

Does Governance Improve with Globalisation? A Case Study of Village Level Institutions in Maharashtra, India

Dhanmanjiri Sathe

Quantitative Approaches to Public Policy –
Conference in Honour of Professor T. Krishna Kumar

Held in conjunction with the
Fourth Annual International Conference on Public Policy and Management
Indian Institute of Management Bangalore (IIMB)

9-12 August 2009



School of Business and Management
Queen Mary, University of London
London, United Kingdom



Indira Gandhi Institute of
Development Research
Mumbai, India



Centre for Public Policy
Indian Institute of Management
Bangalore, India

<http://www.igidr.ac.in/pdf/publication/PP-062-17.pdf>

Does Governance Improve with Globalisation ?

A Case Study of Village Level Institutions in Maharashtra, INDIA.

Dhanmanjiri Sathe, Prof. and Head

Department of Economics, Ambedkar Bhavan

University of Pune, Pune, INDIA 411007

Email dsathe@unipune.ernet.in ; makdhan@vsnl.com

Ph. No +91 20 25436215 ; +91 20 9850558651

Abstract

This paper tries to examine if the basic, public services provided to the marginalized sections improve as a village becomes globalised. We have selected eight services and we compare three villages from one state of Maharashtra, India.

We have developed two indices – 1. Index of Availability of Services and 2. Index of Democratic Participation. We find that in a globalised village the availability of public services to the marginalized sections is 30 per cent higher and that democratic participation is 50 per cent higher than the traditional village.

Key words : Globalisation, governance, marginalized sections, basic public services.

Does Governance Improve with Globalisation ?

A Case Study of Village Level Institutions in Maharashtra, INDIA.

Dhanmanjiri Sathe, Prof. and Head

Department of Economics, Ambedkar Bhavan

University of Pune, Pune, INDIA 411007

Email dsathe@unipune.ernet.in ; makdhan@vsnl.com

Ph. No +91 20 25436215 ; +91 20 9850558651

I. Introduction

The relationship between Globalisation and Democracy has been an issue of research for some time now (Eichengreen B. and Leblang D. 2006; Munoz 1994). However in India, democracy has been existing at least since the first general election i.e. the early fifties. In fact as some would claim, India's achievements on the political front are much more impressive than on the economic front! While some people, quite rightly, argue for improvement in the 'quality of democracy', it is an accepted fact that India is amongst the few developing economies which have accomplished the feat of establishing and keeping democracy for the last sixty years (except for the Emergency period). Thus the important question for India becomes not the relationship between globalisation and democracy; but between globalisation and governance.

The purpose of this paper is to find the impact of globalisation on governance at the village level in India. Governance has been defined in many ways –

one simple definition being “governance is the process of decision-making and the process by which decisions are implemented (or not implemented)” (UNESCAP).

We define governance as the availability of basic, public services to the marginalized sections in a village. We believe that it is the responsibility of the state to provide these services and in a village the responsibility would fall on the local self government i.e. the gram panchayat.

Globalisation usually implies increase in trade, investment, technology and labour flows between economies. It was expected by some that as globalisation occurs, the state would wither away. “... many participants in the globalisation debate seem to agree about the decreasing economic, political, and cultural importance of (nation) state. From above the central role of state is being hollowed out by international political organization and ‘ below by the growing phenomenon of local government, which seems to have become the example of what good governance should be about “ (Schuurman, 2001: 8). Similarly Lieten (2003: 26) has argued that “The agenda of decentralization fits another agenda, namely the agenda of globalisation and the rolling back of the state. Globalisation actually sucks the local into centralizing process of the free market. Nation-States are somewhat receding and ceding sovereign power to market forces”.

However, Shuurman says that it would be naïve to write-off nation state, and Nayyar (1997) agrees. In the eighties and the early nineties ... ‘State was supposed to ‘wither away’, leaving the world on the cusp of a ‘new medievalism’, a world in which there were diverse sources of political,

economic and social authority. ... State turned out to be far more resilient than what the declinists had suggested' (Palan, Abbot and Deans, 1999 : vii). In view of the evidence from the developed countries which also happen to be highly globalised, the prognosis of declining state is a bit intriguing. It is well known that the share of government in the GDP in the European countries is close to 50 per cent (Germany- 46%, Italy – 49%, Sweden – 51%), for UK it is 41 % and for USA it is 28%. (Stiglitz, J. 2000: 42). In fact, the Wagner's Law states that as the per capita income of an economy increases, the share of government in the GDP rises. In the now- globalizing developing economies too, while there are genuine doubts with respect to the state meddling in manufacturing or state-directed planning; it is generally accepted that the state has a very crucial role to play in the provision of basic, public services especially to the marginalized sections as they cannot access market for these services. In a village in India, it is the responsibility of the locally-elected body i.e. the gram panchayat to provide these basic, public services. In the next section, we give a brief introduction to the gram panchayats.

