.0
No/Will Contest other Political Post	—	—	16.7	—	—	2.0
No/Too Much Work	—	—	—	—	—	—
No/Other GP Members Not Interested	—	—	—	—	—	—
No/ Villagers Not Interested	—	—	—	—	—	—
No/Some Family Member will contest	6.2	—	—	—	—	2.0
Don't Know/Can't Say	6.2	46.1	—	33.3	—	20.0
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Ward Members						
<u>Yes</u>	64.3	60.0	39.4	57.7	42.8	52.0
No/Not Interested	14.3	10.0	15.1	7.7	14.3	12.0
No/Position Reserved for other group	—	5.0	6.1	—	—	3.0
No/Will Contest other Political Post	7.1	5.0	—	—	—	2.0
No/Too Much Work	—	—	—	—	—	—
No/Other GP Members Not Interested	—	—	—	—	—	—
No/Villagers Not Interested	—	—	—	—	14.3	1.0
No/Some Family Member will contest	—	—	—	—	—	—
Don't Know/Can't Say	14.3	20.0	39.4	34.6	28.6	30.0
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note : The first value of the N refers to Mukhiya and the second value for the Ward Members.

Table M 31 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Plans Regarding Recontesting for Present GP Position in Next Election by Gender

Plans for Recontesting	Male		Female	
	M (N=26)	WM (N=50)	M (N=24)	WM (N=50)
Yes	50.0	54.0	75.0	50.0
No/Not Interested	19.2	10.0	4.2	14.0
No/Position Reserved for other group	—	4.0	4.2	2.0
No/Will Contest other Political Post	3.8	4.0	—	—
No/Too Much Work	—	—	—	—
No/Other GP Members Not Interested	—	—	—	—
No/Villagers Not Interested	—	—	—	2.0
No/Some Family Member will contest	3.8	—	—	—
Don't Know/Can't Say	23.1	28.0	16.7	32.0
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note : M = Mukhiya / WM = Ward Member

Table M 32 : Most Important Source of Persuasion for the Respondents to Contest Election

Sources	Percent of Respondents Persuaded by					
	Bhojpur (N=10/20)	Nalanda (N=10/20)	Begusarai (N=10/20)	Saharsa (N=10/20)	Sitamarhi (N=10/20)	All Districts (N=50/100)
Mukhiya						
<u>Self initiated</u>	70.0	50.0	40.0	30.0	80.0	54.0
MP/MLA/Party officials	—	—	20.0	—	—	4.0
Spouse	—	—	—	—	—	—
Relatives	10.0	10.0	10.0	—	—	6.0
Neighbours	—	20.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
Groups of Persons	—	20.0	10.0	30.0	—	12.0
Previous Mukhiya	10.0	—	10.0	—	—	4.0
Employer	—	—	—	10.0	—	2.0
Important Community Leader	—	—	—	—	10.0	2.0
Other Ward Members	—	—	—	—	—	—
<u>Caste leader</u>	10.0	—	—	20.0	—	6.0
DK/CS	—	—	—	—	—	—
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Ward Member						
<u>Self initiated</u>	90.0	45.0	55.0	55.0	60.0	61.0
MP/MLA/Party officials	—	—	—	—	—	—
Spouse	—	—	5.0	—	—	1.0
Relatives	—	25.0	10.0	—	20.0	11.0
Neighbours	—	5.0	5.0	10.0	15.0	7.0
Groups of Persons	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Previous Mukhiya	—	10.0	10.0	—	—	4.0
Employer	—	—	—	—	—	—
Important Community Leader	5.0	—	—	5.0	—	2.0
Other Ward Members	—	—	—	5.0	—	1.0
<u>Caste leader</u>	—	10.0	—	20.0	—	6.0
DK/CS	—	—	10.0	—	—	2.0
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note : The first value of the N refers to Mukhiya and the second value for the Ward Members.

Table M33 : Most Important Source of Persuasion for the Respondents to Contest Election by Religion/ Caste Groups

Sources	Percent of Respondents Persuaded by					
	UC (H) (N=16/14)	BC (H) (N=13/20)	EBC (H) (N=6/33)	SC (H) (N=9/26)	Muslim (N=6/7)	All Religion/ Caste (N=50/100)
Mukhiya						
<u>Self initiated</u>	56.2	53.8	50.0	44.4	66.7	54.0
MP/MLA/Party officials	—	7.7	16.7	—	—	4.0
Spouse	—	—	—	—	—	—
Relatives	—	—	16.7	22.2	—	6.0
Neighbours	6.2	15.3	—	11.1	16.7	10.0
Groups of Persons	25.0	7.7	—	11.1	—	12.0
Previous Mukhiya	12.5	—	—	—	—	4.0
Employer	—	7.7	—	—	—	2.0
Important Community Leader	—	—	16.7	—	—	2.0
Other Ward Members	—	—	—	—	—	—
<u>Caste leader</u>	—	7.7	—	11.1	16.7	6.0
DK/CS	—	—	—	—	—	—
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Ward Member						
<u>Self initiated</u>	78.6	65.0	57.6	50.0	71.4	61.0
MP/MLA/Party officials	—	—	—	—	—	—
Spouse	—	—	—	3.8	—	1.0
Relatives	—	5.0	18.2	15.4	—	11.0
Neighbours	7.1	5.0	3.0	11.5	14.3	7.0
Groups of Persons	7.1	5.0	6.1	3.8	—	5.0
Previous Mukhiya	—	5.0	—	11.5	—	4.0
Employer	—	—	—	—	—	—
Important Community Leader	—	5.0	3.0	—	—	2.0
Other Ward Members	—	—	3.0	—	—	1.0
<u>Caste leader</u>	7.1	10.0	3.0	3.8	14.3	6.0
DK/CS	—	—	6.1	—	—	2.0
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note : The first value of the N refers to Mukhiya and the second value for the Ward Members.

Table M 34 : Most Important Source of Persuasion for the Respondents to Contest Election by Gender

Sources	Percent of Respondents Persuaded by			
	Male		Female	
	M (N=26)	WM (N=50)	M (N=24)	WM (N=50)
<u>Self initiated</u>	57.7	58.0	50.0	64.0
MP/MLA/Party officials	7.7	—	—	—
Spouse	—	—	—	2.0
Relatives	3.8	12.0	8.3	10.0
Neighbours	7.7	8.0	12.5	6.0
Groups of Persons	15.4	6.0	8.3	4.0
Previous Mukhiya	—	6.0	8.3	2.0
Employer	—	—	4.2	—
Important Community Leader	3.8	2.0	—	2.0
Other Ward Members	—	2.0	—	
<u>Caste leader</u>	3.8	6.0	8.3	6.0
DK/CS	—	—	—	4.0
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note : M = Mukhiya / WM = Ward Member

Table M 35 : Information on Political Affiliation of Respondent (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)

Characteristic of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents Affiliated to Political Party		Percentage Distribution of Affiliated Respondents by Party						
	M	WM	JDU	BJP	RJD	CON	LEFT	OTH	TOTAL
District									
Bhojpur (N=10/20)	40.0	45.0	—	—	15.4	—	69.2	15.4	100.0
Nalanda (N=10/20)	50.0	50.0	66.7	—	—	16.7	16.7	—	100.0
Begusarai (N=10/20)	60.0	25.0	27.3	—	—	9.1	54.5	9.1	100.0
Saharsa (N=10/20)	60.0	25.0	45.4	—	18.2	36.4	—	—	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=10/20)	50.0	10.0	28.6	28.6	42.8	—	—	—	100.0
Religion / Caste									
Upper Caste (H) (N=16/14)	37.5	14.3	37.5	—	—	50.0	12.5	—	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=13/20)	61.5	35.0	33.3	—	33.3	—	33.3	—	100.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=6/33)	83.3	18.2	18.2	18.2	9.1	9.1	36.4	9.1	100.0
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=9/26)	33.3	19.2	25.0	—	—	—	62.5	12.5	100.0
Muslims (N=6/7)	66.7	28.6	33.3	—	16.7	16.7	16.7	16.7	100.0
Gender									
Male (N=26/50)	65.4	28.0	25.8	6.4	9.7	9.7	38.7	9.7	100.0
Female (N=24/50)	37.5	16.0	35.3	—	23.5	17.6	23.5	—	100.0
All Respondents (N=50/100)									
	52.0	22.0	29.2	4.2	14.6	12.5	33.3	6.2	100.0

Note : The first value of the N refers to Mukhiya and the second value for the Ward Members.

Table M 36 : Percentage of Respondents Undertaking Different Types of Political Activities (Mukhiya & Ward Member).

Characteristic of Respondents	Percentage of Responding Undertaking Activities					
	A	B	C	D	E	F
District						
Bhojpur (N=30)	43.3	40.0	43.3	40.0	43.3	36.7
Nalanda (N=30)	16.7	13.3	6.7	3.3	13.3	16.7
Begusarai (N=30)	30.0	16.7	30.0	13.3	30.0	13.3
Saharsa (N=30)	20.0	13.3	30.0	13.3	23.3	10.0
Sitamarhi (N=30)	16.7	16.7	16.7	0.0	6.7	6.7
Religion / Caste						
Upper Caste (H) (N=30)	23.3	16.7	23.3	10.0	20.0	10.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=33)	36.4	27.3	36.4	24.2	33.3	27.3
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=39)	20.5	25.6	28.2	12.8	23.1	12.8
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=35)	20.0	22.8	17.1	11.4	20.0	17.1
Muslims (N=13)	30.8	30.8	15.4	7.7	15.4	15.4
Gender						
Male (N=76)	32.9	31.6	31.6	21.0	28.9	22.4
Female (N=74)	17.6	16.2	18.9	6.7	17.6	10.8
All Respondents (N=150)						
	25.3	24.0	25.3	14.0	23.3	16.7

Note : A = Going to Rallies / Giving Speeches / B = Distributing Leaflets, Campaign in Elections, etc / C = Giving to Party Meetings / D = Writing Pamphlets / E = Giving Money / F = Giving Support in kind.

Table M 37 : Membership of Respondents in Other Local Bodies and Whether Holding Positions in Political Party

Characteristic of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents who are members of at least one Local Body		Percentage of Respondents and relatives who are holding position in a political party	
	M	WM	M	WM
District				
Bhojpur (N=10/20)	—	—	10.0	5.0
Nalanda (N=10/20)	20.0	5.0	—	—
Begusarai (N=10/20)	—	15.0	20.0	5.0
Saharsa (N=10/20)	10.0	—	40.0	5.0
Sitamarhi (N=10/20)	—	20.0	—	5.0
Religion / Caste				
Upper Caste (H) (N=16/14)	12.5	14.3	18.7	—
Backward Caste (H) (N=13/20)	7.7	5.0	30.8	5.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=6/33)	—	3.0	—	3.0
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=9/26)	—	7.7	—	3.8
Muslims (N=6/7)	—	28.6	—	14.3
Gender				
Male (N=28/50)	11.5	10.0	7.7	4.0
Female (N=24/50)	—	3 (6.0)	5 (20.8)	4.0

All Respondents (N=50/100)	6.0	8.0	14.0	4.0
-----------------------------------	-----	-----	------	-----

Note : M= Mukhiya / WM= Ward Member

Table M 38 : Percentage of Respondents who Correctly Named Important Political Functionaries (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)

Characteristic of Respondents	Important Political Functionaries				
	MLA	MP	Chief Minister	Prime Minister	President
District					
Bhojpur (N=30)	100.0 (100.0)	86.7 (70.0)	93.3 (43.3)	76.7 (83.3)	56.7 (70.0)
Nalanda (N=30)	63.3 (63.3)	50.0 (50.0)	86.7 (26.7)	53.3 (46.7)	43.3 (43.3)
Begusarai (N=30)	86.7 (86.7)	73.3 (63.3)	83.3 (16.7)	73.3 (70.0)	60.0 (60.0)
Saharsa (N=30)	100.0 (93.3)	86.7 (90.0)	96.7 (20.0)	76.7 (73.3)	63.3 (66.7)
Sitamarhi (N=30)	80.0 (76.7)	70.0 (70.0)	80.0 (23.3)	66.7 (66.7)	56.7 (60.0)
Religion / Caste					
Upper Caste (H) (N=30)	96.7 (90.0)	80.0 (80.0)	93.3 (33.3)	76.7 (80.0)	80.0 (86.7)
Backward Caste (H) (N=33)	93.9 (93.9)	84.8 (78.8)	93.9 (18.2)	75.7 (69.7)	63.6 (66.7)
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=39)	76.9 (74.3)	61.5 (59.0)	87.2 (41.0)	64.1 (69.2)	41.0 (48.7)
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=35)	77.1 (77.1)	62.8 (54.3)	77.1 (14.3)	57.1 (48.6)	34.3 (34.3)
Muslims (N=13)	92.3 (92.3)	92.3 (84.6)	92.3 (15.4)	84.6 (84.6)	84.6 (84.6)
Gender					
Male (N=76)	97.4 (97.4)	89.5 (85.5)	98.7 (14.5)	86.8 (80.3)	73.7 (75.0)
Female (N=74)	74.3 (70.3)	56.7 (51.3)	77.0 (37.8)	51.3 (55.4)	37.8 (44.6)

All Respondents (N=150)	86.0 (84.0)	73.3 (68.7)	88.0 (26.0)	69.3 (68.0)	56.0 (60.0)
--------------------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Note : Figure in bracket indicate the percentage of respondents who has seen them in picture.

Table M 39 : Percentage of Respondents who Have Voted in Last Election

Characteristic of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents Voting in Last							
	PRI Election		Assembly Election		Parliamentary Election		Co-operative Election	
	M	WM	M	WM	M	WM	M	WM
District								
Bhojpur (N=10/20)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	10.0	—
Nalanda (N=10/20)	100.0	100.0	100.0	95.0	100.0	90.0	30.0	5.0
Begusarai (N=10/20)	100.0	100.0	100.0	95.0	100.0	95.0	0.0	5.0
Saharsa (N=10/20)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	95.0	—	—
Sitamarhi (N=10/20)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	20.0	5.0
Religion / Caste								
Upper Caste (H) (N=16/14)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	92.8	12.5	7.1
Backward Caste (H) (N=13/20)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	95.0	—	5.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=6/33)	100.0	100.0	100.0	97.0	100.0	97.0	16.7	—
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=9/26)	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.1	100.0	26.1	33.3	—
Muslims (N=6/7)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	—	14.3
Gender								
Male (N=26/50)	100.0	100.0	100.0	98.0	100.0	96.0	15.4	6.0
Female (N=24/50)	100.0	100.0	100.0	98.0	100.0	96.0	8.3	—

All Respondents (N=50/100)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.0	12.0	3.0
-----------------------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	------	------	-----

- Note :**
1. M= Mukhiya/ WM= Ward Member
 2. The first value of N refers to Mukhiyas and the second value for the Ward Members

Table M 40 : Frequency of Social Audit Forum as Reported by Respondents (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)

Characteristic of GP	How often are social audit forums held in this GP?					Indication of Attendance	
	Every Six months	Once a year	Never	No response	All	A	B
District							
Bhojpur (N=30)	6.7		93.3		100.0	6.7	10.5
Nalanda (N=30)	13.3	6.7	66.7	13.3	100.0	20.0	167.5
Begusarai (N=30)	3.3	3.3	86.7	6.7	100.0	6.7	350.0
Saharsa (N=30)		10.0	90.0		100.0	10.0	32.3
Sitamarhi (N=30)	6.7		86.7	6.7	100.0	6.7	300.0
Religion / Caste							
Upper Caste (H) (N=30)	6.7	3.3	86.7	3.3	100.0	10.0	293.3
Backward Cast (H) (N=33)	30.0	3.0	87.9	6.1	100.0	6.1	65.0
Extr. Backward Cast (H) (N=39)	10.3	2.6	76.9	10.3	100.0	12.8	154.2
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=35)	5.7	5.7	85.7	2.9	100.0	11.4	138.7
Muslims (N=13)		7.7	92.3		100.0	7.7	27.0
Gender							
Male (N=76)	3.9	5.3	90.8		100.0	9.2	104.4
Female (N=74)	8.1	2.7	78.4	10.8	100.0	10.8	211.5
All Respondents (N=150)							
	6.0	4.0	84.7	5.3	100.0	10.0	161.5

- Note :**
- A = Percentage of respondents who or their family members ever attended a forum
 - B = Average attendance in a meeting

Table M 41 : Source of Information for Respondents Regarding Social Audit Forum (Mukhiyas and Ward members)

Characteristic of GP	How did you find out about the social audit forum?					
	Gram Sabha Meeting	GP Members	Other Sources	No Response	Never Attended Forum	All
District						
Bhojpur (N=30)	3.3	3.3		10.0	83.3	100.0
Nalanda (N=30)	10.0	3.3	6.7	13.3	66.7	100.0
Begusarai (N=30)	6.7				93.3	100.0
Saharsa (N=30)	3.3	6.7			90.0	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=30)	6.7			6.7	86.7	100.0
Religion / Caste						
Upper Caste (H) (N=30)	6.7	3.3		3.3	86.7	100.0
Backward Cast (H) (N=33)		3.0	3.0	12.1	81.8	100.0
Extr. Backward Cast (H) (N=39)	10.3	2.6		7.7	79.5	100.0
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=35)	5.7	2.9	2.9	2.9	85.7	100.0
Muslims (N=13)	7.7				92.3	100.0
Gender of Mukhiya						
Male (N=76)	5.3	3.9		2.6	88.2	100.0
Female (N=74)	6.8	1.4	2.7	9.5	79.7	100.0
All Respondents (N=150)						
	6.0	2.7	1.3	6.0	84.0	100.0