II. A Brief Introduction to the Gram Panchayats

The three tier Panchayati Raj Institutions in their current avatar, were put in place in India in 1993 when the 73rd Constitutional Amendment was passed.

The panchayat system which was existing in India since Independence had become largely defunct and dysfunctional over the period. In most of the

villages elections were not held. More significantly, the central government had created its own administrative hierarchy for rural development with plethora of special programmes that all bypassed the panchayati raj institutions (Lieten, 2003: 23)

The system got a new lease of life in the late eighties when the then Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi saw a great potential in them. He was highly frustrated with the government machinery which was implementing the government schemes meant for the poor. In his view, the machinery had become exceedingly corrupt and power to the local governments was one way of bypassing them and reaching the government money to the poor. This was a period when there was disillusionment with the capability of strong centralized governance. "The idea of decentralization has got associated with 'good governance' (Lieten, 2003: 17). There was increasing feeling that "These people, however poor and illiterate, however much repressed by gender, caste and class, have a richness of thought that needs to be tapped much more than has been done so far" (Lieten, 2003:13). Moreover, the idea of decentralization is also close to the principle in public finance which says that the service provider should be close to the beneficiary/consumer. This helps in decreasing the information gap between the two, better targeting, higher efficiency and lower costs.

Rajiv Gandhi put forth the Bill for Local Governance as 64th Amendment in 1989, but this Bill was rejected by the Rajya Sabha. It was eventually passed in 1993 as the 73rd Amendment to the Constitution which empowered the

state governments to pass their own bills. Under this new dispensation, a new term came into being called the 'Panchayati Raj Institutions' (PRIs) which include the gram panchayat, panchayat samiti and the zilla parishad. In this paper we will be examining the gram panchayat which is the local body at the village level and hence is the lowest rung of governance in India.

One of India's great strengths is that it is a vibrant democracy and the development of the PRIs has strengthened it. The expansion of the PRIs in their new form is a very significant movement as, "Earlier , Lok Sabha, Rajya Sabha and 25 State assemblies and 2 Union Territories used to elect only 4,963 members. Today every five years 30 lakh (i.e. 3 million) representatives are elected out of which 10 lakh (i.e. 33 %) are women and 22.5% seats belong to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes" (Institute of Social Sciences, 2000: 10). Therefore, the democratic base of Indian polity has widened. The PRIs are responsible for the provision of the basic services and the execution and maintenance of development works and schemes in rural areas. Hence how efficiently they perform has tremendous impact on the rural areas and especially the welfare of the marginalized sections is greatly influenced by them.

III. Outline of the Problem

Globalisation started in India in an explicit way since 1991 and it is interesting to note that the renewed movement towards local self governance happened almost at the same time (i.e. in the early nineties). We believe that the role of state does not diminish with globalisation, rather its **criticality** increases.

“Many recognize the opportunities for a better life that globalisation presents. We believe their hopes are realizable, but only if globalisation is subjected to better governance at all levels”. (World Commission on Social Dimension of Globalisation, 2006: vii). The concept of ‘governance’ is quite clearly broader than that of ‘government’ alone. ‘Governance’ has been defined by the World Bank as the traditions and institutions by which authority is exercised for the common good (World Bank, 1992). Along with the institutions, effective governance also tries to develop the ‘voice’ of the people, which ‘they need in order to improve the accountability and efficiency of the government’ (Harriss, 2007: 2716)

In this research project we have tried to examine the relationship between globalisation and governance. We ask the question, does globalisation improve the quality of governance as it is experienced by the marginalized sections in the village? Globalisation is a complex and multi-dimensional process. However, we shall confine ourselves to one meaning of globalisation viz. increase in international trade. As is known, the agricultural exports of the Indian economy have increased at 13 per cent per annum since 1991 (Sathe, 2006: 5337-5344). When a village starts to export, there are no doubt many ways in which it would be affected and governance would be one of them.

We define ‘better governance’ as ‘better availability of public services’ to the marginalized sections. Thus we explore whether the public services like sanitation, education, health etc. provided by the state to the marginalized sections improve as globalisation occurs at the village level.

To that end, we have developed a framework of three types of villages. The first type is a 'globalised' village which is a village engaged in exporting a product, most likely an agricultural product *in a major way*. The opposite of a globalised village would be a non-globalised village. However as we looked at the villages, we found that a non-globalised village could be of two types. The first type is the 'traditional' village which is producing mainly for self-consumption. Between the two extremes of the globalised and the traditional village lies another type of village. This is the second type of non-globalised village which can be called the 'commercialized' village. This village is producing crops which are sold in the domestic markets but not in the international markets. Thus this type of village, which has stopped being a traditional village, has got integrated with the national markets but not with the international markets.

IV. Selection of the sample and Nature of the sample

The next step was to select the three types of villages.