Table M 42 : Information on Chairpersons of Social Audit Forum

Characteristic of Respondents	Who chaired the meeting?				
	Mukhiya	Spouse of Mukhiya	No Response	Never Attended Forum	All
District					
Bhojpur (N=30)	10.0	—	—	90.0	100.0
Nalanda (N=30)	23.3	—	6.7	70.0	100.0
Begusarai (N=30)	10.0	—	—	90.0	100.0
Saharsa (N=30)	10.0	3.3	—	86.7	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=30)	6.7	6.7	—	93.3	100.0
Religion / Caste					
Upper Caste (H) (N=30)	10.0	—	3.3	86.7	100.0
Backward Cast (H) (N=33)	9.1	—	—	90.9	100.0
Extr. Backward Cast (H) (N=39)	15.4	—	2.6	82.1	100.0
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=35)	14.3	2.9	—	82.9	100.0
Muslims (N=13)	7.7	—	—	92.3	100.0
Gender					
Male (N=76)	11.8	1.3	—	86.8	100.0
Female (N=14)	12.2	—	2.7	85.1	100.0
All Respondents (N=150)					
	12.0	0.7	1.3	86.0	100.0

Table M 43 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Knowledge about Statutory Requirement of Gram Sabha and General Body Meeting (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)

Characteristic of Respondents	Gram Sabha Meeting			General Body Meeting			All
	Correct Response	Incorrect Response	No Response	Correct Response	Incorrect Response	No Response	
District							
Bhojpur (N=30)	66.7	33.3	—	90.0	23.1	—	100.0
Nalanda (N=30)	18.2	17.0	38.9	—	17.9	30.0	100.0
Begusarai (N=30)	23.3	70.0	6.7	16.7	76.7	6.7	100.0
Saharsa (N=30)	10.0	73.3	16.7	—	76.7	23.3	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=30)	20.0	66.7	13.3	10.0	76.7	13.3	100.0
Religion / Caste							
Upper Caste (H) (N=30)	40.0	50.0	10.0	10.0	73.3	16.7	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=33)	27.3	63.6	9.1	15.1	75.7	9.1	100.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=39)	23.1	59.0	17.9	2.6	79.5	17.9	100.0
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=35)	31.4	57.1	11.4	—	82.8	17.1	100.0

Muslims (N=13)	23.1	69.2	7.7	15.4	76.9	7.7	100.0
Gender							
Male (N=76)	28.9	65.8	5.3	10.5	82.9	6.6	100.0
Female (N=74)	29.7	51.3	18.9	4.0	73.0	23.0	100.0
All Respondents (N=150)							
	29.3	58.7	12.0	7.3	78.0	14.7	100.0

Table M 44 : Percentage of Respondents who Attended Any Village Meeting in Last One Year (Mukhiya and Ward Members).

Characteristic of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents who have attended							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
District								
Bhojpur (N=30)	10.0	93.3	30.0	16.7	93.3	93.3	—	3.3
Nalanda (N=30)	46.7	23.3	33.3	—	73.3	33.3	3.3	13.3
Begusarai (N=30)	43.3	20.0	16.7	13.3	73.3	70.0	3.3	6.7
Saharsa (N=30)	6.7	26.7	3.3	16.7	90.0	33.3	—	6.7
Sitamarhi (N=30)	83.3	13.3	43.3	3.3	90.0	83.3	—	3.3
Religion / Caste								
Upper Caste (H) (N=30)	36.7	50.0	26.7	10.0	93.3	60.0	3.3	6.7
Backward Caste (H) (N=33)	30.3	42.4	30.3	15.1	75.7	48.5	—	6.1
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=39)	33.3	23.1	15.4	2.6	89.7	74.3	—	2.6
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=35)	37.1	34.3	25.7	5.7	80.0	65.7	2.8	14.3
Muslims (N=13)	76.9	23.1	38.5	7.7	76.9	61.5	—	—

Gender								
Male (N=76)	42.1	35.5	30.3	6.6	89.5	65.8	1.3	5.3
Female (N=74)	33.8	35.1	20.3	9.4	78.4	59.4	1.3	8.1
All Respondents (N=150)								
	38.0	35.3	25.3	8.0	84.0	62.7	1.3	6.7

Note : A = Traditional Panchayat Meeting / B = Meeting organized by GP / C = Meeting organized by BDO or Other state official / D = Meeting organized by NGO / E = Gram Sabha / F = Aam Sabha / G = Have attended but do not remember the meeting / H = Not Attended any Village Meeting.

Table M 45 : Information about Attendance by Respondents in Gram Sabha.

Characteristic of Respondents	Percentage of Respondent who have Heard about Gram Sabha		Percentage of Respondents who have ever attended Gram Sabha		No of Gram Sabha Meetings Attended last Year	
	M	WM	M	WM	M	WM
District						
Bhojpur (N=10/20)	100.0	95.0	100.0	95.0	6.3	5.5
Nalanda (N=10/20)	100.0	90.0	100.0	80.0	5.1	2.9
Begusarai (N=10/20)	100.0	95.0	100.0	85.0	4.7	3.1
Saharsa (N=10/20)	100.0	90.0	100.0	85.0	3.2	4.9
Sitamarhi (N=10/20)	100.0	85.0	100.0	85.0	3.8	2.2
Religion / Caste						
Upper Caste (H) (N=16/14)	100.0	92.8	100.0	85.7	4.9	5.7
Backward Caste (H) (N=13/20)	100.0	80.0	100.0	80.0	4.5	4.9

Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=6/33)	100.0	97.0	100.0	87.9	4.3	2.9
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=9/26)	100.0	88.5	100.0	88.5	5.2	2.8
Muslims (N=6/7)	100.0	100.0	100.0	85.7	3.7	4.8
Gender						
Male (N=26/50)	100.0	94.0	100.0	94.0	4.5	3.9
Female (N=24/50)	100.0	88.0	100.0	78.0	4.8	3.5
All Respondents (N=50/100)						
	100.0	91.0	100.0	86.0	4.6	3.7

- Note :**
1. M= Mukhiya/ WM= Ward Member
 2. The first value of N refers to Mukhiyas and the second value for the Ward Members

Table M 46 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Source of Information about Gram Sabha Meeting (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)

Source of Information	Bhojpur (N=30)	Nalanda (N=30)	Begusarai (N=30)	Saharsa (N=30)	Sitama rhi (N=30)	All Districts (N=150)
<u>Village / Ward Notice Board</u>	—	—	—	—	3.3	0.7
Public Announcement	6.7	6.7	10.0	6.7	13.3	8.7
Government Official / GP Secretary	23.3	—	—	26.7	—	10.0
Mukhiya / GP Members	53.3	26.7	3.3	26.7	6.7	23.3
Community Leader	—	—	—	3.3	—	0.7
Friend / Relative / Neighbour	—	10.0	3.3	3.3	3.3	4.0
Dug-Dug Announcement	6.7	20.0	43.3	3.3	10.0	16.7
Did Not Hear about it/ No Response	10.0	36.7	40.0	30.0	63.3	36.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table M 47 : Reasons for Attending Gram Sabha Meeting

Reasons	Bhojpur (N=30)	Nalanda (N=30)	Begusarai (N=30)	Saharsa (N=30)	Sitamarhi (N=30)	All Districts (N=150)
	Percentage of Respondent Mentioning the Reason (1 st reason)					
<u>Because of Membership</u>	96.6	84.6	96.3	100.0	88.9	93.4
Encouraged by Spouse	—	—	—	—	—	—
Encouraged by Relative / Neighbour	—	—	3.8	—	—	0.7
Encouraged by Mukhiya / GP Member	3.4	11.5	3.7		11.1	5.9

Encouraged by Caste Member	—	—	—	—	—	—
Encouraged by NGO / SHG	—	—	—	—	—	—
Discussed Issues were Important	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Percentage of Respondent Mentioning the Reason (2nd reason)					
<u>Because of Membership</u>	—	—	3.7	—	11.1	2.9
Encouraged by Spouse	—	7.7	—	—	25.9	6.6
Encouraged by Relative / Neighbour	—	23.1	11.1	3.7	7.4	8.8
Encouraged by Mukhiya / GP Member	37.9	23.1	63.0	—	29.6	30.9
Encouraged by Caste Member	—	23.1	—	—	—	4.4
Encouraged by NGO / SHG	3.4	3.8	—	—	—	1.5
Discussed Issues were Important	55.2	19.2	—	66.7	18.5	32.4
Other	—	—	14.8	18.5	—	6.6
No Response	3.4	—	7.4	11.1	7.4	5.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table M 48 : Location of Gram Sabha Meeting

Location	Percentage of Respondent Reporting the Location Meeting at					
	Bhojpur (N=30)	Nalanda (N=30)	Begusarai (N=30)	Saharsa (N=30)	Sitamarhi (N=30)	All Districts (N=150)
Community / Other Hall	30.0	—	—	10.0	—	8.0
Panchayat Bhawan	33.3	53.3	60.0	53.3	40.0	48.0
Mukhiya House (front)	—	—	—	3.3	6.7	2.0
Mukhiya House (Inside)	3.3	—	—	3.3	3.3	2.0
Any Government Building	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	20.0	28.0
Other	—	10.0	3.3	—	20.0	6.7
No Response	3.3	6.7	6.7	—	10.0	5.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table M 49 : Information on Awareness about NREGA among Mukhiyas and Ward members.

Source of Information	Districts					Category of Mukhiya/Ward Member		All Districts (N=50/100)
	Bhojpur (N=10/20)	Nalanda (N=10/20)	Begusa-rai (N=10/20)	Saharsa (N=10/20)	Sitama-rhi (N=10/20)	Ele (N=32/67)	Elected in Open Seat (N=18/33)	
Percentage of Respondents Aware about NREGA								
Mukhiya	90.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.9	100.0	98.0
Ward member	90.0	35.0	75.0	85.0	75.0	59.7	97.0	72.0
Percentage Distribution by Sources of Information on NREGA (Mukhiya)								
Radio	0.0	0.0	40.0	10.0	0.0	6.2	16.7	10.0
Television	0.0	0.0	30.0	10.0	10.0	9.4	11.1	10.0
Newspaper	70.0	10.0	10.0	20.0	20.0	28.1	22.2	26.0
NGOs	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	2.0
Panchayat / Pradhan	0.0	10.0	20.0	10.0	10.0	12.5	5.5	10.0
SHG / VOs	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Awareness Event	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	30.0	6.2	16.7	10.0
Family / Friends	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Others	20.0	60.0	0.0	50.0	30.0	34.4	27.8	32.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Percentage Distribution by Source of Information on NREGA (Ward Member)								
Radio	15.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	3.0	4.0
Television	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	1.5	3.0	2.0
Newspaper	20.0	5.0	0.0	15.0	5.0	11.9	3.0	9.0
NGOs	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Panchayat / Pradhan	30.0	15.0	75.0	50.0	65.0	32.8	75.8	47.0
SHG / VO's	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Awareness Event	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Family / Friends	5.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Others	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	3.0	9.1	5.0
No knowledge	15.0	65.0	25.0	10.0	20.0	40.3	0.0	27.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note : The first value of the N refers to Mukhiya and the second value for the Ward Members.

Table M 50 : Extent of Knowledge about Different Provisions of NREGA (Availability of Work).

Characteristic of Respondents	How many days of work are available per household per year ?							Total
	Mukhiya				Ward Member			
	Correct Response	Incorrect Response	No response	Total	Correct Response	Incorrect Response	No response	
District								
Bhojpur (N=10/20)	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	90.0	0.0	10.0	100.0
Nalanda (N=10/20)	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	20.0	0.0	80.0	100.0
Begusarai (N=10/20)	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	75.0	0.0	25.0	100.0
Saharsa (N=10/20)	90.0	0.0	10.0	100.0	70.0	0.0	30.0	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=10/20)	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	65.0	10.0	25.0	100.0
Religion/Caste								
Upper Caste (H) (N=16/24)	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	92.9	0.0	7.1	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=13/20)	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	75.0	5.0	20.0	100.0
Extr. Back. Caste (H) (N=6/33)	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	54.5	0.0	45.5	100.0
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=9/26)	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	53.8	0.0	46.2	100.0
Muslims (N=6/7)	83.3	0.0	16.7	100.0	57.1	14.3	28.6	100.0
Gender								
Male (N=26/50)	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	72.0	2.0	26.0	100.0
Female (N=24/50)	95.8	0.0	4.2	100.0	56.0	2.0	42.0	100.0
All Respondents (N=50/100)								
	98.0	0.0	2.0	100.0	64.0	2.0	34.0	100.0

Note : The first value of the N refers to Mukhiya and the second value for the Ward Members.

Table M 51 : Extent of Knowledge about Different Provisions of NREGA (Wage Rate).

Characteristic of Respondents	What should be the daily wage rate?							Total
	Mukhiya				Ward Member			
	Correct Response (1)	Correct Response (2)	No/ Incorrect response	Total	Correct Response (1)	Correct Response (2)	No/ Incorrect response	
District								
Bhojpur (N=10/20)	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	75.0	5.0	20.0	100.0
Nalanda (N=10/20)	60.0	30.0	10.0	100.0	5.0	15.0	80.0	100.0
Begusarai (N=10/20)	70.0	10.0	20.0	100.0	60.0	0.0	40.0	100.0
Saharsa (N=10/20)	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=10/20)	20.0	30.0	50.0	100.0	45.0	5.0	50.0	100.0
Religion/Caste								
Upper Caste (H) (N=16/24)	87.5	6.3	6.3	100.0	64.3	7.1	28.6	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=13/20)	53.9	23.1	23.1	100.0	55.0	10.0	35.0	100.0
Extr. Back. Caste (H) (N=6/33)	50.0	33.3	16.7	100.0	45.4	0.0	54.6	100.0
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=9/26)	88.9	0.0	11.1	100.0	34.6	7.7	57.7	100.0
Muslims (N=6/7)	50.0	16.7	33.3	100.0	42.9	0.0	57.1	100.0
Gender								
Male (N=26/50)	57.6	15.4	26.9	100.0	58.0	8.0	34.0	100.0
Female (N=24/50)	83.3	12.5	4.2	100.0	36.0	2.0	62.0	100.0
All Respondents (N=50/100)								
	70.0	14.0	16.0	100.0	47.0	5.0	48.0	100.0

- Note :** 1. Correct Response (1) = Refers to Revised Provision on Wage Rate
 Correct Response (2) = Refers to Unrevised Provision on Wage Rate
 2. The first values for N refers to Mukhiyas and the second value for the Ward Members.

Table M 52 : Extent of Knowledge about Different Provisions of NREGA (Worker's Responsibility) (Mukhiyas)

Characteristic of Respondents	It is worker's responsibility to demand work. Do you agree?					
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	No Response	Total
District						
Bhojpur (N=10)	20.0	0.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	100.0
Nalanda (N=10)	0.0	10.0	20.0	70.0	0.0	100.0
Begusarai (N=10)	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Saharsa (N=10)	20.0	0.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=10)	0.0	0.0	20.0	80.0	0.0	100.0
Religion/Caste						
Upper Caste (H) (N=16)	12.5	0.0	0.0	87.5	0.0	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=13)	7.7	7.7	23.1	61.5	0.0	100.0
Extr. Back. Caste (H) (N=6)	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=9)	11.1	0.0	11.1	77.8	0.0	100.0
Muslims (N=6)	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Gender						
Male (N=26)	0.0	3.8	11.5	84.6	0.0	100.0
Female (N=24)	16.7	0.0	4.2	79.2	0.0	100.0
All Respondents (N=50)	8.0	2.0	8.0	82.0	0.0	100.0

Table M 53 : Extent of Knowledge about Different Provisions of NREGA (Worker's Responsibility) (Ward Members)

Characteristic of Respondents	It is worker's responsibility to demand work. Do you agree?					Total
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	No Response	
District						
Bhojpur (N=20)	10.0	0.0	5.0	80.0	5.0	100.0
Nalanda (N=20)	0.0	5.0	0.0	20.0	75.0	100.0
Begusarai (N=20)	0.0	0.0	10.0	65.0	25.0	100.0
Saharsa (N=20)	15.0	15.0	25.0	40.0	5.0	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=20)	0.0	0.0	20.0	55.0	25.0	100.0
Religion/Caste						
Upper Caste (H) (N=14)	14.3	7.1	14.3	57.1	7.1	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=20)	0.0	10.0	15.0	65.0	10.0	100.0
Extr. Back. Caste (H) (N=33)	6.1	3.0	12.1	45.5	33.3	100.0
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=26)	3.8	0.0	7.7	46.2	42.3	100.0
Muslims (N=7)	0.0	0.0	14.3	57.1	28.6	100.0
Gender						
Male (N=50)	4.0	4.0	12.0	62.0	18.0	100.0
Female (N=50)	6.0	4.0	12.0	42.0	36.0	100.0
All Respondents (N=100)						
	5.0	4.0	12.0	52.0	27.0	100.0

Table M 54 : Extent of Knowledge about Different Provisions of NREGA (Duration of Waiting).