Selection of the villages: We were interested in isolating the impact of globalisation on governance and keep other things same, as far as possible. Thus we have selected the three villages that belong to the same district from one state in India. Maharashtra was identified as the state because of its familiarity to the author and because the state has a somewhat better record with respect to the PRI than the other states (Rajiv Gandhi Foundation, 2000 : 5)

We needed to select a district which had all three types of villages. Globalised kind of villages are mainly to be found in the western Maharashtra. We examined a few districts from this part of Maharashtra like Nashik, Ahmednagar, Satara, Kolhapur and Sangli which were capable of giving us all three type of villages. Out of these we selected the Sangli district where contrast of immense dimensions exists.

Sangli is a district in western Maharashtra which is basically an agricultural district. According to the 2001 Census, the total population of the district is around 2.5 million. It is one of the more progressive districts in Maharashtra. The political leadership has been quite enlightened in this district. It has a very strong tradition of cooperative sector. This district has given many important leaders including one chief minister. It has 10 sugar factories and 21 textile factories. There are around 7,000 small scale industries in this area. Most of the people live in villages and there are 705 gram panchayats in this district. The district has 1 major, 5 medium and 54 minor irrigation projects. Due to these projects half of the area is well irrigated but the remaining half is extremely drought-prone. The irrigated areas supported by appropriate institutions, show progressive agriculture. In contrast, drought-prone areas are enormously backward. Due to these features we felt that this district could give us all three types of villages.

The three appropriate villages were selected after discussions with the NGOs, government servants and after doing field visits to 7-8 villages.

The first one was Morbagi, which is 5 km from Bijapur which is the closest town, and 170 km away from Sangli is a traditional village. It is completely dependent on monsoons for water. The only crops which are grown are *jowar*, *bajra*, and some pulses like *matki* etc. It is a village which is very close to the border with Karnataka. One important feature of this village is that a large number of people migrate to the neighbouring areas for cutting sugarcane. This migration can be for as high a period as six months. Since the agriculture in this village is very backward and there are no other employment opportunities, sugarcane cutting is preferred by most of the men and women; and some times even older children.

Ankali which is 5 km away from Sangli was selected as a commercialized village. It is an irrigated village and the crops which are grown are sugarcane- which is the main crop, soyabean, jowar and vegetables. There is a Sugar cooperative factory to which the farmers sell their sugarcane.

Savlaj, a globalised village, is 46 km away from Sangli. It is also an irrigated village and the crops cultivated are grapes- which is the main crop, sugarcane, bananas, wheat. Savlaj belongs to a taluka called Tasgoan which has been historically known for good grapes. It is grapes which are exported from this village.

We found that in Ankali and Savlaj there are many institutions like public sector banks, cooperative banks, Grape Export Cooperative, Milk cooperative,

Sugar factory and Mahila Bachats Gats i.e. the self-help groups. Morbagi does not have a single such institution.

Henceforth we shall be calling the traditional village as Morbagi(T), commercialized village as Ankali(C) and globalised village as Savlaj(G).

Some of the important parameters with respect to the villages have been given in the Table I below.

(Table I should come here)

It can be seen that the population of the village increases as we move from the traditional to the commercial to the globalised village. It is interesting to note that it was difficult for us to find a village that was traditional and big in size. All traditional villages were small and some even smaller than Morbagi. Similarly it was not possible for us to find a village which was globalised and also small. All the globalised villages in Sangli district were big in size. Thus this means that a certain scale is achieved as a village becomes globalised in nature. The literacy rate seems to improve across the type of village and so does the percentage of the Below Poverty Line (i.e. BPL) families. For Morbagi(T), the records were not properly kept and hence it was not possible to get figures for total number of families and BPL families.

We have done a micro-level analysis to find out a relationship between the type of village and the basic, public services provided by the gram panchayat to the marginalized sections. A comparative analysis between the three types of villages has been done using the survey method.

Definition and selection of the marginalized sections: We have defined 'marginalized sections' as those people who a. belong to the scheduled castes i.e. the dalits ('erstwhile untouchables'), b. women and c. those belonging to 'Below Poverty Line' i.e. BPL families. Thus '*marginalization*' is based not only on economic status, but also on social exclusion.

We selected 10 respondents from the Scheduled Castes, 10 women¹ and 10 from Below Poverty Line(BPL) families. The respondents were selected in a random way. Thus on the whole we had 30 respondents from each of the village and the total sample size was of 90 respondents.

V. Methodology and Findings

Often globalisation is associated with cuts in public expenditures especially those affecting the poor. Quite frequently, public budgets are cut as part of the Structural Adjustment Programme suggested by the IMF. Since it is difficult to cut the expenditures meant for the elite, usually there is a decline in the expenditures meant for the poor (Bardhan, 2006: 20). However, the Indian economy has passed that stage of crisis since the mid-nineties and now there is no need to cut public budgets as such. But there remains the problem about the amount of allocations made and how they are used. More specifically, there is the problem of - do the allocations made for the poor reach the poor or are they lost somewhere in-between by way of corruption and other

reasons? Thus there can be a discrepancy between allocations intended for the poor and the money that reaches them.

To circumvent this discrepancy, we have focused on the ground level availability of the public services to the marginalized sections in the sample villages. Thus we have shifted the focus from allocations to availability.

We canvassed the questionnaire on the randomly selected respondents from the marginalized sections and collected the information. In the questionnaire, we have asked two set of questions. The first one dealt with the availability of the basic, public services and the second one explores the questions related to the political participation of the marginalized sections.

Based on these, we have developed the two indices.

V.1 Grand Index of Availability of Services:

This index captures the availability and level of satisfaction with respect to the basic, public services over the three villages.

The public services which we selected were

1. Drinking water
2. Toilets
3. Gutters
4. School education
5. Primary Health Centre
6. Electricity
7. Roads
8. Rationing shop.

In Table II, we have given the list of questions asked, the alternative answers; and the score for each of the answer is given in the bracket.

The best availability gets the highest score and the worst gets a 'zero'. Each is multiplied by its frequency and added up. This sum total is then divided by the maximum possible score which gives the Index of Availability for that service. Thus for the question 'What are the sources of Drinking Water for you?' (Table II, Part A, Q. 1) there are three answers .– They are Ans 1. 'Tap at Home' which gets the highest score of 2; then Ans 2. 'Common Tap' gets a score of 1 and Ans 3. 'Well/River' gets a score of zero. These scores are multiplied by the frequencies for each of the village and divided by 60 (i.e. best score * total respondents= 2*30). Thus in Morbagi (T) one person has a 'tap at home'; twenty six respondents use a common tap and three people use the well/river.

Thus the index for Morbagi (T) for this question becomes

$$(2*1+1*26+0*3)/60 = 0.466 \text{ (See Table III, Part A).}$$

When there are only two responses, 'Yes' gets 1 and 'No' gets a zero.

If the index is 1 for a question for a village, then it implies that all the respondents are availing of that service or the rating of the service is the best for all the respondents. A index of 0 for a question for the village would mean that the service is not available to any of the respondents in the village/all respondents have rated the service as very low in quality.

In this manner we have got the village indices for the questions asked to the marginalized section respondents. Based on these scores, we have found the average for each of the village which we call the Grand Index of Availability of

Services. (If a service is 'Not Available' the further questions are excluded from finding the average).

(Table II should come here)

In Table III Part A, we have put forth the village-wise results. We find that with respect to three questions the index is '1' for all the three villages. Thus in all the three villages all the children are going to a school (Q. 8); all the respondents have a *pucca* (i.e. all weather) road in their village (Q18); and in all the three villages a ration shop exists (Q19). Thus there is no difference by type of village in the availability of these services. With respect to the 'Poorna Poshan Yojana' which is the mid-day meal scheme for the schools, Morbagi (T) i.e. the traditional village, in fact, does better than the other two villages. That is, it has a index of 0.8 in response to the Q. 11 and Q. 12 while the indices are slightly lower in Ankali(C) and Savlaj(G) . The rating of the zilla parishad school (i.e. the ZP school, a school run by the local government) and the teachers is also quite similar for the three villages (Q. 9 and Q.10). Thus with respect to attendance in the school, quality of the school and the teachers; and the 'Poorna Poshan Yojana' all three villages seem to be doing well for the marginalized sections.

(Table III should come here)

At the other extreme is the absolute non-availability of Primary Health Centre (PHC) in the Morbagi(T) village. It is expected that a town of 30,000

population should have a PHC and a village of 5,000 population should have a sub-centre. The smaller villages are to be served by ANM i.e. the Auxiliary Nurse Midwife. It is her responsibility to refer complicated cases to the PHC. In Morbagi (T) the villagers said that no ANM visited them and there were no private doctors in the village.

We found (from questions not given in the Table) that the respondents were not partaking of any medical service what so ever, they never go to a doctor and use only household measures/ self-treatment. However, Ankali(C) and Savlaj(T) both did have a PHC and they rated the services quite high at 0.9 index. But they don't seem to be using it as frequently at the index of 0.5, which is a bit intriguing. The next worst situation is with respect to the use of ration shop (Q20, 21, 22). Though a ration shop is available in Morbagi (T) we found that the respondents had never seen their ration cards as they were lying with the shopkeeper!! Naturally the use of card was also quite infrequent; the commodities availed were less in number. Thus the marginalized sections were not able to benefit from the ration shop which existed in this village. As against this, the scores on this issue in Ankali(C) and Savlaj(G) were quite high implying that the marginalized sections do get the benefit of the public distribution in these villages.

The indices with respect to the availability of toilets inside the homes and government support to build those toilets (Q 4,5) is worse in Morbagi(T) than in Savlaj(G). Gutters are also reasonably worse in the traditional village of Morbagi as compared to the other two villages (Q6,7).

Not surprisingly, the Grand Index of Availability of Services in the traditional village is only 70 percent that of the globalised village (0.51 against 0.75). Thus the marginalized sections are much worse off in a traditional village as compared to the globalised village.