Characteristic of Respondents	Within how many days should work be provided?							
	Mukhiya				Ward Member			
	Correct Response	Nearly Correct Response	No/ Incorrect response	Total	Correct Response	Nearly Correct Response	No/ Incorrect response	Total
District								
Bhojpur (N=10/20)	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	75.0	0.0	25.0	100.0
Nalanda (N=10/20)	70.0	10.0	20.0	100.0	20.0	0.0	80.0	100.0
Begusarai (N=10/20)	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	60.0	100.0	40.0	100.0
Saharsa (N=10/20)	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	35.0	0.0	65.0	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=10/20)	60.0	10.0	30.0	100.0	10.0	15.0	75.0	100.0
Religion/Caste								
Upper Caste (H) (N=16/14)	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	71.4	0.0	28.5	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=13/20)	84.6	0.0	15.4	100.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	100.0
Extr. Back. Caste (H) (N=6/33)	83.3	0.0	16.7	100.0	30.3	3.0	66.7	100.0
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=9/26)	66.7	22.2	11.1	100.0	34.6	3.8	61.5	100.0
Muslims (N=6/7)	83.3	0.0	16.7	100.0	14.3	14.3	71.4	100.0
Gender								
Male (N=26/50)	80.8	3.8	15.4	100.0	50.0	4.0	46.0	100.0
Female (N=24/50)	91.7	4.2	4.2	100.0	30.0	2.0	68.0	100.0

All Respondents (N=50/100)	86.0	4.0	10.0	100.0	40.0	3.0	57.0	100.0
-----------------------------------	------	-----	------	-------	------	-----	------	-------

Note : The first value of the N refers to Mukhiya and the second value for the Ward Members.

Table M 55 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Opinion about Beneficiary of NREGA (Mukhiyas)

Characteristic of Respondents	Who do you think will benefit most from NREGA?						Percentage of Respondents thinking NREGA will operate next year
	Every-body	Casual Labour	Panchayat Functionaries	Govt. Officials	Others	Total	
District							
Bhojpur (N=10)	0.0	80.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	100.0	23.3
Nalanda (N=10)	0.0	90.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	100.0	9.3
Begusarai (N=10)	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	20.9
Saharsa (N=10)	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	23.3
Sitamarhi (N=10)	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	23.3
Religion/Caste							
Upper Caste (H) (N=16)	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	32.6
Backward Caste (H) (N=13)	0.0	84.6	0.0	0.0	15.4	100.0	20.9
Extr. Back. Caste (H) (N=6)	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	14.0
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=9)	0.0	88.9	0.0	11.1	0.0	100.0	18.6
Muslims (N=6)	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	14.0
Gender							
Male (N=26)	0.0	92.3	0.0	3.8	3.8	100.0	51.2
Female (N=24)	0.0	95.8	0.0	0.0	4.2	100.0	48.8

All Respondents (N=50)	0.0	94.0	0.0	2.0	4.0	100.0	100.0
-------------------------------	-----	------	-----	-----	-----	-------	-------

Table M 56 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Opinion about Beneficiary of NREGA (Ward members)

Characteristic of Respondents	Who do you think will benefit most from NREGA?							Percentage of Respondents thinking NREGA will operate next year
	Every-body	Casual Labour	Panchayat Functionaries	Govt. Officials	Others	No response	Total	
District								
Bhojpur (N=20)	5.0	80.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	100.0	25.4
Nalanda (N=20)	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	80.0	100.0	4.5
Begusarai (N=20)	0.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	100.0	22.4
Saharsa (N=20)	0.0	80.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	100.0	25.4
Sitamarhi (N=20)	0.0	65.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	30.0	100.0	22.4
Religion/Caste								
Upper Caste (H) (N=14)	0.0	92.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	100.0	17.9
Backward Caste (H) (N=20)	0.0	80.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	100.0	25.4
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=33)	0.0	57.6	6.1	0.0	0.0	36.4	100.0	29.8
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=26)	0.0	46.2	3.8	0.0	0.0	50.0	100.0	17.9
Muslims (N=7)	14.3	57.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	100.0	9.0
Gender								
Male (N=50)	2.0	74.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	22.0	100.0	56.7
Female (N=50)	0.0	54.0	6.0	2.0	0.0	38.0	100.0	43.3

All Respondents (N=100)	1.0	64.0	4.0	1.0	0.0	30.0	100.0	100.0
--------------------------------	-----	------	-----	-----	-----	------	-------	-------

Table M 57 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Knowledge about NREGA Allocations (Mukhiyas and Ward Members).

Characteristic of Respondents	NREGA Allocation Last Year			NREGA Allocation This Year			All
	Correct Response	Incorrect Response	No Response	Correct Response	Incorrect Response	No Response	
District							
Bhojpur (N=30)	20.0	20.0	60.0	30.0	13.3	56.7	100.0
Nalanda (N=30)	26.7	13.3	60.0	20.0	16.7	63.3	100.0
Begusarai (N=30)	13.3	30.0	56.7	6.7	30.0	63.3	100.0
Saharsa (N=30)	—	36.7	63.3	6.7	26.7	66.7	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=30)	10.0	26.7	63.3	6.7	23.3	70.0	100.00
Religion / Caste							
Upper Caste (H) (N=30)	20.0	40.0	40.0	16.7	40.0	43.3	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=33)	15.1	30.3	54.5	18.1	27.3	54.5	100.0

Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=39)	10.2	15.4	74.3	5.1	12.8	82.0	100.0
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=35)	14.3	14.3	71.4	14.3	14.3	71.4	100.0
Muslims (N=13)	7.7	38.5	73.8	23.1	15.4	61.5	100.0
Gender							
Male (N=76)	17.1	23.7	59.2	13.1	23.7	63.1	100.0
Female (N=74)	10.8	27.0	62.2	14.9	20.3	64.9	100.0
All Respondents (N=150)							
	14.0	25.3	60.7	14.0	22.0	64.0	100.0

Table M 58 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Knowledge about BRGF Allocations (Mukhiyas and Ward Members).

Characteristic of Respondents	BRGF Allocation Last Year			BRGF Allocation This Year			All
	Correct Response	Incorrect Response	No Response	Correct Response	Incorrect Response	No Response	
District							
Bhojpur (N=30)	23.3	16.7	60.0	36.7	3.3	60.0	100.0
Nalanda (N=30)	16.7	16.7	66.7	16.7	30.0	63.3	100.0
Begusarai (N=30)	3.3	40.0	56.7	6.7	26.7	66.7	100.0
Saharsa (N=30)	6.7	33.3	60.0	—	40.0	60.0	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=30)	—	40.0	60.0	10.0	23.3	66.7	100.0
Religion / Caste							
Upper Caste (H) (N=30)	16.7	50.0	33.3	23.3	40.0	36.7	100.0

Backward Caste (H) (N=33)	8.1	27.3	54.5	6.1	30.3	63.6	100.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=39)	—	15.4	84.6	7.7	7.7	84.6	100.0
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=35)	8.6	25.7	65.7	14.3	20.0	65.7	100.0
Muslims (N=13)	7.7	38.5	53.8	7.7	38.5	53.8	100.0
Gender							
Male (N=76)	10.5	27.6	61.8	14.5	22.4	63.1	100.0
Female (N=74)	9.4	31.1	59.4	9.4	27.0	63.5	100.0
All Respondents (N=150)							
	10.0	29.3	60.7	12.0	24.7	63.3	100.0

Table M 59 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Knowledge about FC12 Allocations (Mukhiyas and Ward Member)

Characteristic of Respondents	FC 12 Allocation Last Year			FC 12 Allocation This Year			All
	Correct Response	Incorrect Response	No Response	Correct Response	Incorrect Response	No Response	
District							
Bhojpur (N=30)	36.7	6.7	56.7	30.0	13.3	56.7	100.0
Nalanda (N=30)	20.0	23.3	56.7	13.3	23.3	63.3	100.0
Begusarai (N=30)	10.0	26.7	63.3	10.0	13.3	76.7	100.0
Saharsa (N=30)	23.3	16.7	60.0	10.0	30.0	60.0	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=30)	6.7	33.3	60.0	13.3	20.0	66.7	100.0

Religion / Caste							
Upper Caste (H) (N=30)	36.7	30.0	33.3	33.3	26.7	40.0	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=33)	24.2	21.2	54.5	9.1	27.3	63.6	100.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=39)	2.6	12.8	84.6	7.7	5.1	87.2	100.0
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=35)	14.3	22.8	62.8	11.4	22.8	65.7	100.0
Muslims (N=13)	30.8	23.1	46.1	23.1	23.1	53.8	100.0
Gender							
Male (N=76)	17.1	22.4	60.5	18.4	14.5	67.1	100.0
Female (N=74)	21.6	20.3	58.1	12.2	25.7	62.2	100.0
All Respondents (N=150)							
	19.3	21.3	59.3	15.3	20.0	64.7	100.0

Table M 60 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Knowledge about RTI Act (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)

Characteristic of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents who				
	Heard about RTI	Knows Correctly about RTI	Have tried to use it	Know someone who has tried to use it	Newspaper reading by Respondents (avg. days/week)
District					
Bhojpur (N=30)	43.3	40.0	20.0	23.3	2.8
Nalanda (N=30)	40.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	1.7
Begusarai (N=30)	60.0	56.7	33.3	20.0	2.6
Saharsa (N=30)	33.3	13.3	—	3.3	2.1

Sitamarhi (N=30)	53.3	36.7	43.3	33.3	0.8
Religion / Caste					
Upper Caste (H) (N=30)	68.3	53.3	33.3	33.3	3.7
Backward Caste (H) (N=33)	42.4	36.4	21.2	15.1	2.6
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=39)	33.3	23.1	15.4	12.8	1.2
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=35)	40.0	40.0	22.8	20.0	0.9
Muslims (N=13)	69.2	38.5	30.8	23.1	2.1
Gender					
Male (N=76)	53.9	46.0	30.3	25.0	2.4
Female (N=74)	37.8	28.4	16.2	14.9	1.6
All Respondents (N=150)					
	46.0	37.3	23.3	20.0	2.0

Table M 61 : Decision Making Process in Gram Panchayat (Mukhiyas and Ward Members)

Characteristic of Respondents	Percentage of Respondent Reporting Decision Maker to be						
	Mukhiya	Mukhiya Spouse / Family Member	GP Secretary	Ward Members	Others	No Response	All
District							
Bhojpur (N=30)	93.3	—	3.3	3.3	—	—	100.0
Nalanda (N=30)	93.3	—	—	—	—	6.7	100.0
Begusarai (N=30)	93.3	—	—	—	3.3	3.3	100.0
Saharsa (N=30)	76.7	10.0	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	100.0

Sitamarhi (N=30)	86.7	3.3	—	—	3.3	6.7	100.0
Religion / Caste							
Upper Caste (H) (N=30)	83.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=33)	90.1	3.0	3.0	—	—	3.0	100.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=39)	84.6	2.6	—	—	5.1	7.7	100.0
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=35)	91.4	2.8	—	2.8	—	2.8	100.0
Muslims (N=13)	100.0	—	—	—	—	—	100.0
Gender							
Male (N=76)	93.4	—	1.3	1.3	3.9	—	100.0
Female (N=74)	83.8	5.4	1.3	1.3	—	8.1	100.0
All Respondents (N=150)							
	88.7	2.7	1.3	1.3	2.0	4.0	100.0

Table M 62 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Responses on the Questions on Functioning of Gram Panchayat (Mukhiyas and Ward Members).

Question / Response	Percentage of Respondents					
	Bhojpur (N=30)	Nalanda (N=30)	Begusarai (N=30)	Saharsa (N=30)	Sitamarhi (N=30)	All District (N=150)
Does the General Body of GP meet every month?						
No	6.7	40.0	30.0	63.3	30.0	34.0
Sometimes	83.3	40.0	13.3	6.7	46.7	38.0
Yes	10.0	20.0	56.7	30.0	23.3	28.0
Do you receive the seven days' notice for the meeting?						
No	10.0	46.7	26.7	20.0	36.7	28.0
Sometimes	20.0	10.0	10.0	50.0	26.7	23.3

Yes	70.0	43.3	63.3	30.0	36.7	48.7
Do the lady members attend / talk during the meeting?						
No one	6.7	6.7	16.7	16.7	13.3	12.0
Only some of them	50.0	43.3	30.0	56.7	56.7	47.3
All of them	43.3	50.0	53.3	26.7	30.0	40.7
Do the SC / ST members participate in the discussions?						
No one	6.7	10.0	23.3	6.7	13.3	12.0
Only some of them	10.0	43.3	23.3	60.0	66.7	40.7
All of them	83.3	46.7	53.3	33.3	20.0	47.3
Are the minutes recorded during the meeting itself?						
No	3.3	30.0	33.3	20.0	36.7	24.7
In some meetings	13.3	10.0	23.3	16.7	43.3	21.3
In all meetings	83.3	60.0	43.3	63.3	20.0	54.0
All Respondents						
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(Continued)

Table M 62 : (Continued)

Question / Response	Percentage of Respondents					
	Bhojpur (N=30)	Nalanda (N=30)	Begusarai (N=30)	Saharsa (N=30)	Sitamarhi (N=30)	All District (N=150)
Prior to decision making, are all members given chance to express their opinion?						
No	3.3	23.3	20.0	20.0	16.7	16.7
Sometimes	13.3	26.7	33.3	40.0	53.3	33.3
Always	83.3	50.0	46.7	40.0	30.0	50.0
Are the minutes of the GB meeting displayed on notice board?						
No	50.0	60.0	33.3	70.0	53.3	53.3
Some resolutions only	13.3	10.0	36.7	10.0	40.0	22.0

All meeting resolutions	36.7	30.0	30.0	20.0	6.7	24.7
Are the decisions of the GP meeting generally implemented?						
None	13.3	26.7	16.7	16.7	23.3	19.3
Some only	13.3	56.7	63.3	36.7	73.3	48.7
All	73.3	16.7	20.0	46.7	3.3	32.0
Have Standing Committees been formed in your GP?						
No	73.3	46.7	66.7	83.3	36.7	61.3
1 or 2 formed	—	20.0	30.0	6.7	53.3	22.0
All formed	26.7	33.3	3.3	10.0	10.0	16.7
Are the Meeting of Standing Committees held?						
No	76.7	50.0	66.7	80.0	36.7	62.0
Held by 1 or 2 Committees	10.0	26.7	26.7	10.0	50.0	24.7
Held by All Committees	13.3	23.3	6.7	10.0	13.3	13.3
All Respondents						
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(Continued)

Table M 62 : (Concluded)

Question / Response	Percentage of Respondents					
	Bhojpur (N=30)	Nalanda (N=30)	Begusarai (N=30)	Saharsa (N=30)	Sitamarhi (N=30)	All District (N=150)
Do members of all wards come for Gram Sabha?						
No	13.3	16.7	20.0	10.0	30.0	18.0
Only some wards	20.0	53.3	46.7	46.7	43.3	42.0
All wards	66.7	30.0	33.3	43.3	26.7	40.0
Have the details of work of GP put on display?						

No	36.7	70.0	40.0	36.7	50.0	46.7
Some of them	3.3	23.3	36.7	13.3	40.0	23.3
All of them	60.0	6.7	23.3	50.0	10.0	30.0
Is the GP Secretary available at his office or GP area?						
No	23.3	26.7	36.7	26.7	23.3	27.3
4 – 5 times / month	60.0	46.7	63.3	70.0	53.3	58.7
Everyday	16.7	26.7	—	3.3	23.3	14.0
Does the GP Secretary provide information or rules / programmes / circulars?						
No	26.7	40.0	33.3	26.7	30.0	31.3
Only to some people	50.0	43.3	53.3	70.0	40.0	51.3
To all people	23.3	16.7	13.3	3.3	30.0	17.3
All Respondents						
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table M 63 : Extent of Interaction between Respondents and Political and Administrative Functionaries

Item	Bhojpur (N=30)	Nalanda (N=30)	Begusarai (N=30)	Saharsa (N=30)	Sitamarhi (N=30)	All Districts (N=150)
Percentage of Respondents who have Ever Tried to Meet						
PS Pramukh	53.3	53.3	63.3	73.3	83.3	65.3
ZP Adhyaksha	23.3	26.7	33.3	36.7	50.0	34.0
BDO	86.7	80.0	86.7	90.0	86.7	86.0
District Magistrate	36.7	26.7	23.3	36.7	43.3	33.3
MLA	63.3	30.0	43.3	53.3	70.0	52.0

Percentage of Respondents who Succeeded in Meeting						
PS Pramukh	50.0	50.0	60.0	73.3	83.3	63.3
ZP Adhyaksha	23.3	26.7	33.3	36.7	46.7	33.3
BDO	80.0	76.7	86.7	86.7	80.0	82.0
District Magistrate	33.3	26.7	23.3	36.7	43.3	32.7
MLA	63.3	30.0	43.3	53.3	66.7	51.3
Percentage of Respondents whose Request was Granted by						
PS Pramukh	40.0	43.3	53.3	43.3	60.0	48.0
ZP Adhyaksha	10.0	26.7	30.0	36.7	30.0	26.7
BDO	70.0	66.7	83.3	63.3	66.7	70.0
District Magistrate	26.7	23.3	23.3	30.0	33.3	27.3
MLA	46.7	26.7	40.0	50.0	43.3	41.3

Table M 64 : Information on Frequency of Visits by Respondents to Block Headquarters and ZP Headquarters.