It is also interesting to note that the difference between the commercialized and the globalised village is very less at 0.71 and 0.75 respectively. Thus there is a case for saying that market integration, be it domestic or global improves availability of public services.

V.2 Grand Index of Democratic Participation:

The democratic, decentralized system gives better results if the people take a very active part in the processes. The benefits will accrue only if the people speak about their problems and are, in general, un-afraid and involved parties. However, reaching this kind of a situation is not easy. The path to transforming a nation from a feudal kind to a democratic kind is beset with innumerable problems. Countries have managed it over a period of centuries. Indian society at the time of Independence had all kinds of hierarchies. In the what-can- be-called the 'First episode' of panchayati raj, i.e. the pre-nineties period, it has been observed that the elite misused the system to their own advantage (Kothari, R. 1989).

Thus the political awareness, willingness and ability, especially of the marginalized sections, to participate in the political system and processes is extremely important if we want the 'Second episode' of panchayati raj

institutions to succeed. The problems of the poor, marginalized and the deprived will be adequately addressed, if they feel free to speak about it and take rectifying action.

We have tried to capture these and such issues in the second set of questions that we asked. In this second set of questions we tried to capture the participation, involvement and information of the respondents about the gram panchayat's processes and activities. The questions tried to find out how proactive the marginalized sections were with respect to their democratic rights and duties.

Thus we have called the result as the 'Index of Democratic Participation'.

The methodology used is the same as explained above. The questions asked have been given in Table II Part B and the indices given in Table III Part B. Over and above, in view of the complexity of the issues at hand, we have also asked many questions requiring long answers. For example, we have asked questions regarding the reasons for voting for a candidate, when and for what reason/s have they raised issues in the gram sabha etc. Further, many of the basic, public services are available via various 'schemes'. To avail of those schemes, a person has to apply for it. Thus information about the schemes, willingness and capacity to negotiate for those scheme etc. becomes an extremely important issue. We have asked questions about them too. The answers to such qualitative questions have also been presented below.

We find that in all the three villages the index for the question 'Do you vote in the gram panchayat election?' is very high (Q.1, Table III Part B). Thus voting

as a democratic action seems to be well entrenched in all the three villages. Further we asked them the reasons for voting for a particular candidate. The reasons for voting for one particular candidate were various. Most men said that they vote for the person who works for the betterment of the village. Some respondents were affiliated to a particular caste and some to a political party. Some voted , so that their name would not be deleted from the list. In Morbagi(T), 9 out of 10 women said that they voted according to the men's choice. In Ankali(C) and Savlaj(G), however, the women too used the development argument (i.e. had established a link between development and voting) and said that they voted for the person 'who improved the village'.

We found that the gram sabha meetings were held regularly in all the three villages. Thus there is no difference according to the type of village in the voting behavior and frequency of the gram sabha meeting (not given in the Table).

However the difference started then on. The worst index for Morbagi(T) and greatest difference between the villages, is shown by the question " Do you know the name of your gram sevak?" (Q 5, Table III Part B, gram sevak is the only administrative functionary at village level) in Morbagi (T) at 0.066. The indices for Ankali(C) and Savlaj (G) are much better at 0.33, though not very good in absolute terms. While the difference over villages in terms of awareness about the schemes (self rating) is not very different (Q7); the investigator found that the information was quite less in Morbagi (T) (Q8).

We found that while the attendance in the gram sabha was quite bad in all the villages, it was worse in Morbagi (T)(Q2). It was also found that relatively, more women and dalits could not attend the meetings. While for the women, the reasons were social in nature (“none of the other women go, so how can I go?”); for the dalits they were economic (“ we work as labourers so how can we attend?”)

We also found that the incidence of raising issues in the gram sabha was quite low in all the three villages. In Morbagi (T), the index for raising issues (Q3) was the lowest, but it was somewhat higher in other two villages. One dalit said that he was afraid to raise any issues; while another said that ‘they may ask for money if I raise any issue’. The issues raised were typically with respect to toilets, drainage etc. On the whole, men had a better idea about the functions of the panchayats – they could list most of the important functions. Most women in Ankali(C) and Savlaj(G) could list at least one function of the panchayat. However, in Morbagi(T) none of the ten women had an inkling about the functions of the panchayat. Hence they could not rank the performance of the panchayat in any satisfactory way. Since men had better information, their expectations from panchayats were also higher. Many of them stated that the panchayat should start income generating schemes, give loans, start small scale industries, build an entrance arc etc.

Thus, not unexpectedly, we find that the Grand Index of Democratic Participation is almost half in Morbagi(T) at 0.25, as compared to Savlaj (G) at 0.43 and 0.44 in Ankali(C)

Thus in a globalised village, the involvement of the marginalized sections in the panchayat affairs is higher than in a traditional village.