Characteristic of Respondents	Av. no. of visits per month to Block Headquarters		Av. no. of visits per month to ZP Headquarters	
	M	WM	M	WM
<u>District</u>				
Bhojpur (N=10/20)	11.0	3.9	2.5	0.1
Nalanda (N=10/20)	9.3	0.9	2.6	0.1
Begusarai (N=10/20)	3.5	1.0	0.5	0.1
Saharsa (N=10/20)	14.0	4.7	3.0	0.5

Sitamarhi (N=10/20)	4.6	2.5	0.9	0.2
Religion / Caste				
Upper Caste (H) (N=16/14)	8.4	2.4	2.1	0.1
Backward Caste (H) (N=13/20)	10.8	2.7	2.4	0.1
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=6/33)	7.5	2.4	1.3	0.4
Scheduled Caste (H) (N=9/26)	6.6	2.5	2.0	0.3
Muslims (N=6/7)	7.5	4.3	0.8	0.4
Gender				
Male (N=26/50)	8.5	3.5	1.7	0.3
Female (N=24/50)	8.4	1.8	2.1	0.2
All Respondents (N=50/100)				
	8.5	2.6	1.9	0.2

- Note :** 1. M= Mukhiya/ WM= Ward Member
2. The first value of N refers to Mukhiyas and the second value for the Ward Members

Table M 65 : Perception of Mukhiyas about Their Two Most Important Problems

Problems	Percentage Distribution of Mukhiyas by Problems Identified					
	Bhojpur (N=10)		Nalanda (N=10)		Begusarai (N=10)	
	First Problem	Second Problem	First Problem	Second Problem	First Problem	Second Problem
Lack of Importance for Mukhiya	—	10.0	10.0	10.0	—	—
Lack of Importance for Female Mukhiya	10.0	—	—	—	—	—
Lack of Participation of Elected Functionaries	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lack of Education / Knowledge	—	10.0	—	—	—	—
Inadequate Finance for PRI	10.0	10.0	20.0	40.0	10.0	
Lack of Cooperation of Govt. Officials	—	—	30.0	20.0	10.0	20.0

Management of Programmes	20.0	10.0	10.0	—	50.0	20.0
Public Grievance against Functionaries	—	—	20.0	—	10.0	—
No Financial Compensation for Work	—	—	—	—	—	—
Village Politics Guided by Self-Interest	10.0	20.0	10.0	10.0	—	—
Corruption	10.0	—	—	—	—	10.0
Others	40.0	40.0	—	20.0	20.0	50.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Saharsa (N=10)		Sitamarhi (N=10)		All Districts (N=50)	
Lack of Importance for Mukhiya	20.0	10.0	10.0	—	8.0	6.0
Lack of Importance for Female Mukhiya	—	30.0	—	—	2.0	6.0
Lack of Participation of Elected Functionaries	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lack of Education / Knowledge	—	10.0	—	—	—	4.0
Inadequate Finance for PRI	10.0	—	20.0	20.0	14.0	14.0
Lack of Cooperation of Govt. Officials	30.0	10.0	10.0	—	16.0	10.0
Management of Programmes	10.0	—	20.0	30.0	22.0	12.0
Public Grievance against Functionaries	10.0	10.0	—	—	8.0	2.0
No Financial Compensation for Work	20.0	—	—	10.0	4.0	2.0
Village Politics Guided by Self-Interest	—	30.0	40.0	—	12.0	12.0
Corruption	—	—	—	—	2.0	2.0
Others	—	—	—	40.0	12.0	30.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table M 66 : Perception of Ward Members about Their Two Most Important Problems

Problems	Percentage Distribution of Ward Members by Problems Identified					
	Bhojpur (N=20)		Nalanda (N=20)		Begusarai (N=20)	
	First Problem	Second Problem	First Problem	Second Problem	First Problem	Second Problem
Dominance by Mukhiya	10.0	10.0	40.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
Lack of Importance for Female Mukhiya	10.0	—	—	—	—	—
Lack of Participation of Elected Functionaries	—	—	10.0	20.0	—	—
Lack of Education / Knowledge	15.0	5.0	10.0	—	5.0	—
Inadequate Finance for PRI	—	—	10.0	10.0	—	—

Lack of Cooperation of Govt. Officials	5.0	—	5.0	—	—	—
Management of Programmes	25.0	15.0	15.0	10.0	25.0	5.0
Public Grievance against Functionaries	—	—	5.0	—	—	5.0
No Financial Compensation for Work	—	—	—	5.0	5.0	5.0
Village Politics Guided by Self-Interest	5.0	—	—	—	20.0	5.0
Corruption	—	—	—	—	—	—
Others	30.0	70.0	5.0	45.0	35.0	70.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Saharsa (N=20)		Sitamarhi (N=20)		All Districts (N=100)	
Dominance by Mukhiya	20.0	10.0	5.0	—	17.0	8.0
Lack of Importance for Female Mukhiya	5.0	—	—	—	3.0	—
Lack of Participation of Elected Functionaries	—	—	5.0	—	3.0	4.0
Lack of Education / Knowledge	10.0	5.0	5.0	—	9.0	2.0
Inadequate Finance for PRI	15.0	—	25.0	—	10.0	2.0
Lack of Cooperation of Govt. Officials	15.0	5.0	10.0	—	7.0	1.0
Management of Programmes	15.0	10.0	20.0	15.0	20.0	11.0
Public Grievance against Functionaries	5.0	—	—	—	2.0	1.0
No Financial Compensation for Work	5.0	10.0	—	5.0	2.0	5.0
Village Politics Guided by Self-Interest	5.0	5.0	30.0	—	12.0	2.0
Corruption	—	—	—	—	—	—
Others	5.0	55.0	—	80.0	15.0	64.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table M 67 : Identification by the Respondents of Three Major Problems Facing the Villages

Problems	Bhojpur (N= 30)				Nalanda (N=30)			
	Percentage of Respondents Reporting the Problem as				Percentage of Respondents Reporting the Problem as			
	Rank 1	Rank 2	Rank 3	Total	Rank 1	Rank 2	Rank 3	Total
Drinking Water	13.3	16.7	6.7	36.7	60.0	13.3	3.3	76.6
Connectivity of Village	20.0	13.3	—	33.3	13.3	10.0	6.7	30.0
Pucca Roads within Village	10.0	3.3	13.3	26.6	3.3	—	—	3.3
Electricity / Solar Light	10.0	26.7	30.0	66.7	—	13.3	6.7	20.0

Drainage	—	3.3	—	3.3	6.7	6.7	3.3	10.0
Irrigation Facilities	3.3	10.0	—	13.3	3.3	20.0	13.3	33.3
Education	3.3	3.3	13.3	19.9	—	—	10.0	10.0
Health	6.7	10.0	6.7	20.0	—	6.7	—	6.7
Functioning of GP	16.7	13.3	23.3	53.3	6.7	13.3	6.7	20.0
Attitude of Govt. Officials	—	—	—	—	3.3	—	—	3.3
Unemployment / Migration	—	—	3.3	3.3	—	—	—	—
	Begusarai (N=30)				Saharsa (N=30)			
Drinking Water	16.7	20.0	23.3	60.0	16.7	23.3	33.3	73.3
Connectivity of Village	10.0	30.0	10.0	50.0	23.3	10.0	23.3	56.6
Pucca Roads within Village	—	—	—	—	3.3	3.3	—	6.6
Electricity / Solar Light	13.3	26.7	20.0	60.0	10.0	20.0	6.7	36.7
Drainage	16.7	6.7	10.0	33.4	6.7	—	—	6.7
Irrigation Facilities	10.0	—	10.0	20.0	6.7	10.0	6.7	23.4
Education	3.3	3.3	13.3	19.9	3.3	—	6.7	10.0
Health	—	3.3	—	3.3	6.7	10.0	3.3	20.0
Functioning of GP	26.7	6.7	13.3	46.7	16.7	13.3	13.3	43.3
Attitude of Govt. Officials	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unemployment / Migration	—	3.3	—	3.3	6.7	3.3	—	10.0

(Continued)

Table M 67 : (Concluded)

Problems	Sitamarhi (N=30)				All Districts (N= 150)			
	Percentage of Respondents Reporting the Problem as				Percentage of Respondents Reporting the Problem as			
	Rank 1	Rank 2	Rank 3	Total	Rank 1	Rank 2	Rank 3	Total
Drinking Water	13.3	6.7	6.7	26.7	24.0	16.0	14.7	54.7
Connectivity of Village	6.7	20.0	16.7	43.4	14.7	16.7	11.3	42.7
Pucca Roads within Village	—	—	—	—	3.3	1.3	2.7	7.3
Electricity / Solar Light	36.7	16.7	13.3	66.7	14.0	20.7	15.3	50.0

Drainage	3.3	6.7	10.0	20.0	6.7	4.7	7.4	18.8
Irrigation Facilities	16.7	16.7	3.3	36.7	8.0	11.3	6.7	26.0
Education	—	3.3	10.0	13.3	2.0	2.0	10.7	14.7
Health	10.0	10.0	13.3	33.3	4.7	8.0	4.7	17.4
Functioning of GP	100.0	16.7	10.0	36.7	15.3	12.7	13.3	41.3
Attitude of Govt. Officials	—	—	—	—	0.7	—	—	0.7
Unemployment / Migration	3.3	—	—	3.3	2.0	1.3	0.7	4.0

Table M 68 : Perception of Respondents Regarding Person/Agency Responsible for Three Most Serious Problems

Plans for Recontesting	Percentage of Respondents Holding the Person or Agency Responsible for Different Problems					All Districts (N=150)
	Bhojpur (N=30)	Nalanda (N=30)	Begusarai (N=30)	Saharsa (N=30)	Sitamarhi (N=30)	
Most Serious Problem						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	16.7	56.7	16.7	33.3	23.3	29.3
Panchayat Samiti / Zilla Parishad	—	—	—	6.7	—	1.3

MLA / MP	6.7	—	—	10.0	—	3.3
BDO	16.7	10.0	20.0	10.0	3.3	12.0
Collector	—	6.7	—	13.3	6.7	5.3
No Response	60.0	26.7	63.3	26.7	66.7	48.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Second Most Serious Problem						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	26.7	52.0	16.7	21.4	24.1	27.5
Panchayat Samiti / Zilla Parishad	—	—	—	7.1	—	1.4
MLA / MP	6.7	—	—	17.8	—	4.9
BDO	3.3	8.0	10.0	3.6	3.4	5.6
Collector	—	—	—	3.6	10.3	2.8
No Response	63.3	40.0	73.3	46.4	62.1	57.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Third Most Serious Problem						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	17.2	33.3	13.3	42.8	34.6	27.3
Panchayat Samiti / Zilla Parishad	—	6.7	—	—	—	0.8
MLA / MP	3.4	20.0	—	17.8	—	7.0
BDO	6.9	—	10.0	14.3	—	7.0
Collector	—	—	—	3.6	3.8	1.6
No Response	72.4	40.0	76.7	21.4	61.5	56.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note : The problem that are 'Most Serious', 'Second Most Serious' and 'Third Most Serious' in different districts vary across the district (Please see Table 43.)

Table M 69 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Perception about Responsible Agency for Different Facilities.

Facility / Responsible Agency	Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Perception about Responsible Agency					
	Bhojpur (N=30)	Nalanda (N=30)	Begusarai (N=30)	Saharsa (N=30)	Sitamarhi (N=30)	All Districts (N=150)
Facility 1 : Road Inside Village						

<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	100.0	63.3	83.3	96.7	46.7	78.0
PS / ZP / State Government	—	26.7	16.7	—	43.3	17.3
MLA / MP	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	—	10.0	—	3.3	10.0	4.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Facility 2 : Streetlights in the Village						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	100.0	86.7	80.0	96.7	63.3	85.3
PS / ZP / State Government	—	3.3	16.7	—	20.0	8.0
MLA / MP	—	—	3.3	—	6.7	2.0
No Response	—	10.0	—	3.3	10.0	4.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Facility 3 : Anganwadi						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	36.7	80.0	73.3	70.0	60.0	64.0
PS / ZP / State Government	63.3	6.7	16.7	26.7	20.0	26.7
MLA / MP	—	—	3.3	—	3.3	1.3
No Response	—	13.3	6.7	3.3	16.7	8.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Facility 4 : Health Sub Centre in Village						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	10.0	13.3	50.0	60.0	23.3	31.3
PS / ZP / State Government	90.0	43.3	20.0	36.7	36.7	45.3
MLA / MP	—	10.0	—	—	3.3	2.7
No Response	—	33.3	30.0	3.3	36.7	20.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(Continued)

Table M 69: (Concluded)

Facility / Responsible Agency	<u>Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Perception about Responsible Agency</u>					
	Bhojpur (N=30)	Nalanda (N=30)	Begusarai (N=30)	Saharsa (N=30)	Sitamarhi (N=30)	All Districts (N=150)
Facility 5 : Primary School in Village						

<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	93.3	46.7	80.0	83.3	60.0	72.7
PS / ZP / State Government	6.7	30.0	13.3	13.3	23.3	17.3
MLA / MP	—	10.0	—	—	—	2.0
No Response	—	13.3	6.7	3.3	16.7	8.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Facility 6 : Drinking Water						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	96.7	86.7	86.7	26.7	66.7	72.7
PS / ZP / State Government	3.3	6.7	13.3	53.3	20.0	19.3
MLA / MP	—	—	—	16.7	3.3	4.0
No Response	—	6.7	—	3.3	10.0	4.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Facility 7 : Temple / Mosque in Village						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	3.3	46.7	93.3	3.3	73.3	44.0
PS / ZP / State Government	—	—	3.3	—	3.3	1.3
MLA / MP	—	—	—	—	3.3	0.7
CBO	83.3	13.3	3.3	66.7	—	33.3
Landlord	13.3	3.3	—	3.3	3.3	4.7
Other	—	20.0	—	23.3	6.7	10.0
No Response	—	16.7	—	3.3	10.0	6.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table M 70 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Perception about Quality of Facilities in Their Own Village.

Facility / Quality	Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Quality of Facilities					
	Bhojpur (N=30)	Nalanda (N=30)	Begusarai (N=30)	Saharsa (N=30)	Sitamarhi (N=30)	All Districts (N=150)
Facility 1 : Roads Inside Village						

<u>Better than next Village</u>	30.0	20.0	20.0	10.0	23.3	20.7
Same as next Village	63.3	43.3	63.3	43.3	43.3	51.3
Worse than next Village	3.3	30.0	13.3	43.3	20.0	22.0
No Response / Not Applicable	3.3	6.7	3.3	3.3	13.3	6.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Facility 2 : Streetlights in Village						
<u>Better than next Village</u>	13.3	20.0	26.7	6.7	26.7	18.7
Same as next Village	56.7	50.0	53.3	76.7	40.0	55.3
Worse than next Village	6.7	23.3	13.3	13.3	20.0	15.3
No Response / Not Applicable	23.3	6.7	6.7	3.3	13.3	10.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Facility 3 : Anganwadi						
<u>Better than next Village</u>	20.0	10.0	16.7	6.7	20.0	14.7
Same as next Village	76.7	60.0	70.0	80.0	56.3	68.0
Worse than next Village	3.3	20.0	3.3	3.3	6.7	7.3
No Response / Not Applicable	—	10.0	10.0	10.0	20.0	10.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Facility 4 : Health Sub Centre in Village						
<u>Better than next Village</u>	13.4	3.3	6.7	13.4	16.7	10.6
Same as next Village	50.0	36.7	46.6	63.3	36.7	46.7
Worse than next Village	3.3	13.4	16.7	6.7	6.7	9.3
No Response / Not Applicable	33.3	46.6	30.0	16.7	40.0	33.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(Continued)

Table M 70 : (Concluded)

Facility / Quality	Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Quality of Facilities					
	Bhojpur (N=30)	Nalanda (N=30)	Begusarai (N=30)	Saharsa (N=30)	Sitamarhi (N=30)	All Districts (N=150)
Facility 5 : Primary School in Village						
<u>Better than next Village</u>	20.0	23.3	26.7	20.0	23.3	22.7
Same as next Village	76.7	46.7	53.3	70.0	56.7	60.7
Worse than next Village	3.3	16.7	6.7	6.7	—	6.7
No Response / Not Applicable	—	13.3	13.3	3.3	20.0	10.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Facility 6 : Drinking Water in Village						
<u>Better than next Village</u>	23.3	26.7	16.7	6.7	23.4	19.3
Same as next Village	73.3	43.3	70.0	70.0	50.0	61.3
Worse than next Village	3.3	26.7	10.0	20.0	13.3	14.7
No Response / Not Applicable	—	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	4.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Facility 7 : Temple / Mosque in Village						
<u>Better than next Village</u>	26.7	16.7	20.0	13.3	30.0	21.3
Same as next Village	70.0	56.7	76.7	70.0	53.4	65.3
Worse than next Village	3.3	13.3	—	10.0	3.3	6.0
No Response / Not Applicable	—	13.3	3.3	6.7	13.3	7.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table M 71: Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Their Contribution to Working of Different Facilities.