VI. Concluding Remarks

Quite frequently, globalisation is taken to be a predominantly urban phenomenon. However, globalisation has important ramifications for the rural areas too. In this paper, we have tried to examine some of the implications of globalisation on the rural areas by doing a sample survey of three villages from one district i.e. Sangli in Maharashtra, India.

Our survey shows that the availability of basic, public services to the marginalized sections is better in a globalised village (i.e. a village exporting an agri-product in a major way) as compared to a traditional village (i.e. a village engaging in agriculture for self-consumption) as revealed by the Grand Index of Availability of Services. The availability is around 30 per cent higher in the globalised village. The reason for differential availability of the basic, primary services to the marginalized sections cannot be explained in terms of the differential availability of financial resources to the three villages. As is well known, the panchayats do not have any significant sources of raising their own finances. In general, the panchayats get the financial allocations from their respective State governments and from the Central government. Usually the allocations are made on a per capita basis. With respect to some of the schemes, the panchayats have to ask for the money (Rajaraman, I. 2003 , Govind Rao et.al. 2008) which is available equally to all villages.

Then what could be the probable reasons for the disparity? We propose a few causal links which could explain the difference. It needs to be remembered that they are preliminary in nature and more rigorous work needs to be done in this area.

The first reason could be the difference in the size of the village. The globalised village is big in size while the traditional village is small in size. Further, as already mentioned, it was impossible to find a globalised village which was small in size and a traditional village that was big in size. Some studies (Paul S, et al , 2006) have also found that as the size of the village expands the availability of the basic, public services improves. *But the important thing that we find here is that the availability of services improves for the marginalized sections too.*

The second probable reason could be the difference in the literacy level in the three villages. Table I has shown the rate of literacy to be higher for the globalised village as compared to the traditional village. In Table IV we have given the level of literacy for the marginalized section respondents which is higher for the globalised village. This could be another reason for the differences in availability of the services. Thus the more educated respondents were better informed, better able to ask for and put more pressure on the system; and get better services.

The third reason could be the better political participation by the marginalized sections in the globalised village. This was revealed by the Grand Index of

Democratic Participation which was almost double in the globalised village as compared to the traditional village. Thus if participation of the marginalized sections in the gram panchayat improves, the probability of getting better services rises. Undoubtedly, political participation is a complex process. However as a first level explanation we could state that it is dependent on the scale of the village and education of the marginalized sections (Incidentally, these two factors were given extremely high importance by Ambedkar, the leader of the Dalits). It can be argued that in a bigger village the marginalized sections are able to negotiate better for the services as self-assurance is higher and fear is less; and education gives them the skills and confidence to do so.

Distance does not seem to be an important factor as Morbagi(T) is close to Bijapur (5 km.), though it is somewhat far off from Sangli. Further, Ankali (C) which is the closest to Sangli, has a lower index of availability of services than the globalised village i.e. Savlaj(G).

It is now part of received wisdom that decentralization is better than the centralized system on many economic and political counts. However, decentralization does not and will not work itself out in the same manner in various kinds of villages. There are going to be other influences affecting the success and efficacy of decentralization. We have tried to examine one such factor viz. globalisation on the availability of public services to the marginalized sections. Further, globalisation itself is a result of many other processes. In

addition to this, there are other processes at work in a village besides globalisation or lack of it.

What we have succeeded in doing is to establish a correlation between globalisation and services availability to the marginalized sections at a micro level. We have also put forth a few tentative causal explanations. We find that the impact of globalisation on service availability to the marginalized sections is positive. The negotiating power of the marginalized sections seems to be improving with globalisation. If globalisation is to succeed then it should not only benefit the rich but also the marginalized sections. Our paper is one small step in finding out if that is happening at micro level.

Notes

1. While selecting women, we avoided the affluent and so-called high caste areas. Thus out of the 30 women selected, 70% had education below 7th std. and all below 12th std. Non of their families owned irrigated land.

Acknowledgements : This project was supported by National Centre for Advocacy Studies, Pune. We would like to thank Raja Deshpande, Machhindra, and Sandhi from the Yerala Projects Society, Sangli for the help they have given us. Thanks are also due to Rajendra Mahajan from the Cooperative Dept., Sangli, Chougule from Ankali and Pandurang Bhadake from Savlaj. Research Assistance for the project provided by Gunavant Mahajan is gratefully acknowledged.

Table I Important Parameters of the Selected Villages

Name of the village	Population	Literacy Rate	Distance from closest town	Total No. of Families	BPL families*
Morbaji(T)	2150	20- 25%	5 Km from Bijapur	Not available	Not available
Ankali(C)	3275	80-85%	5 kms from Sangli	624	232 (37%)
Savlaj(G)	8984	65-70%	46 kms from Sangli	1491	298 (19.9%)

Note : Figs. in bracket indicate the percentage share in total.