Facility / Contribution	Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Type of Contribution					
	Bhojpur (N=30)	Nalanda (N=30)	Begusarai (N=30)	Saharsa (N=30)	Sitamarhi (N=30)	All Districts (N=150)
Facility 1 : Road Inside Village						
<u>Provided Cash</u>	—	—	3.3	—	—	0.7
Provided Material	3.3	—	—	—	—	0.7
Provided Labour	—	3.3	6.7	6.7	16.7	6.6
Provided Nothing	96.7	96.7	90.0	93.3	83.3	92.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Facility 2 : Streetlight in Village						
<u>Provided Cash</u>	—	—	3.3	—	—	0.7
Provided Material	—	—	3.3	—	—	0.7
Provided Labour	—	—	—	3.3	6.7	2.0
Provided Nothing	100.0	100.0	93.3	96.7	93.3	96.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Facility 3 : Anganwadi in Village						
<u>Provided Cash</u>	—	—	3.3	—	—	0.7
Provided Material	3.3	—	—	—	—	0.7
Provided Labour	—	—	—	—	—	—
Provided Nothing	96.7	100.0	96.7	100.0	100.0	98.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Facility 4 : Health Sub Centre in Village						
<u>Provided Cash</u>	3.3	—	—	—	—	0.7
Provided Material	—	—	—	—	—	—
Provided Labour	—	—	3.3	—	—	0.7
Provided Nothing	96.7	100.0	96.7	100.0	100.0	98.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(Continued)

Table M 71: (Concluded)

Facility / Contribution	Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Type of Contribution					
	Bhojpur (N=30)	Nalanda (N=30)	Begusarai (N=30)	Saharsa (N=30)	Sitamarhi (N=30)	All Districts (N=150)
Facility 5 : Primary School in Village						
<u>Provided Cash</u>	3.3	—	—	—	—	0.7
Provided Material	—	—	—	—	—	—
Provided Labour	—	—	3.3	3.3	3.3	2.0
Provided Nothing	96.7	100.0	96.9	96.7	96.7	97.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Facility 6 : Drinking Water in Village						
<u>Provided Cash</u>	3.3	—	—	—	—	0.7
Provided Material	—	—	—	—	—	—
Provided Labour	—	—	—	3.3	—	0.7
Provided Nothing	96.7	100.0	100.0	96.7	100.0	98.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Facility 7 : Temple / Mosque						
<u>Provided Cash</u>	10.0	6.7	3.3	43.3	13.3	15.3
Provided Material	3.3	—	3.3	—	3.3	2.0
Provided Labour	30.0	—	3.3	—	13.3	9.3
Provided Nothing	56.7	93.3	90.0	56.7	70.0	73.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(Continued)

Table M 72 : Information on Frequency of Different Types of Health Service in GPs.

Service / Frequency	Percentage of Respondents by Frequency of Services					
	Bhojpur (N=30)	Nalanda (N=30)	Begusarai (N=30)	Saharsa (N=30)	Sitamarhi (N=30)	All Districts (N=150)
Service 1 : Sanitary Inspection of Public Toilet						
<u>Never Done</u>	3.3	—	—	3.3	3.3	2.0
Less than One a Year	—	6.7	6.7	—	—	2.7
One a Year or More	13.3	—	—	—	3.3	3.3
Not Applicable	83.4	93.3	93.3	96.7	93.3	92.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 2 : Sanitary Inspection of Water Tank						
<u>Never Done</u>	—	—	—	—	—	—
Less than One a Year	3.3	10.0	—	—	—	4.7
One a Year or More	—	—	—	—	—	—
Not Applicable	96.7	90.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	97.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 3 : Cleaning of Irrigation Channels and Tanks						
<u>Never Done</u>	13.3	13.3	—	6.7	10.0	8.7
Less than One a Year	13.3	3.3	—	10.0	—	5.3
One a Year or More	23.4	10.0	—	—	—	6.7
Not Applicable	50.0	73.4	100.0	83.3	90.0	79.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 4 : Cleaning Water Accumulation						
<u>Never Done</u>	53.3	86.7	—	33.3	50.0	44.7
Less than One a Year	—	—	—	—	—	—
One a Year or More	10.0	—	—	—	—	2.0
Not Applicable	36.7	13.3	100.0	66.7	50.0	53.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(Continued)

Table M 72 : (Continued)

Service / Frequency	Percentage of Respondents by Frequency of Services					
	Bhojpur (N=30)	Nalanda (N=30)	Begusarai (N=30)	Saharsa (N=30)	Sitamarhi (N=30)	All Districts (N=150)
Service 5 : Spraying for mosquitoes						
<u>Never Done</u>	56.7	86.7	26.7	36.7	53.3	52.0
Less than One a Year	—	—	3.3	—	6.7	2.0
One a Year or More	6.7	—	13.3	3.3	3.3	5.3
Not Applicable	36.6	13.3	56.7	60.0	36.7	40.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 6 : Cleaning Streets / Roads						
<u>Never Done</u>	60.0	63.3	60.0	30.0	73.3	57.3
Less than One a Year	3.3	20.0	3.3	10.0	6.7	8.7
One a Year or More	—	3.3	6.7	—	3.3	2.7
Not Applicable	36.7	13.4	30.0	60.0	16.7	31.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 7 : Cleaning of Draing						
<u>Never Done</u>	60.0	63.3	26.7	30.0	56.7	47.3
Less than One a Year	—	13.3	—	3.3	—	3.3
One a Year or More	3.3	—	3.3	—	3.3	2.0
Not Applicable	36.7	23.3	70.0	66.7	40.0	47.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 8 : Cleaning of Garbage Sites						
<u>Never Done</u>	56.7	83.3	16.7	56.7	63.3	55.3
Less than One a Year	—	3.3	—	—	—	0.7
One a Year or More	3.3	—	—	6.7	—	2.0
Not Applicable	40.0	13.3	83.3	36.7	36.7	42.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(Continued)

Table M 72 : (Concluded)

Service / Frequency	Percentage of Respondents by Frequency of Services					
	Bhojpur (N=30)	Nalanda (N=30)	Begusarai (N=30)	Saharsa (N=30)	Sitamarhi (N=30)	All Districts (N=150)
Service 9 : Chlorination of drinking water						
<u>Never Done</u>	66.7	80.0	26.7	30.0	70.0	54.7
Less than One a Year	3.3	6.7	—	3.3	—	2.7
One a Year or More	6.7	3.3	—	6.7	—	3.3
Not Applicable	23.3	10.0	73.3	60.0	30.0	39.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 10 : Testing of drinking water						
<u>Never Done</u>	76.7	96.7	96.7	96.7	100.0	93.3
Less than One a Year	13.3	—	—	—	—	2.7
One a Year or More	10.0	3.3	3.3	3.3	—	4.0
Not Applicable	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 11 : Cleaning of drinking water						
<u>Never Done</u>	83.3	93.3	96.7	93.3	100.0	93.3
Less than One a Year	3.3	3.3	—	3.3	—	2.0
One a Year or More	13.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	—	4.7
Not Applicable	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 12 : Cleaning drinking water Tank / Channels						
<u>Never Done</u>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Less than One a Year	—	—	—	—	—	—
One a Year or More	—	—	—	—	—	—
Not Applicable	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table M 73 : Perception of Respondents about Responsible Agency for Different Health Services.

Service / Responsible Agency	Percentage of Respondents					
	Bhojpur (N=30)	Nalanda (N=30)	Begusarai (N=30)	Saharsa (N=30)	Sitamarhi (N=30)	All Districts (N=150)
Service 1 : Sanitary Inspection of Public Toilet						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	13.3	—	—	10.0	—	4.7
Higher Panchayats	—	3.3	—	—	—	0.7
State Government	56.7	76.7	93.3	53.3	90.0	74.0
Private Households	—	—	—	—	—	—
NGOs	23.3	—	6.7	—	—	6.0
No Response	6.7	20.0	—	36.7	10.0	14.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 2 : Sanitary Inspection of Water Tank						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	13.3	—	—	—	—	2.7
Higher Panchayats	—	3.3	—	—	—	0.7
State Government	76.7	76.7	100.0	56.7	90.0	80.0
Private Households	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	10.0	20.0	—	43.3	10.0	16.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 3 : Cleaning of Irrigation Channels / Tanks						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	30.0	3.3	—	70.0	—	20.7
Higher Panchayats	—	3.3	—	—	—	0.7
State Government	66.7	73.1	100.0	23.3	90.0	70.7
Private Households	—	—	—	—	—	—
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	3.3	20.0	—	6.7	10.0	8.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 4 : Cleaning Water Accumulation						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	26.7	3.3	—	—	—	6.0
Higher Panchayats	—	3.3	3.3	—	—	1.3
State Government	70.0	70.0	73.4	86.7	90.0	78.0
Private Households	—	—	3.3	—	—	0.7
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	3.3	23.4	20.0	13.3	10.0	14.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(Continued)

Table M 73 : (Continued)

Service / Responsible Agency	Percentage of Respondents					
	Bhojpur (N=30)	Nalanda (N=30)	Begusarai (N=30)	Saharsa (N=30)	Sitamarhi (N=30)	All Districts (N=150)
Service 5 : Spraying for Mosquitoes						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	6.7	—	16.7	6.7	10.0	8.0
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	90.0	60.0	73.3	83.3	80.0	77.3
Private Households	—	13.3	6.7	—	—	4.0
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	3.3	26.7	3.3	10.0	10.0	10.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 6 : Cleaning Streets Roads						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	20.0	36.7	43.3	70.0	33.3	40.7
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	73.3	43.3	50.0	13.3	56.7	47.3
Private Households	—	—	—	10.0	—	2.0
NGOs	—	—	3.3	—	—	0.7
No Response	6.7	20.0	3.3	6.7	10.0	9.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 7 : Cleaning of Draing						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	16.7	30.0	30.0	73.3	33.3	36.7
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	76.7	46.7	66.7	16.7	56.7	52.7
Private Households	—	—	—	6.7	—	1.3
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	6.7	23.3	3.3	3.3	10.0	9.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 8 : Cleaning of Garbage Rites						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	16.7	23.3	23.3	70.0	33.3	33.3
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	83.3	53.3	73.3	16.7	56.7	56.7
Private Households	—	—	—	10.0	—	2.0
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	—	23.3	3.3	3.3	10.0	8.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(Continued)

Table M 73 : (Concluded)

Service / Responsible Agency	Percentage of Respondents					
	Bhojpur (N=30)	Nalanda (N=30)	Begusarai (N=30)	Saharsa (N=30)	Sitamarhi (N=30)	All Districts (N=150)
Service 9 : Chlorination of Drinking Water						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	16.7	20.0	20.0	3.3	20.0	16.0
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	83.3	56.7	76.7	93.3	70.0	76.0
Private Households	—	—	—	—	—	—
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	—	23.3	3.3	3.3	10.0	8.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<u>Service 10 : Testing of Drinking Water</u>						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	10.0	16.7	26.7	—	10.0	12.7
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	83.3	60.0	70.0	96.7	80.0	78.0
Private Households	—	—	—	—	—	—
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	6.7	23.3	3.3	3.3	10.0	9.63
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 11 : Cleaning of Drinking Water						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	16.7	16.7	26.7	3.3	13.3	15.3
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	76.7	60.0	70.0	86.7	76.7	74.0
Private Households	—	—	—	6.7	—	1.3
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	6.7	23.3	3.3	3.3	10.0	9.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 12 : Cleaning of Drinking Water Tank / Channels						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	6.7	3.3	23.3	—	13.3	9.3
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	83.3	73.3	73.3	90.0	76.7	79.3
Private Households	—	—	—	—	—	—
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	10.0	23.3	3.3	10.0	10.0	11.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table M 74 : Perception of Respondents about Responsible Agencies for Selected Education, Health and Construction Related Activities.

Activity / Responsible Agency	Percentage of Respondents					
	Bhojpur (N=30)	Nalanda (N=30)	Begusarai (N=30)	Saharsa (N=30)	Sitamarhi (N=30)	All Districts (N=150)
Activity 1 : Education on Health						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	23.3	6.7	10.0	10.0	6.7	11.3
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	63.4	70.0	86.7	63.3	83.3	77.3
NGOs	10.0	—	—	—	—	2.0
No Response	3.3	23.3	3.3	6.7	10.0	9.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Activity 2 : Education on Sanitation						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	23.3	6.7	10.0	10.0	6.7	11.3
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	56.7	63.3	86.7	16.7	83.3	61.3
NGOs	13.3	6.7	—	66.7	—	17.3
No Response	6.7	23.3	3.3	6.7	10.0	10.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Activity 3 : Primary School						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	90.0	43.3	36.7	96.7	53.3	64.0
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	10.0	33.3	60.0	3.3	36.7	28.7
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	—	23.4	3.3	—	10.0	7.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(Continued)

Table M 74 : (Continued)

Activity / Responsible Agency	Percentage of Respondents					
	Bhojpur (N=30)	Nalanda (N=30)	Begusarai (N=30)	Saharsa (N=30)	Sitamarhi (N=30)	All Districts (N=150)
Activity 4 : Primary Health Centre (P.H.C.)						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	16.7	6.7	13.3	—	16.7	10.7
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	83.3	70.0	80.0	100.0	66.7	80.0
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	—	23.3	6.7	—	16.6	8.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Activity 5 : Hospital						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	—	—	—	—	—	—
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	100.0	73.3	93.3	96.7	80.0	88.7
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	—	26.7	6.7	3.3	20.0	11.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Activity 6 : Road Construction in GP						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	96.7	46.7	43.3	100.0	46.7	66.7
Higher Panchayats	3.3	—	—	—	—	0.7
State Government	—	33.3	53.3	—	40.0	25.3
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	—	20.0	3.3	—	13.3	7.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(Continued)

Table M 74 : (Concluded)

Activity / Responsible Agency	Percentage of Respondents					
	Bhojpur (N=30)	Nalanda (N=30)	Begusarai (N=30)	Saharsa (N=30)	Sitamarhi (N=30)	All Districts (N=150)
Activity 7 : Construction / Renovation of GP office						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	46.7	43.3	30.0	100.0	13.3	52.7
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	53.3	33.3	63.3	—	40.0	38.0
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	—	23.3	6.7	—	16.7	9.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Activity 8 : Watershed Building / Repair						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	—	3.3	3.3	16.7	—	4.7
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	96.7	70.0	93.3	83.3	70.0	82.7
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	3.3	26.7	3.3	—	30.0	12.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Activity 9 : Water Tank Construction						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	—	3.3	—	3.3	—	1.3
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	96.7	73.3	96.7	93.3	70.0	86.0
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	3.3	23.3	3.3	3.3	30.0	12.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table M 75 : Percentage of Respondents Reporting Action by GP in Last 12 Months for Different Health, Education and Construction Related Activities.

Activities	Percentage Respondents Reporting Activity in Last 12 Month					
	Bhojpur (N=30)	Nalanda (N=30)	Begusarai (N=30)	Saharsa (N=30)	Sitamarhi (N=30)	All Districts (N=150)
Sanitary inspection of public toilets	13.3	3.3	3.3	—	3.3	4.7
Sanitary inspection of water tank	—	3.3	—	—	—	0.7
Cleaning of irrigation channels tanks	33.3	10.0	—	6.7	—	10.0
Cleaning water accumulation	10.0	—	—	—	—	2.0
Spraying for mosquitoes	6.7	—	10.0	3.3	10.0	6.0
Cleaning streets / roads	3.3	16.7	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
Cleaning of drains	3.3	13.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	5.3
Cleaning of garbage sites	3.3	3.3	—	6.7	—	2.7
Chlorination of drinking water	10.0	3.3	—	6.7	—	4.0
Testing of drinking water	20.0	—	3.3	—	—	4.7
Cleaning of drinking water	16.7	3.3	3.3	—	—	4.7
Cleaning drinking water tanks / channels	—	—	—	—	—	—
Education on health	33.3	10.0	10.0	66.7	10.0	26.0
Education on Sanitation	30.0	3.3	6.7	66.7	—	21.3
Primary school	96.7	30.0	53.3	100.0	36.7	63.3
Primary Health Centre (PHC)	70.0	—	10.0	16.7	6.7	20.7
Hospital	—	—	—	—	—	—
Road construction in GP	93.3	56.7	30.0	96.7	36.7	62.7

Construction / renovation of GP office	40.0	6.7	16.7	23.3	20.0	21.3
Watershed building / repair	—	—	—	6.7	—	1.3
Water tank construction	—	—	—	—	—	—

Table S1 : Demographic Profile of Panchayat Sachivs

Characteristics	Districts					All Districts (N=49)
	Bhojpur (N=10)	Nalanda (N=10)	Begusarai (N=9)	Saharsa (N=10)	Sitamarhi (N=10)	
Percentage Distribution by Religion and Caste						
Upper Caste (H)	50.0	10.0	11.1	20.0	20.0	22.4
Backward Caste (H)	10.0	50.0	44.4	30.0	20.0	30.6
Extr. Backward Caste (H)	20.0	10.0	22.2	-----	-----	10.2
Scheduled Caste / ST (H)	20.0	30.0	22.2	50.0	60.0	36.7
Muslims	—	—	—	—	—	----
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Average Age (Years)						
	50.3	45.1	50.8	46.7	45.2	47.6
Percentage Distribution by years of Education						
Secondary	30.0	50.0	55.6	30.0	30.0	38.8
Above Secondary	70.0	50.0	44.4	70.0	70.0	61.2
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Percentage Distribution by Location of House						
SC/ST Hamlet	—	—	—	10.0	—	2.0
SC/ST Locality	—	10.0	—	—	10.0	4.1
Other Caste Locality	20.0	80.0	77.8	40.0	50.0	53.1
Hamlet away from main	80.0	10.0	22.2	50.0	40.0	40.8

village						
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Percentage Distribution by Residence						
Same as that of Mukhiya	—	—	11.1	—	—	2.0
Other village in GP	—	10.0	—	10.0	30.0	10.2
Outside in GP	100.0	90.0	88.9	90.0	70.0	87.7
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table S2 : Occupational Profile of Panchayat Sachivs

Characteristics	Districts					All Districts (N=49)
	Bhojpur (N=10)	Nalanda (N=10)	Begusarai (N=9)	Saharsa (N=10)	Sitamarhi (N=10)	
Percentage Distribution by Primary Occupation						
Agriculture	20.0	—	—	—	—	4.1
Animal Husbandry Fishing, etc	—	—	—	—	—	---
Casual Labour (Agr. Or Non Agr.)	—	—	—	—	—	---
Own Farm Enterprises (Dairy, Poultry, etc.)	—	—	—	—	—	---
Salaried Employment	80.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	95.9
Non Agr. Enterprises (Trade, Artisan's works, etc)	—	—	—	—	—	---
Other (Business, Contractor, Driver, Advocate, etc.)	—	—	—	—	—	---
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Percentage Distribution by Secondary Occupation						
Agriculture	80.0	100.0	77.8	70.0	70.0	79.6
Animal Husbandry Fishing, etc.	—	—	—	—	—	---
Casual Labour (Agr. Or Non Agr)	—	—	—	—	—	----
Own Farm Enterprises (Dairy, Poultry, etc.)	—	—	—	—	—	----

Salaried Employment	—	—	—	—	—	----
Non Agr. Enterprises (Trade, Artisan's works, etc)	—	—	—	10.0	-----	2.0
Other (Business, Contractor, Driver, Advocate, etc.)	—	—	—	—	—	----
No Secondary Occupation	20.0	—	22.2	20.0	30.0	18.4
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table S3 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Main Mode of Transportation

Characteristic of Respondents	Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs by Main Mode of Transportation							
	Own 2 wheeler	Bus	Cycle	Walking	Train	Public Tempo	Tum-Tum	Total
Districts								
Bhojpur (N=10)	30.0	20.0	30.0	—	—	20.0	—	100.0
Nalanda (N=10)	30.0	20.0	30.0	—	—	—	20.0	100.0
Begusarai (N=9)	11.1	22.2	55.5	—	11.1	—	—	100.0
Saharsa (N=10)	40.0	—	40.0	—	10.0	10.0	—	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=10)	60.0	—	10.0	20.0	10.0	—	—	100.0
Religion / Caste								
Upper Caste (H) (N=11)	18.2	—	63.6	9.1	9.1	—	—	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=15)	18.7	25.0	43.7	—	—	6.2	6.2	100.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=5)	50.0	50.0	—	—	—	—	—	100.0
Scheduled Caste / ST (H) (N=18)	55.6	—	11.1	5.5	11.1	11.1	5.5	100.0

Muslims	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
All Respondents (N=49)								
	34.7	12.2	32.6	4.1	6.1	6.1	4.1	100.0

Table S4 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Housing Pattern

Characteristic of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents Living in Self Owned House	Percentage of Respondents whose House was built under a govt. scheme
District		
Bhojpur (N=10)	30.0	33.3
Nalanda (N=10)	30.0	—
Begusarai (N=9)	44.4	75.0
Saharsa (N=10)	30.0	33.3
Sitamarhi (N=10)	60.0	—
Religion / Caste		
Upper Caste (H) (N=11)	45.4	—
Backward Caste (H) (N=15)	31.2	60.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=5)	50.0	—
Scheduled Caste / ST (H) (N=18)	38.9	28.6
Muslims	—	—

All Respondents (N=49)	38.8	10.2

Table S5 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Toilet Facilities in Their Dwelling

Characteristic of Respondents	Percentage of Panchayat Sachiv Using					Total
	Open Area	Private Toilet				
		Flush	Bowl / Bucket	Pit / Double Pit	Other	
District						
Bhojpur (N=10)	50.0	—	—	40.0	60.0	100.0
Nalanda (N=10)	—	50.0	40.0	10.0	—	100.0
Begusarai (N=9)	11.1	—	—	75.0	25.0	100.0
Saharsa (N=10)	—	—	—	30.0	70.0	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=10)	—	10.0	10.0	70.0	10.0	100.0
Religion / Caste						
Upper Caste (H) (N=11)	27.3	—	12.5	50.0	37.5	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=15)	6.2	26.7	6.7	40.0	26.7	100.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=5)	25.0	—	33.3	—	66.7	100.0
Scheduled Caste / ST (H) (N=18)	5.5	11.8	11.8	52.9	23.5	100.0

Muslims	—	—	—	—	—	—
All Respondents (N=49)	12.2	13.9	11.6	44.2	30.2	100.0

Table S6 : Information on Landholding of Panchayat Sachivs

Characteristic of Respondents	Percentage Owning Land	Average Amount of Land (acres)				Area Irrigated (acres)
		Owned	Leased In	Leased Out	Operational Land	
District						
Bhojpur (N=10)	80.0	5.4	0.0	1.0	4.4	2.7 (61.4)
Nalanda (N=10)	100.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	3.7	3.5 (94.6)
Begusarai (N=9)	78.8	1.7	0.0	0.0	1.7	1.7 (100.0)
Saharsa (N=10)	80.0	5.3	0.4	2.3	3.4	3.4 (100.0)
Sitamarhi (N=10)	70.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	3.1	3.1 (100.0)
Religion / Caste						
Upper Caste (H) (N=11)	90.1	6.9	0.0	1.9	5.0	5.0 (100.0)
Backward Caste (H) (N=15)	100.0	4.9	0.2	0.7	4.4	3.7 (84.1)
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=5)	75.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	1.3	1.3 (100.0)

Scheduled Caste / ST (H) (N=18)	61.1	1.8	0.0	0.0	1.8	1.8 (100.0)
Muslims	—	—	—	—	—	—
All Respondents (N=49)						
	81.6	3.9	0.1	0.7	3.3	3.2 (97.0)

Note : The bracket figure in last column indicates area irrigated as percentage of operational land.

Table S7 : Percentage Distribution of Landowning Panchayat Sachivs by Their Main Source of Irrigation

Characteristic of Respondents	Percentage of Landowning Panchayat by Main Source of Irrigation			
	Tube well	Canal	Others	Total
District				
Bhojpur (N=10)	50.0	50.0	—	100.0
Nalanda (N=10)	80.0	—	20.0	100.0
Begusarai (N=9)	100.0	—	—	100.0
Saharsa (N=10)	100.0	—	—	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=10)	100.0	—	—	100.0
Religion / Caste				
Upper Caste (H) (N=11)	80.0	20.0	—	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=15)	81.2	12.5	1.6	100.0

Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=5)	100.0	—	—	100.0
Scheduled Caste / ST (H) (N=18)	90.9	—	9.1	100.0
Muslims	—	—	—	—
All Respondents (N=49)	85.9	10.0	5.0	100.0

Table S8 : Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs Having Different Farm Implements and Livestock

Farm Implements/ Livestock	Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs Having					
	Bhojpur (N=10)	Nalanda (N=10)	Begusarai (9)	Saharsa (N=10)	Sitamarhi (N=10)	All Districts (N=49)
Farm Implements						
Ploughing Implements	10.0	20.0	—	40.0	30.0	20.4
Cart	—	—	—	10.0	20.0	6.1
Tractor	—	10.0	—	—	—	2.0
Thresher	—	30.0	—	10.0	—	8.2
Fodder Cutting Machine	30.0	40.0	11.1	30.0	10.0	24.5
Generator	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other Machineries	10.0	—	—	30.0	10.0	10.2

Pump for Irrigation		20.0	40.0	44.4	50.0	20.0	34.7
Livestock							
Cows / Buffaloes	P	70.0	40.0	44.4	60.0	40.0	51.0
	N	1.1	0.6	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.0
Goats / Sheep	P	—	—	—	—	—	—
	N						
<u>Poultry</u>	P	—	—	—	—	—	—
	N						

Note : P = Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs having Livestock

P = Number of Livestock

Table S9 : Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs Owning Different Household Assets

Household Assets	Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs Having					
	Bhojpur (N=10)	Nalanda (N=10)	Begusarai (9)	Saharsa (N=10)	Sitamarhi (N=10)	All Districts (N=49)
Ordinary Assets						
Charpoy / Bed	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Shoes	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<u>Pressure Cooker</u>	60.0	90.0	55.5	100.0	80.0	77.5
Fans	50.0	90.0	77.8	100.0	80.0	79.6
Bicycle	80.0	70.0	100.0	70.0	80.0	79.6

Pressure Lamps / Petroma	20.0	80.6	66.7	10.0	40.0	42.8
Watches / Clocks	90.0	90.0	100.0	100.0	90.0	93.9
<u>Sewing Machine</u>	40.0	20.0	66.7	70.0	10.0	40.8
Expensive Assets						
Radio / Cassette Player	40.0	80.0	77.8	80.0	80.0	71.4
Black/White Television	20.0	30.0	11.1	40.0	40.0	28.6
<u>Colour Television</u>	30.0	60.0	33.3	40.0	40.0	40.8
Motorcycle / Scooter / Moped	70.0	80.0	66.7	50.0	70.0	67.3
Refrigerator	10.0	20.0	—	—	—	6.1
Washing Machine	10.0	—	—	20.0	—	6.1
<u>Telephone</u>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	90.0	97.9
<u>Desert Cooler</u>	—	10.0	11.1	—	40.6	12.2

Table S10 : Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs who Correctly Named Important Political Functionaries

Characteristic of Respondents	Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs correctly naming Important Political Functionaries				
	MLA	MP	Chief Minister	Prime Minister	President
District					
Bhojpur (N=10)	100.0 (100.0)	100.0 (100.0)	100.0 (50.0)	100.0(90.0)	80.0 (90.0)
Nalanda (N=10)	100.0 (100.0)	100.0 (100.0)	100.0 (0.0)	100.0 (100.0)	100.0 (100.0)
Begusarai (N=9)	100.0 (88.9)	100.0 (88.9)	100.0 (11.1)	100.0 (100.0)	100.0 (100.0)
Saharsa (N=10)	90.0 (80.0)	90.0 (90.0)	100.0 (0.0)	100.0 (60.0)	80.0 (60.0)

Sitamarhi (N=10)	100.0 (100.0)	100.0 (80.0)	100.0 (10.0)	100.0 (100.0)	100.0 (100.0)
Religion / Caste					
Upper Caste (H) (N=11)	100.0 (90.9)	100.0 (100.0)	100.0 (27.3)	100.0 (100.0)	100.0 (100.0)
Backward Caste (H) (N=15)	100.0 (100.0)	100.0 (100.0)	100.0 (6.7)	100.0 (100.0)	93.7 (93.7)
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=5)	100.0 (100.0)	100.0 (100.0)	100.0 (0.0)	100.0 (100.0)	75.0 (75.0)
Scheduled Caste / ST (H) (N=18)	94.4 (88.9)	94.4 (77.8)	100.0 (16.7)	100.0 (72.2)	88.9 (83.3)
Muslims	—	—	—	—	—
All Respondents (N=49)					
All Respondents (N=49)	98.0(93.9)	98.0(91.8)	100.0(14.3)	100.0(89.8)	91.8(89.8)

Note : Figure in bracket indicate the percentage of respondents who has seen them in picture.

Table S11 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Knowledge about Statutory Requirement of Gram Sabha and General Body Meeting

Characteristic of Respondents	Gram Sabha Meeting			General Body Meeting			Total
	<u>Correct Response</u>	<u>Incorrect Response</u>	<u>No Response</u>	<u>Correct Response</u>	<u>Incorrect Response</u>	<u>No response</u>	
District							
Bhojpur (N=10)	80.0	20.0	—	20.0	80.0	—	100.0
Nalanda (N=10)	30.0	60.0	10.0	—	90.0	10.0	100.0
Begusarai (N=9)	33.3	44.4	22.2	—	77.8	22.2	100.0
Saharsa (N=10)	60.0	40.0	—	40.0	60.0	—	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=10)	20.0	80.0	—	10.0	90.0	—	100.0

Religion / Caste							
Upper Caste (H) (N=11)	45.4	54.5	—	36.4	63.6	—	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=15)	43.7	56.2	—	6.2	93.7	—	100.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=5)	75.0	—	25.0	—	75.0	25.0	100.0
Scheduled Caste / ST (H) (N=18)	38.9	50.0	11.1	11.1	77.8	11.1	100.0
Muslims	—	—	—	—	—	—	---
All Respondents (N=49)							
	44.9	49.0	6.1	14.3	79.6	6.1	100.0

Table S12 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Knowledge about NREGA Allocations

Characteristic of Respondents	NREGA Allocation Last Year			NREGA Allocation This Year			Total
	<u>Correct Response</u>	Incorrect Response	No Response	Correct Response	Incorrect Response	No response	
District							
Bhojpur (N=10)	20.0	—	80.0	—	20.0	80.0	100.0
Nalanda (N=10)	—	10.0	90.0	10.0	—	90.0	100.0
Begusarai (N=9)	—	11.1	88.9	11.1	—	88.9	100.0
Saharsa (N=10)	—	10.0	90.0	20.0	10.0	70.0	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=10)	30.0	30.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	60.0)	100.0

Religion / Caste							
Upper Caste (H) (N=11)	27.3	9.1	63.6	18.2	18.2	63.6	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=15)	6.2	6.2	87.5	6.2	6.2	87.5	100.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=5)	—	—	100.0	—	—	100.0	100.0
Scheduled Caste / ST (H) (N=18)	5.5	22.2	72.2	16.7	11.1	72.2	100.0
Muslims	—	—	—	—	—	—	----
All Respondents (N=49)	10.2	12.2	77.5	12.2	10.2	77.5	100.0

Table S13 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Knowledge about BRGF Allocations

Characteristic of Respondents	BRGF Allocation Last Year			BRGF Allocation This Year			Total
	<u>Correct</u> Response	<u>Incorrec</u> <u>t</u> Response	No Response	Correct Response	Incorrect Response	No Response	
District							
Bhojpur (N=10)	10.0	90.0	—	80.0	20.0	—	100.0
Nalanda (N=10)	50.0	20.0	30.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	100.0
Begusarai (N=9)	11.1	66.7	22.2	—	77.8	22.2	100.0
Saharsa (N=10)	20.0	70.0	10.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=10)	20.0	70.0	10.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	100.0

Religion / Caste							
Upper Caste (H) (N=11)	18.2	72.7	9.1	36.4	63.6	—	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=15)	18.7	68.7	12.5	31.2	43.7	25.0	100.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=5)	25.0	75.0	—	50.0	50.0	—	100.0
Scheduled Caste / ST (H) (N=18)	27.8	50.0	22.2	27.8	38.9	33.3	100.0
Muslims	—	—	—	—	—	—	----
All Respondents (N=49)	22.4	63.3	14.3	32.6	46.9	20.4	100.0

Table S14 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Knowledge about FC12 Allocations

Characteristic of Respondents	FC12 Allocation Last Year			FC12 Allocation This Year			Total
	Correct Response	Incorrect Response	No Response	Correct Response	Incorrect Response	No response	
<u>District</u>							
Bhojpur (N=10)	70.0	30.0	—	80.0	20.0	—	100.0
Nalanda (N=10)	70.0	30.0	—	40.0	40.0	20.0	100.0
Begusarai (N=9)	22.2	55.5	22.2	22.2	55.5	22.2	100.0
Saharsa (N=10)	70.0	20.0	10.0	20.0	70.0	10.0	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=10)	50.0	40.0	10.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	100.0

Religion / Caste							
Upper Caste (H) (N=11)	54.5	45.4	—	45.4	54.5	—	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=15)	62.5	31.2	6.2	31.2	50.0	18.7	100.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=5)	25.0	75.0	—	25.0	75.0	—	100.0
Scheduled Caste / ST (H) (N=18)	61.1	22.2	16.7	44.4	33.3	22.2	100.0
Muslims	—	—	—	—	—	—	----
All Respondents (N=49)							
	57.1	34.7	8.1	38.8	46.9	14.3	100.0

Table S15 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Knowledge and Uses of RTI

Characteristic of Respondents	Percentage of Panchayat Sachiv				Newspaper reading by Respondents (avg. days/week)
	Heard about RTI	Knows Correctly about RTI	Have tried to use it	Know someone who has tried to use it	
District					
Bhojpur (N=10)	100.0	80.0	30.0	50.0	6.2
Nalanda (N=10)	100.0	80.0	60.0	80.0	6.3
Begusarai (N=9)	88.9	88.9	66.7	55.5	6.6

Saharsa (N=10)	100.0	90.0	—	90.0	5.5
Sitamarhi (N=10)	100.0	60.0	60.0	90.0	5.9
Religion / Caste					
Upper Caste (H) (N=11)	100.0	90.9	36.3	63.6	6.6
Backward Caste (H) (N=15)	100.0	87.5	56.2	87.5	5.8
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=5)	100.0	75.0	25.0	50.0	5.7
Scheduled Caste / ST (H) (N=18)	94.4	66.7	38.9	72.2	6.1
Muslims	—	—	—	—	—
All Respondents (N=49)					
	97.9	79.6	42.8	73.5	6.1

Table S16 : Decision Making Process in Gram Panchayat as Reported by Panchayat Sachivs