BPL stands for 'Below Poverty Line'

Source: The respective gram panchayat offices

Table II Questions asked and the Respective Scores

Part A		Answers(Scores)			
No.	Questions pertaining to Availability of Services				
1	What are the Sources of water used?	Tap at home (2)	Common Tap (1)	Well/ River (0)	
2	What is the frequency of the break down of the water supply?	Rarely (1)	Often (0)		
3	How good is the quality and quantity of water in the village?	High (2)	Medium (1)	Low (0)	
4	What kind of toilets do you use?	Inside home (2)	Common (1)	Open Air (0)	
5	Were government schemes used to build toilets inside home?	Yes (1)	No (0)		
6	Do you have gutters in the vicinity of your house?	Yes (1)	No (0)		
7	What is the condition of the gutter?	Closed (1)	Open (0)		
8	Do your children go to school?	Yes (1)	No (0)		
9	How would you rate the ZP school where your child(ren) goes?	Very Good (2)	Good (1)	Bad (0)	
10	How would you rate the teachers in ZP school?	Good (2)	Fair (1)	Bad (0)	
11	Does Purna Poshan Yojana exist in ZP schools in your village?	Yes (1)	Don't Know /No(0)		
12	How would you rate this Yojana?	Good (1)	Bad (0)		
13	Is there any Public Health Centre facility in the village?	Yes (1)	No (0)		
14	How would you rate the Public Health Centre if present in the village?	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Bad (1)	
15	How frequently do you use PHC if present in the village?	Very Often (3)	Often (2)	Rarely (1)	Never (0)
16	How would you rate the quality of the doctors and paramedics if PHC exists?	Good (2)	Low (1)		
17	Is electricity available in your house?	Yes (1)	No (0)		
18	What kind of road is available in the village?	Pucca (All weather) (1)	Not Pucca (All weather) (0)		
19	Is ration shop present within the village?	Yes (1)	No (0)		
20	How many times do you use ration shop?	Twice a Month (2)	Once a Month (1)	Once in 2 Months (1)	No Usage (0)
21	Can the commodities be easily availed from ration shop?	Very Often (3)	Often (2)	Rarely (1)	No Usage (0)
22	How do you rate the ration shop?	Good (2)	Low (1)	No Usage (0)	

Part B**Answers (Scores)**

	Questions pertaining to Democratic Participation					
1	Did you vote in the Gram Panchayat election?	Yes (1)	No (0)			
2	How regularly you attend gram sabha?	Regularly (3)	Farely Regularly (2)	Rarely (1)	Never(0)	
3	Have you raised any issue in the gram sabha?	Yes (1)	No (0)			
4	According to you how has Gram Panchayat worked?	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Bad (2)	Very Bad (1)	Not Aware (0)
5	Do you know the name of Gram Sevak?	Yes (1)	No (0)			
6	Are you aware of your rights in a democracy?	Yes (1)	No (0)			
7	Are you aware about the schemes made available to you?	Yes (1)	No (0)			
8	What is the quality of understanding about the schemes? (Ranked by the Investigator)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Bad (1)	Not Aware (0)	

Table III Indices of Services Availability and Democratic Participation

Part A

Index of Services Availability

No.	Questions pertaining to Availability of Services	Morbagi(T)	Ankali(C)	Savlaj(G)
1	What are the Sources of water used?	0.466	0.733	0.783
2	What is the frequency of the break down of the water supply?	0.966	0.966	0.833
3	How good is the quality and quantity of water in the village?	0.683	1	0.75
4	What kind of toilets do you use?	0.166	0.366	0.666
5	Were government schemes used to build toilets inside home?	0.166	0	0.3
6	Do you have gutters in the vicinity of your house?	0.2	0.466	0.833
7	What is the condition of the gutter?	N.A.	0.333	0.2
8	Do your children go to school?	1	1	1
9	How would you rate the ZP school where your child(ren) goes?	0.5	0.552	0.538
10	How would you rate the teachers in ZP school?	0.961	1	1
11	Does Purna Poshan Yojana exist in ZP schools in your village?	0.8	0.7	0.7
12	How would you rate this Yojana?	0.8	0.7	0.7
13	Is there any Public Health Centre facility in the village?	0	1	1
14	How would you rate the Public Health Centre if present in the village?	N.A.	0.866	0.9
15	How frequently do you use PHC if present in the village?	N.A.	0.555	0.577
16	How would you rate the quality of the doctors and paramedics if PHC exists?	N.A.	0.916	0.95
17	Is electricity available in your house?	0.133	0.533	0.766
18	What kind of road is available in the village?	1	1	1
19	Is ration shop present within the village?	1	1	1
20	How many times do you use ration shop?	0.111	0.666	0.6
21	Can the commodities be easily availed from ration shop?	0.144	0.6	0.655
22	How do you rate the ration shop?	0.166	0.883	0.883
	GRAND INDEX OF AVAILABILITY OF SERVICES	0.5145	0.7197	0.756