Characteristic of Respondents	Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs Reporting Decision Maker to be						Total
	Mukhiya	Mukhiya Spouse / Family Member	GP Secretary	Ward Members	PS/ZP Officials	Others	
District							
Bhojpur (N=10)	90.0	—	—	—	—	10.0	100.0
Nalanda (N=10)	100.0	—	—	—	—	—	100.0
Begusarai (N=9)	100.0	—	—	—	—	—	100.0

Saharsa (N=10)	50.0	40.0	—	—	—	10.0	100.0
Sitamarhi (N=10)	90.0	10.0	—	—	—	—	100.0
Religion / Caste							
Upper Caste (H) (N=11)	81.8	18.2	—	—	—	—	100.0
Backward Caste (H) (N=15)	75.0	18.7	—	—	—	6.2	100.0
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=5)	100.0	—	—	—	—	—	100.0
Scheduled Caste / ST (H) (N=18)	94.4	—	—	—	—	5.5	100.0
Muslims	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
All Respondents (N=49)							
	85.7	10.2	—	—	—	4.1	100.0

Table S17 : Frequency of Social Audit Forum as Reported by Panchayat Sachivs

Characteristic of Respondent	How often are social audit forums held in this GP?						Indication of Attendance	
	Every Six months	Once a year	Less than once a year	Never	No response	All	A	B
District								
Bhojpur (N=10)	—	10.0	—	90.0	—	100.0	10.0	47
Nalanda (N=10)	—	10.0	10.0	80.0	—	100.0	20.0	235
Begusarai (N=9)	—	—	11.1	88.9	—	100.0	11.1	194
Saharsa (N=10)	—	10.0	—	90.0	—	100.0	10.0	154
Sitamarhi (N=10)	10.0	—	—	90.0	—	100.0	10.0	154

All Respondents (N=49)	2.0	6.1	4.1	87.8	—	100.0	12.2	156
-------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	------	---	-------	------	-----

Note : A = Percentage of respondents who or their family members ever attended a forum

B = Average attendance in a meeting

Table S18 : Information about Attendance of Panchayat Sachivs in Gram Sabha

Characteristic of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents who have ever attended Gram Sabha	No of Gram Sabha Meetings Attended last Year
District		
Bhojpur (N=10)	100.0	2.8
Nalanda (N=10)	100.0	4.8
Begusarai (N=9)	100.0	3.7
Saharsa (N=10)	100.0	3.2
Sitamarhi (N=10)	100.0	3.6
Religion / Caste		
Upper Caste (H) (N=11)	100.0	4.4
Backward Caste (H) (N=15)	100.0	4.2
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=5)	100.0	3.2
Scheduled Caste / ST (H) (N=18)	100.0	2.7
Muslims	—	—
All Respondents (N=49)		
	100.0	3.6

Table S19 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Attendance in Any Village Meeting in Last One Year

Characteristic of Respondents	Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs who have attended							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
District								
Bhojpur (N=10)	10.0	70.0	80.0	—	100.0	90.0	—	—
Nalanda (N=10)	10.0	40.0	80.0	—	100.0	40.0	—	—
Begusarai (N=9)	33.3	44.4	100.0	—	100.0	88.9	—	—
Saharsa (N=10)	—	50.0	70.0	11.1	100.0	70.0	0.0	0.0
Sitamarhi (N=10)	50.0	40.0	100.0	—	100.0	80.0	20.0	10.0
Religion / Caste								
Upper Caste (H) (N=11)	9.1	54.5	90.9	—	100.0	81.8	9.1	9.1
Backward Caste (H) (N=15)	12.5	43.7	93.7	—	100.0	81.2	12.5	6.2
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=5)	50.0	100.0	100.0	—	100.0	75.0	—	—
Scheduled Caste/ ST (H) (N=18)	27.8	38.9	72.2	5.6	100.0	61.1	—	—
Muslims	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
All Respondents (N=49)								
	20.4	49.0	85.7	(2.0	100.0	73.5	6.1	4.1

Note : A = Traditional Panchayat Meeting / B = Meeting organized by GP / C = Meeting organized by BDO or Other state official / D = Meeting organized by NGO / E = Gram Sabha / F = Aam Sabha / G = Have attended but do not remember the meeting / H = Not Attended any Village Meeting.

Table S20 : Location of Gram Sabha Meetings as Reported by Panchayat Sachivs

Location	Bhojpur (N=10)	Nalanda (N=10)	Begusarai (N=9)	Saharsa (N=10)	Sitamarhi (N=10)	All Districts (N=49)
Percentage of Respondent Reporting the Location of Gram Sabha Meeting at						
Community / Other Hall	20.0	20.0	—	10.0	—	10.2
Panchayat Bhawan	40.0	50.0	55.5	60.0	60.0	53.0
Mukhiya House (front)	10.0	—	—	—	10.0	4.0
Any Government Building	30.0	10.0	33.3	30.0	20.0	24.5
Other	—	20.0	11.1	—	10.0	8.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table S21 : Extent of Interaction Between Administrative/Political Functionaries and Panchayat Sachivs

Item	Bhojpur (N=10)	Nalanda (N=10)	Begusarai (N=9)	Saharsa (N=10)	Sitamarhi (N=10)	All District (N=49)
Percentage of Respondents who have Ever Tried to Meet						
PS Pramukh	90.0	80.0	88.9	100.0	90.0	89.8
ZP Adhyaksha	20.0	10.0	22.2	60.0	40.0	30.6
BDO	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
District Magistrate	60.0)	10.0	66.7	60.0	100.0	59.2
MLA	50.0	20.0	55.5	30.0	50.0	40.8
Percentage of Respondents who Succeeded in Meeting						
PS Pramukh	90.0	80.0	88.9	100.0	90.0	89.8
ZP Adhyaksha	20.0	10.0	22.2	60.0	40.0	30.6
BDO	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
District Magistrate	60.0	10.0	66.7	60.0	90.0	57.1
MLA	50.0	20.0	55.5	30.0	50.0	40.8
Percentage of Respondents whose Request was Granted by						
PS Pramukh	90.0	80.0	88.9	100.0	80.0	87.7
ZP Adhyaksha	20.0	10.0	22.2	50.0	40.0	28.6
BDO	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
District Magistrate	60.0	10.0	66.7	60.0	90.0	57.1
MLA	50.0	20.0	55.5	30.0	40.0	38.8

Table S22 : Information on Frequency of Visits by Panchayat Sachivs to Block Headquarters and ZP Headquarters

Characteristic of Respondents	Av. No. of Visits per Month to		Avg. Amount spent in Transportation per month
	Block Headquarters	ZP Headquarters	
District			
Bhojpur (N=10)	11.9	0.2	13.5
Nalanda (N=10)	4.5	1.0	24.5
Begusarai (N=9)	3.9	0.3	23.1
Saharsa (N=10)	8.9	3.2	29.2
Sitamarhi (N=10)	4.3	0.4	40.6
Religion / Caste			
Upper Caste (H) (N=11)	7.7	1.1	11.8
Backward Caste (H) (N=15)	5.6	0.6	20.6
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=5)	13.7	0.0	25.7
Scheduled Caste / ST (H) (N=18)	5.6	1.1	40.2
Muslims	—	—	—
All Respondents (N=49)			
	6.8	0.9	26.2

Table S23 : Information on Work Pattern of Panchayat Sachiv

Characteristic of Respondents	Indicators of Work Pattern						
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
District							
Bhojpur (N=10)	2.0	12.6	15.2	34.0	34.0	2.5	2.5
Nalanda (N=10)	1.6	13.0	17.4	30.9	35.5	3.5	1.5
Begusarai (N=9)	2.0	8.3	26.6	31.7	46.7	3.1	1.9
Saharsa (N=10)	1.4	11.8	7.8	30.3	34.5	4.2	0.8
Sitamarhi (N=10)	1.2	19.7	6.4	24.0	46.5	4.3	0.7
Religion / Caste							
Upper Caste (H) (N=11)	1.7	13.4	8.6	26.4	48.6	3.1	1.9
Backward Caste (H) (N=15)	1.9	12.0	14.8	38.9	36.4	3.1	1.9
Extr. Backward Caste (H) (N=5)	2.0	14.0	36.0	41.2	27.5	2.5	2.5
Scheduled Caste / ST (H) (N=18)	1.2	13.9	12.8	22.2	37.7	3.4	1.6
Muslims	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
All Respondents (N=49)	1.6	13.2	14.4	30.1	37.0	3.5	1.5

Note : A = Average No. of GPs responsible for / B = Distance between GP headquarters and residence for first GP (Kms.) / C = Distance for 2nd GP (Kms.) / D = Average time required to reach GP headquarter (minutes) / E = Time required for 2nd GP (minutes) / F = Average No. of days spent in the GP in a week for 1st GP / G = Average No. of days spent in GP in week for 2nd GP.

Table S24 : Perception of Panchayat Sachivs by their Perception about Their Two Most Important Problems

Problems	Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachiv by Problems Identified					
	Bhojpur (N=10)		Nalanda (N=10)		Begusarai (N=9)	
	First Problem	Second Problem	First Problem	Second Problem	First Problem	Second Problem
Lack of Office Building	—	—	—	—	—	—
Excessive Load of Work	40.0	—	50.0	20.0	88.9	11.1
Lack of Local Transportation Facility	—	—	10.0	—	—	—
Lack of Training	10.0	—	—	—	—	—
Effective Management of Programmes	20.0	10.0	—	—	—	—
Financial Management of Funds	—	—	—	10.0	—	—
Lack of Experience of Mukhiya	—	—	—	—	—	—
Dominance of Elected Functionaries	—	—	10.0	20.0	—	22.2
Indecent Behaviour of Officials	—	—	10.0	10.0	—	—
Unreasonable Demand of People	10.0	—	—	—	—	—
Others	20.0	90.0	20.0	40.0	11.1	66.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Saharsa (N=10)		Sitamarhi (N=10)		All Districts (N=49)	
Lack of Office Building	—	—	10.0	10.0	20.0	2.0
Excessive Load of Work	10.0	10.0	20.0	10.0	40.8	10.2
Lack of Local Transportation Facility	—	—	10.0	—	4.1	—
Lack of Training	10.0	—	10.0	—	6.1	—
Effective Management of Programmes	30.0	30.0	—	10.0	10.2	10.2
Financial Management of Funds	—	—	—	—	—	2.0
Lack of Experience of Mukhiya	30.0	—	—	—	6.1	—
Dominance of Elected Functionaries	—	—	—	—	2.0	8.2
Indecent Behaviour of Officials	—	—	—	—	2.0	2.0
Unreasonable Demand of People	—	—	10.0	—	4.1	—
Others	20.0	60.0	10.0	70.0	16.4	65.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table S25 : Identification by Panchayat Sachivs of Three Major Problems in Their Villages

	Bhojpur (N=10)	Nalanda (N=10)
Problems		

	Percentage of Respondents Reporting the Problem as				Percentage of Respondents Reporting the Problem as			
	Rank 1	Rank 2	Rank 3	Total	Rank 1	Rank 2	Rank 3	Total
Drinking Water	20.0	10.0	10.0	40.0	70.0	20.0	—	90.0
Connectivity of Village	10.0	10.0	10.0	30.0	10.0	30.0	—	40.0
Lack / Timeliness of Fund	—	—	—	—	20.0	—	—	20.0
Electricity / Solar Light	10.0	40.0	40.0	90.0	—	20.0	20.0	40.0
Drainage	—	—	10.0	10.0	—	—	—	—
Irrigation Facilities	10.0	—	—	10.0	—	—	—	—
Education	—	20.0	—	20.0	—	—	—	—
Health	—	10.0	10.0	20.0	—	—	—	—
Functioning of GP	50.0	—	—	50.0	—	10.0	10.0	20.0
	Begusarai (N=9)				Saharsa (N=10)			
Drinking Water	11.1	11.1	22.2	44.4	10.0	10.0	—	20.0
Connectivity of Village	—	—	11.1	11.1	—	—	—	—
Lack / Timeliness of Fund	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Electricity / Solar Light	11.1	44.4	11.1	66.6	20.0	—	—	20.0
Drainage	22.2	—	11.1	33.3	10.0	—	—	10.0
Irrigation Facilities	—	11.1	22.2	33.3	—	—	—	—
Education	33.3	11.1	11.1	55.5	10.0	—	—	10.0
Health	11.1	—	—	11.1	10.0	—	—	10.0
Functioning of GP	11.1	11.1	—	22.2	10.0	30.0	10.0	50.0

(Continued)

Table S25 : (Concluded)

Problems	Sitamarhi (N=10)				All Districts (N=49)			
	Percentage of Respondents Reporting the Problem as				Percentage of Respondents Reporting the Problem as			
	Rank 1	Rank 2	Rank 3	Total	Rank 1	Rank 2	Rank 3	Total
Drinking Water	—	10.0	10.0	20.0	22.4	12.2	8.0	42.6
Connectivity of Village	—	—	10.0	10.0	4.1	8.2	6.1	18.4
Lack / Timeliness of Fund	—	—	—	—	4.1	—	—	4.1
Electricity / Solar Light	20.0	30.0	30.0	80.0	12.2	26.5	20.4	59.1
Drainage	—	—	10.0	10.0	6.1	—	6.1	12.2
Irrigation Facilities	40.0	20.0	10.0	70.0	10.2	6.1	6.1	22.4
Education	10.0	20.0	—	30.0	10.2	10.2	2.0	22.4
Health	10.0	—	—	10.0	6.1	2.0	2.0	10.1
Functioning of GP	20.0	10.0	10.0	40.0	18.4	12.2	6.1	36.9

Table S26 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Perception about Quality of Facilities in Their Own Village

Facility / Quality	Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs					
	Bhojpur (N=10)	Nalanda (N=10)	Begusarai (9)	Saharsa (N=10)	Sitamarhi (N=10)	All Districts (N=49)
Facility 1 : Roads Inside Village						
<u>Better than next Village</u>	40.0	20.0	22.2	10.0	20.0	22.4
Same as next Village	50.0	60.0	55.5	90.0	70.0	65.3
Worse than next Village	10.0	10.0	11.1	—	10.0	8.2
No Response / Not Applicable	—	10.0	11.1	—	—	4.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Facility 2 : Streetlights in Village						
<u>Better than next Village</u>	20.0	30.0	33.3	10.0	20.0	22.4
Same as next Village	60.0	70.0	44.4	90.0	80.0	69.4
Worse than next Village	—	—	11.1	—	—	2.0
No Response / Not Applicable	20.0	—	11.1	—	—	6.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Facility 3 : Anganwadi						
<u>Better than next Village</u>	20.0	—	22.2	10.0	10.0	12.2
Same as next Village	80.0	90.0	44.4	90.0	60.0	73.5
Worse than next Village	—	—	22.2	—	10.0	6.1
No Response / No Applicable	—	10.0	11.1	—	20.0	8.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Facility 4 : Health Sub Centre in Village						
<u>Better than next Village</u>	10.0	—	11.1	10.0	—	6.1
Same as next Village	80.0	50.0	55.5	90.0	50.0	65.3
Worse than next Village	—	—	22.2	—	10.0	6.1

No Response / Not Applicable	10.0	50.0	11.1	—	40.0	22.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(Continued)

Table S26 : (Concluded)

Facility / Quality	Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs					
	Bhojpur (N=10)	Nalanda (N=10)	Begusarai (9)	Saharsa (N=10)	Sitamarhi (N=10)	All Districts (N=49)
Facility 5 : Primary School in Village						
<u>Better than next Village</u>	20.0	—	44.4	10.0	30.0	20.4
Same as next Village	80.0	70.0	33.3	90.0	70.0	69.4
Worse than next Village	—	20.0	11.1	—	—	6.1
No Response / Not Applicable	—	10.0	11.1	—	—	4.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Facility 6 : Drinking Water in Village						
<u>Better than next Village</u>	20.0	20.0	11.1	10.0	10.0	14.3
Same as next Village	80.0	80.0	55.5	80.0	90.0	77.5
Worse than next Village	—	—	22.2	10.0	—	6.1
No Response / Not Applicable	—	—	11.1	—	—	2.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Facility 7 : Temple / Mosque in Village						
<u>Better than next Village</u>	20.0	10.0	33.3	10.0	20.0	18.4
Same as next Village	80.0	80.0	55.5	80.0	80.0	75.5
Worse than next Village	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response / Not Applicable	—	10.0	11.1	10.0	—	6.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table S27 : Information on Frequency of Different Types of Health Service in GPs as Reported by Panchayat Sachivs

Service / Frequency	Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs					
	Bhojpur (N=10)	Nalanda (N=10)	Begusarai (9)	Saharsa (N=10)	Sitamarhi (N=10)	All Districts (N=49)
Service 1 : Sanitary Inspection of Public Toilet						
<u>Never Done</u>	—	—	—	—	—	—
Less than One a Year	—	—	—	—	—	—
One a Year or More	10.0	—	—	—	—	2.0
Not Applicable	90.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 2 : Sanitary Inspection of Water Tank						
<u>Never Done</u>	—	—	—	—	—	—
Less than One a Year	—	—	—	—	—	—
One a Year or More	—	—	—	—	—	—
Not Applicable	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 3 : Clearing of Irrigation Channels and Tanks						
<u>Never Done</u>	30.0	—	—	—	30.0	12.2
Less than One a Year	20.0	10.0	—	—	—	6.1
One a Year or More	20.0	10.0	—	—	—	6.1
Not Applicable	30.0	80.0	100.0	100.0	70.0	75.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 4 : Clearing Water Accumulation						
<u>Never Done</u>	20.0	100.0	11.1	—	30.0	32.6
Less than One a Year	20.0	—	—	100.0	—	24.5

One a Year or More	—	—	11.1	—	—	2.0
Not Applicable	60.0	—	77.8	—	70.0	48.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(Continued)

Table S27 : (Continued)

Service / Frequency	Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs					
	Bhojpur (N=10)	Nalanda (N=10)	Begusarai (9)	Saharsa (N=10)	Sitamarhi (N=10)	All Districts (N=49)
Service 5 : Spraying for Mosquitoes						
<u>Never Done</u>	90.0	100.0	100.0	90.0	90.0	93.9
Less than One a Year	—	—	—	10.0	10.0	4.1
One a Year or More	10.0	—	—	—	—	2.0
Not Applicable	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 6 : Cleaning Streets / Roads						
<u>Never Done</u>	100.0	60.0	100.0	100.0	90.0	89.8
Less than One a Year	—	40.0	—	—	10.0	10.2
One a Year or More	—	—	—	—	—	—
Not Applicable	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 7 : Cleaning of Drains						
<u>Never Done</u>	60.0	70.0	100.0	90.0	30.0	69.4
Less than One a Year	10.0	30.0	—	—	10.0	10.2
One a Year or More	—	—	—	—	—	—
Not Applicable	30.0	—	—	10.0	60.0	20.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 8 : Cleaning of Garbage Sites						
<u>Never Done</u>	40.0	80.0	66.7	90.0	30.0	61.2
Less than One a Year	10.0	10.0	—	—	—	4.1

One a Year or More	10.0	—	—	—	—	2.0
Not Applicable	40.0	10.0	33.3	10.0	70.0	32.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(Continued)

Table S27 : (Concluded)

Service / Frequency	Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs					
	Bhojpur (N=10)	Nalanda (N=10)	Begusarai (9)	Saharsa (N=10)	Sitamarhi (N=10)	All Districts (N=49)
Service 9 : Chlorination of Drinking Water						
<u>Never Done</u>	100.0	90.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	97.9
Less than One a Year	—	10.0	—	—	—	2.0
One a Year or More	—	—	—	—	—	—
Not Applicable	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 10 : Testing of Drinking Water						
<u>Never Done</u>	80.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.0
Less than One a Year	10.0	—	—	—	—	2.0
One a Year or More	10.0	—	—	—	—	2.0
Not Applicable	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 11 : Cleaning of Drinking Water						
<u>Never Done</u>	90.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	97.9
Less than One a Year	10.0	—	—	—	—	2.0
One a Year or More	—	—	—	—	—	—
Not Applicable	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 12 : Cleaning of Drinking Water Tanks / Channels						

<u>Never Done</u>	—	—	—	—	—	—
Less than One a Year	—	—	—	10.0	—	2.0
One a Year or More	—	—	—	—	—	—
Not Applicable	100.0	100.0	100.0	90.0	100.0	97.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table S28 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Perception Regarding Person/Agency Responsible for Different Problems

Responsible Person / Agency	Percentage of Respondents Holding the Person or Agency Responsible for Different Problems					
	Bhojpur (N=10)	Nalanda (N=10)	Begusarai (N=9)	Saharsa (N=10)	Sitamarhi (N=10)	All Districts (N=49)
Most Serious Problem						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	10.0	70.0	----	10.0	----	18.4
Other Govt. Officials	80.0	20.0	77.8	70.0	80.0	65.3
MLA / MP	----	----	11.1	----	10.0	4.1
BDO	----	10.0	----	20.0	----	6.1
Collector	10.0	----	----	----	10.0	4.1
No Response	----	----	11.1	----	----	2.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Second Most Serious Problem						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	10.0	30.0	----	10.0	20.0	14.3
Other Govt. Officials	80.0	20.0	66.7	40.0	60.0	53.1
MLA / MP	----	10.0	11.1	----	10.0	6.1
BDO	----	20.0	----	----	----	4.1
Collector	----	----	11.1	----	----	2.0
No Response	10.0	20.0	11.1	50.0	10.0	20.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Third Most Serious Problem						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	10.0	10.0	11.1	----	30.0	12.2
Other Govt. Officials	60.0	10.0	66.7	20.0	30.0	36.7
MLA / MP	10.0	10.0	11.1	----	10.0	44.4

BDO	----	----	----	----	10.0	2.0
Collector	----	----	----	----	----	----
No Response	20.0	70.0	11.1	80.0	20.0	40.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note : Most, Second Most and Third Most serious problems vary across the districts (please see Table 18)

Table S29 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Perception about Responsible Agency for Different Facilities

Facility / Responsible Agency	<u>Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Perception about Responsible Agency</u>					
	Bhojpur (N=10)	Nalanda (N=10)	Begusarai (N=9)	Saharsa (N=10)	Sitamarhi (N=10)	All Districts (N=49)
Facility 1 : Road Inside Village						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	100.0	50.0	88.9	100.0	80.0	83.7
PS / ZP / State Government	—	40.0	—	—	20.0	12.2
No Response	—	10.0	11.1	—	—	4.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Facility 2 : Streetlights in the Village						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	80.0	80.0	88.9	100.0	100.0	89.8
PS / ZP / State Government	—	20.0	—	—	—	4.1
No Response	20.0	—	11.1	—	—	6.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Facility 3 : Anganwadi						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	50.0	90.0	88.9	50.0	70.0	69.4
PS / ZP / State Government	50.0	—	—	50.0	10.0	22.4
No Response	—	10.0	11.1	—	20.0	8.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Facility 4 : Health Sub Centre in Village						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	40.0	10.0	88.9	30.0	20.0	36.7
PS / ZP / State Government	50.0	40.0	—	70.0	40.0	40.8
No Response	10.0	50.0	11.1	—	40.0	22.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(Continued)

Table S29 : (Concluded)

Facility / Responsible Agency	Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Perception about Responsible Agency					
	Bhojpur (N=10)	Nalanda (N=10)	Begusarai (N=9)	Saharsa (N=10)	Sitamarhi (N=10)	All Districts (N=49)
Facility 5 : Primary School in Village						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	100.0	50.0	88.9	100.0	60.0	79.6
PS / ZP / State Government	—	40.0	—	—	40.0	16.3
No Response	—	10.0	11.1	—	—	4.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Facility 6 : Drinking Water						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	90.0	90.0	88.9	100.0	70.0	87.7
PS / ZP / State Government	10.0	10.0	—	—	30.0	10.2
No Response	—	—	11.1	—	—	2.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Facility 7 : Temple / Mosque in Village						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	—	—	88.9	40.0	50.0	34.7
PS / ZP / State Government	—	—	—	—	—	—
CBO	90.0	50.0	—	60.0	40.0	49.0
Landlord	10.0	—	—	—	—	2.0
Other	—	40.0	—	—	10.0	10.2

No Response	—	10.0	11.1	—	—	4.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table S30 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Perception about Responsible Agency for Different Health Services

Service / Responsible Agency	Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs					
	Bhojpur (N=10)	Nalanda (N=10)	Begusarai (9)	Saharsa (N=10)	Sitamarhi (N=10)	All Districts (N=49)
Service 1 : Sanitary Inspection of Public Toilet						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	—	10.0	—	—	—	2.0
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	70.0	90.0	88.9	100.0	100.0	89.8
NGOs	30.0	—	—	—	—	6.1
Others/ No Response	—	—	11.1	—	—	2.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 2 : Sanitary Inspection of Water Tank						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	—	10.0	—	—	—	2.0
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	80.0	90.0	88.9	100.0	100.0	91.8
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
Others/ No Response	20.0	—	11.1	—	—	6.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 3 : Cleaning Water Accumulation						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	40.0	20.0	—	—	—	12.2
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	20.0	—	4.1
State Government	60.0	80.0	88.9	80.0	100.0	81.6

NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
Others/ No Response	—	—	11.1	—	—	2.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 4 : Spraying for Mosquitoes						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	—	10.0	—	10.0	30.0	10.2
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	100.0	70.0	88.9	80.0	70.0	81.6
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
Others/ No Response	—	20.0	—	10.0	—	6.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(Continued)

Table S30 : (Continued)

Service / Responsible Agency	Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs					
	Bhojpur (N=10)	Nalanda (N=10)	Begusarai (9)	Saharsa (N=10)	Sitamarhi (N=10)	All Districts (N=49)
Service 5 : Cleaning Streets / Roads						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	20.0	60.0	66.7	—	70.0	42.8
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	80.0	40.0	22.2	100.0	30.0	55.1
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
Others/ No Response	—	—	11.1	—	—	2.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 6 : Cleaning of Drains						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	30.0	60.0	44.4	—	88.0	42.8
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	70.0	40.0	44.4	100.0	20.0	55.1
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
Others/ No Response	—	—	11.1	—	—	2.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Service 7 : Cleaning of Garbage Sites						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	20.0	50.0	55.5	—	80.0	40.8
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	60.0	50.0	33.3	100.0	20.0	53.1
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
Others/ No Response	20.0	—	11.1	—	—	6.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(Continued)

Table S30 : (Concluded)

Service / Responsible Agency	Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs					
	Bhojpur (N=10)	Nalanda (N=10)	Begusarai (9)	Saharsa (N=10)	Sitamarhi (N=10)	All Districts (N=49)
Service 8 : Chlorination of Drinking Water						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	20.0	50.0	44.4	—	30.0	28.6
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	80.0	50.0	44.4	100.0	70.0	69.4
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
Others/ No Response	—	—	11.1	—	—	2.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Service 9 : Testing of Drinking Water						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	—	50.0	44.4	—	30.0	24.5
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	80.0	50.0	44.4	100.0	70.0	34 (69.4)
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
Others/ No Response	20.0	—	11.1	—	—	6.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Service 10 : Cleaning of Drinking Water Tanks / Channels						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	30.0	50.0	33.3	10.0	30.0	30.6
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	70.0	50.0	55.5	90.0	70.0	67.3
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
Others/ No Response	—	—	11.1	—	—	2.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table S31 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Perception about Responsible Agencies for Selected Education and Construction Related Activities

Activity / Responsible Agency	Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs by Agency					
	Bhojpur (N=10)	Nalanda (N=10)	Begusarai (9)	Saharsa (N=10)	Sitamarhi (N=10)	All Districts (N=49)
Activity 1 : Education on Health						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	20.0	10.0	—	100.0	10.0	28.6
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	80.0	80.0	88.9	—	90.0	67.3
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	—	10.0	11.1	—	—	4.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Activity 2 : Education on Sanitation						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	20.0	30.0	—	90.0	10.0	30.6
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	10.0	—	2.0
State Government	80.0	50.0	88.9	—	90.0	61.2
NGOs	—	10.0	—	—	—	2.0
No Response	—	10.0	11.1	—	—	4.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Activity 3 : Primary School						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	80.0	40.0	44.4	100.0	50.0	63.3
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—

State Government	20.0	60.0	44.4	—	50.0	34.7
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	—	—	11.1	—	—	2.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Activity 4 : Road Construction in GP						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	100.0	70.0	77.8	100.0	90.0	87.7
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	—	30.0	11.1	—	10.0	10.2
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	—	—	11.1	—	—	2.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(Continued)

Table S31 : (Concluded)

Activity / Responsible Agency	Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs by Agency					
	Bhojpur (N=10)	Nalanda (N=10)	Begusarai (9)	Saharsa (N=10)	Sitamarhi (N=10)	All Districts (N=49)
Activity 5 : Construction / Renovation of GP Office						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	80.0	70.0	55.5	100.0	80.0	77.5
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	20.0	30.0	33.3	—	20.0	20.4
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	—	—	11.1	—	—	2.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Activity 6 : Watershed Building / Repair						
<u>Gram Panchayat</u>	20.0	10.0	11.1	—	—	8.2
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	80.0	90.0	77.8	100.0	80.0	85.7
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	—	—	11.1	—	20.0	6.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Activity 7 : Water Tank Construction						

Gram Panchayat	20.0	10.0	11.1	—	—	8.2
Higher Panchayats	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Government	80.0	80.0	77.8	100.0	80.0	83.7
NGOs	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	—	10.0	11.1	—	20.0	8.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table S32 : Percentage Distribution of Panchayat Sachivs by Their Responses on the Questions on Functioning of Gram Panchayat

Question / Response	Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs					
	Bhojpur (N=10)	Nalanda N=10)	Begusarai (N=9)	Saharsa N=10)	Sitamarhi (N=10)	All Districts (N=49)
Does the General Body of GP meet every month?						
No	60.0	20.0	22.2	70.0	20.0	38.8
Sometimes	40.0	30.0	11.1	30.0	60.0	34.7
Yes	—	50.0	66.7	—	20.0	26.5
Do you receive the seven days notice for the meeting?						
No	60.0	20.0	22.2	70.0	20.0	38.8
Sometimes	—	—	—	30.0	60.0	18.4
Yes	40.0	80.0	77.8	—	20.0	42.8
Do the lady members attend / talk during the meeting?						
No one	—	—	22.2	10.0	—	6.1
Only some of them	50.0	20.0	22.2	40.0	90.0	44.9
All of them	50.0	80.0	55.5	50.0	10.0	49.0
Do the SC / ST members participate in the discussions?						

No one	—	—	22.2	20.0	—	8.2
Only some of them	10.0	—	33.3	10.0	60.0	22.4
All of them	90.0	100.0	44.4	70.0	40.0	69.4
Are the minutes recorded during the meeting itself?						
No	—	—	33.3	10.0	10.0	10.2
In some meetings	20.0	10.0	22.2	—	40.0	18.4
In all meetings	80.0	90.0	44.4	90.0	50.0	71.4
All Respondents						
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(Continued)

Table S32 : (Concluded)

Question / Response	Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs					
	Bhojpur (N=10)	Nalanda (N=10)	Begusarai (N=9)	Saharsa (N=10)	Sitamarhi (N=10)	All Districts (N=49)
Prior to decision making, are all members given chance to express their opinion?						
No	—	10.0	22.2	10.0	—	8.2
Sometimes	30.0	30.0	11.1	—	10.0	16.3
Always	70.0	60.0	66.7	90.0	90.0	75.5
Are the minutes of the GB meeting displayed on notice board?						
No	70.0	50.0	22.2	90.0	70.0	61.2
Some resolutions only	10.0	10.0	33.3	—	20.0	14.3
All meeting resolutions	20.0	40.0	44.4	10.0	10.0	24.5
Are the decisions of the GB meeting generally implemented?						
None	—	—	22.2	50.0	10.0	16.3
Some only	40.0	60.0	33.3	—	70.0	40.8
All	60.0	40.0	44.4	50.0	20.0	42.8
<u>Have standing Committees been formed in your GP?</u>						
No	70.0	—	55.5	90.0	90.0	61.2
1 or 2 formed	—	30.0	44.4	—	10.0	16.3
All formed	30.0	70.0	—	10.0	—	22.4
<u>Are the Meeting of Standing Committees held?</u>						
No	70.0	—	55.5	80.0	100.0	61.2

Held by 1 or 2 Committees	10.0	40.0	44.4	20.0	—	22.4
Held by All Committees	20.0	60.0	—	—	—	16.3
All respondents	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<u>Do members of all wards come for Gram Sabha?</u>						
No	—	—	33.3	30.0	—	12.2
Only some wards	20.0	40.0	11.1	60.0	20.0	30.6
All Wards	80.0	60.0	55.5	10.0	80.0	57.1
<u>Have the details of work of GP put on display?</u>						
No	—	80.0	44.4	70.0	50.0	49.0
Some of them	40.0	10.0	22.2	10.0	50.0	26.5
All of them	60.0	10.0	33.3	20.0	—	24.5
All Respondents	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table S33 : Percentage of Panchayat Sachivs Reporting Action by GP in Last 12 Months for Different Health, Education and Construction Related Activities

Activities	Percentage Respondents Reporting Activity in Last 12 Month					
	Bhojpur (N=10)	Nalanda (N=10)	Begusarai (9)	Saharsa (N=10)	Sitamarhi (N=10)	All Districts (N=49)
Sanitary inspection of public toilets	10.0	—	—	—	—	2.0
Sanitary inspection of water tank	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleaning of irrigation channels tanks	30.0	10.0	—	—	—	8.2
Cleaning water accumulation	20.0	—	—	60.0	—	16.3
Spraying for mosquitoes	10.0	—	—	10.0	10.0	6.1
Cleaning streets / roads	—	30.0	—	—	10.0	8.2
Cleaning of drains	—	10.0	—	—	10.0	4.1
Cleaning of garbage sites	—	—	—	—	—	—
Chlorination of drinking water	—	10.0	—	—	—	2.0
Testing of drinking water	10.0	—	—	—	—	4.1
Cleaning of drinking water	10.0	—	—	—	—	2.0
Cleaning drinking water tanks / channels	—	—	—	—	—	—
Education on health	10.0	10.0	—	50.0	—	14.3
Education on Sanitation	20.0	—	—	100.0	—	24.5
Primary school	100.0	60.0	33.3	100.0	40.0	67.3
Primary Health Centre (PHC)/ Sub Centre	80.0	10.0	11.1	70.0	—	34.7
Hospital	—	—	—	20.0	—	4.1

Road construction in GP	100.0	60.0	55.5	100.0	80.0	79.6
Construction / renovation of GP office	60.0	—	44.4	50.0	40.0	38.8
Watershed building / repair	20.0	—	—	—	—	4.1
Water tank construction	—	—	—	—	—	—