Part B**Index of Democratic Participation**

	Questions pertaining to Democratic Participation	Morbagi(T)	(Ankali(C)	Savlaj(G)
1	Did you vote in the Gram Panchayat election?	0.966	0.966	1
2	How regularly you attend gram sabha?	0.2	0.322	0.355
3	Have you raised any issue in the gram sabha?	0.166	0.5	0.3
4	According to you how has Gram Panchayat worked?	0.3	0.608	0.7
5	Do you know the name of Gram Sevak?	0.066	0.333	0.333
6	Are you aware of your rights in a democracy?	0.1	0.3	0.233
7	Are you aware about the schemes made available to you?	0.2	0.366	0.4
8	What is the quality of understanding about the schemes? (Ranked by the Investigator)	0.066	0.15	0.15
	GRAND INDEX OF DEMOCRATIC PARTICIPATION	0.258	0.4431	0.4338

Table IV Level of Education of the marginalized sections from the sample villages

Level of Education	Upto 7 th Std	Up to 10 th	Up to 12 th	Up to Graduation	Till or greater than Graduation	Total
Morbaji(T)	28(98)	1(3)	1(3)	0(0)	0(0)	30(100)
Ankali(C)	15(50)	11(37)	2(7)	2(7)	0(0)	30(100)
Savlaj(G)	19(63)	7(23)	2(7)	1(3)	1(3)	30(100)

Note: Figures in bracket indicate the percentage share in total

Source: The Zilla Parishad Office at Sangli

Bibliography

Alsop R, Krishna A, Sjoblom D. (2001). *Inclusion and Local Elected Governments: The Panchayat Raj System in India*, Social Development Papers, Paper no. 37. (Washington :The World Bank).

Bardhan, P., Bowles, S., Wallerstein, Michael (eds). (2006). *Globalisation and Egalitarian Redistribution*, (New Delhi: Oxford University Press).

Bhambhri, C.P. (2005). *Globalizing India: Nation, State and Democracy*. (Delhi: Shipra).

Chaturvedi, P. (1997). *Food Security and Panchayati Raj* (New Delhi : Concept Publishing Company).

Debroy. B, Kaushik P.D (eds) (2005). *Energising Rural Development through 'Panchayats'* . (New Delhi : Academic Foundation).

Eichengreen B. and Leblang D. (2006). *Democracy and Globalisation*, BIS Working Papers No.219.(Basel: Switzerland).

Govinda Rao, M. and Vasantha Rao, U.A. (2008): Expanding the Resource Base of Panchayats : Augmenting Own Resources , *Economic and Political Weekly*, 43(4), pp54-61.

Harriss, John (2007): Antinomies of Empowerment : Observations on Civil Society, Politics and Urban Governance, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 42(26), pp2716- 2724.

Institute of Social Sciences. (2000). *States of Panchayati Raj in the States and Union Territories of India*. (New Delhi: Concept Publishing Co.).

Kothari Rajani (1989). "Decentralization: The Real Issue", *Seminar*, 360, pp14-19.

Lieten G.K.(2003). *Power, Politics and Rural Development: Essays on India*. (New Delhi: Manohar).

Moore Barrington,(1969). *The Social Origins of Democracy and Dictatorship*, , (Harmondsworth : Penguin).

Nayyar Deepak (1997). 'Globalisation: the Past in Our Present' , *Third World Economics*, 168, pp 7-15

Palan R, Abbot J and Deans P. (1999). *State Strategies in the Global Political Economy*. (London: Pinter).

Paul S, Balakrishnan S, Thampi G K, Sekar S, Vivekananda, M. (2006). *Who Benefits from India's Public Services ? A People's Audit of Five Basic Services*. (New Delhi: Academic Foundation).

Rai M, Nambiar M, Paul S, Singh Sangeeta, Sahni (eds) (2001). *The State of Panchayats: A Participatory Perspective*. (New Delhi: Samskriti).

Rajaraman Indira (2003). *A Fiscal Domain for Panchayats*. (New Delhi : Oxford University Press).

Rajiv Gandhi Foundation (2000). *Panchayati Raj in India: Task Force on Panchayati Raj*. (New Delhi: RGF).

Sathe D., Deshpande R.S. (2006): Sustaining Agricultural Trade : Policy and Impact, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 41(52), pp5337-5344.

Schuurman Frans J (eds) (2001). *Globalisation and Development Studies : Challenges for the 21st Century*. (New Delhi : Vistaar Publications).

Shome P (1998): *Emerging Fiscal Federal Relations and Fiscal Policy: Policy Implications for Local Rural Development in Implications of GATT/WTO on Agricultural and Rural Development*, (Hyderabad: National Institute of Rural Development).

Stiglitz, Joseph (2000): *Economics of the Public Sector*, (New York and London : W.W. Norton & Co.).

UNESCAP www.unescap.org/pdd/prs

World Bank (1992): *Governance and Development*. (Washington D.C. : World Bank).

World Commission on Social Dimension of Globalisation (2006): *A Fair Globalisation: Creating Opportunities for All*. (New Delhi: Academic Foundation)