



# REVIEW OF RESEARCH

ISSN: 2249-894X

IMPACT FACTOR : 5.7631 (UIF)

VOLUME - 15 | ISSUE - 7 | APRIL - 2026



---

---

## ADMINISTRATIVE CHALLENGES IN PANCHAYATI RAJ INSTITUTIONS: EVIDENCE FROM HARYANA

**Dr. Sonika**

Assistant Professor, Dept. of Political Science & Public Administration,  
Baba Mastnath University, Asthal Bohar, Rohtak.

**Akash Chhabra**

Research Scholar, Dept. of Political Science & Public Administration,  
Baba Mastnath University, Asthal Bohar, Rohtak.

**Dr. Kavita**

Assistant Professor (Political Science), Arya Kanya Mahavidyala Gurukul, Mor Majra.

### ABSTRACT :

*Administrative Challenges in Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) play a critical role in shaping the effectiveness of decentralized governance and rural development in India. This review paper examines the nature, causes, and implications of administrative constraints faced by the Panchayati Raj Institutions with special reference to Haryana. It synthesizes existing literature, government reports, and empirical studies to identify key challenges such as inadequate administrative capacity, limited financial autonomy, overlapping jurisdictional authority, shortage of trained personnel, political interference, and weak institutional coordination at the grassroots level. The study highlights how these constraints affect planning, implementation, and monitoring of rural development programs and hinder the realization of participatory governance objectives. In the context of Haryana, rapid socio-economic transformation has further intensified administrative demands on local bodies, exposing gaps between policy design and ground-level execution. The review also underscores the need for capacity building, digital governance tools, and institutional reforms to strengthen accountability and efficiency in PRIs. By integrating findings from diverse scholarly sources, the paper provides a comprehensive understanding of systemic administrative bottlenecks and suggests pathways for improving local governance performance. The study contributes to ongoing discourse on decentralization and sustainable rural development in India.*



**KEYWORDS :** *Administrative Challenges, Panchayati Raj Institutions, Decentralization, Rural Governance, Haryana, Local Self-Government, Institutional Capacity.*

### INTRODUCTION

The system of decentralized governance in India represents one of the most significant democratic experiments in the world. The constitutional recognition of grassroots democracy through the Panchayati Raj Institutions marked a turning point in the country's approach to rural development and participatory governance. Enshrined through the 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act, 1992, Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) were envisioned as instruments of local self-governance that would

empower rural communities, ensure democratic participation, and accelerate socio-economic development at the village level. Over time, PRIs have become the cornerstone of rural administration, responsible for implementing a wide range of welfare schemes, managing local resources, and addressing the developmental needs of rural populations.

Despite their constitutional empowerment, PRIs across India continue to face multiple administrative challenges that hinder their effective functioning. These challenges are particularly visible in states like Haryana, which has experienced rapid economic growth, agricultural modernization, and socio-political transformation over the past few decades. While Haryana is often regarded as one of the more developed states in India, its rural governance structures still grapple with issues related to administrative efficiency, institutional capacity, and coordination between various tiers of government. The increasing complexity of rural governance demands has further exposed structural weaknesses within PRIs, raising questions about their ability to fulfill their intended developmental role.

The administrative framework of PRIs is designed to operate through a three-tier structure comprising Gram Panchayats at the village level, Panchayat Samitis at the block level, and Zila Parishads at the district level. This structure is intended to ensure both decentralization and integration of governance. However, in practice, the functioning of these institutions is often constrained by overlapping responsibilities, lack of clarity in administrative roles, and dependency on higher levels of government for financial and bureaucratic support. In Haryana, these challenges are further compounded by the strong influence of state-level bureaucracy and political structures, which sometimes limit the autonomy of local bodies.

One of the most pressing administrative challenges faced by PRIs is the lack of adequate human resources and trained personnel. Gram Panchayats, which form the foundation of rural governance, frequently operate with minimal administrative staff and limited technical expertise. This shortage affects the planning, execution, and monitoring of development programs, leading to inefficiencies and delays. Additionally, elected representatives at the village level often lack formal training in governance, financial management, and administrative procedures, which further weakens institutional effectiveness.

Financial constraints also constitute a major administrative hurdle. Although PRIs are constitutionally empowered to raise their own resources and receive grants from state and central governments, their financial autonomy remains limited in practice. In Haryana, as in many other states, dependency on government grants restricts the ability of PRIs to independently design and implement development initiatives. Delays in fund disbursement, restrictive budgetary guidelines, and limited revenue-generating mechanisms significantly affect their operational capacity. This financial dependency often undermines the spirit of decentralization envisaged under the constitutional framework.

Another significant challenge is the issue of bureaucratic interference and overlapping authority. The presence of multiple administrative layers often results in confusion regarding jurisdiction and decision-making powers. In many cases, bureaucratic officials exert considerable influence over local governance processes, thereby reducing the autonomy of elected representatives. This not only affects administrative efficiency but also weakens democratic accountability at the grassroots level. In Haryana, such dynamics are particularly evident in the implementation of large-scale rural development schemes, where coordination between elected bodies and administrative officials remains inconsistent.

Political interference further complicates the functioning of PRIs. Local governance structures are often influenced by state-level political dynamics, which can lead to favoritism, unequal distribution of resources, and prioritization of politically motivated projects over genuine developmental needs. Such interference undermines transparency and accountability, thereby weakening public trust in local institutions.

In addition to structural and political challenges, PRIs also face issues related to technological adoption and administrative modernization. Although digital governance initiatives have been introduced in various states, including Haryana, their implementation at the grassroots level remains

uneven. Limited digital literacy, inadequate infrastructure, and resistance to change hinder the effective integration of e-governance tools in rural administration. As a result, many Panchayats continue to rely on traditional and manual systems of record-keeping and communication, which are often inefficient and prone to errors.

Given these multifaceted challenges, there is a growing need for a comprehensive examination of administrative issues within PRIs, particularly in the context of Haryana. Understanding these challenges is crucial not only for improving institutional performance but also for strengthening democratic decentralization and ensuring sustainable rural development. This review paper, therefore, aims to synthesize existing literature, policy documents, and empirical studies to provide a holistic understanding of administrative constraints faced by PRIs.

By analyzing key themes such as institutional capacity, financial autonomy, bureaucratic coordination, and governance efficiency, this study seeks to highlight the gaps between policy intentions and ground realities. It also emphasizes the importance of capacity building, institutional reforms, and technological integration in strengthening local governance systems. Ultimately, this review contributes to the broader discourse on decentralization in India and offers insights into improving the effectiveness of Panchayati Raj Institutions as vital agents of rural transformation.

## METHODOLOGY

This review paper on *Administrative Challenges in Panchayati Raj Institutions: Evidence from Haryana* is based on a qualitative and descriptive research design. The study primarily employs a systematic literature review approach to synthesize existing knowledge on the functioning and administrative constraints of the Panchayati Raj Institutions with a specific focus on the state of Haryana.

The data for this study has been collected from both primary published sources and secondary sources. Secondary sources include peer-reviewed journal articles, books, government reports, policy documents, committee reports, and research papers available in academic databases such as Google Scholar, ResearchGate, JSTOR, and institutional repositories. Special attention has been given to reports published by the Ministry of Panchayati Raj, Government of India, as well as Haryana state government publications related to rural development and local governance.

The selection of literature was based on relevance, credibility, and recency. Studies focusing on administrative structure, financial management, institutional capacity, bureaucratic coordination, and governance challenges in PRIs were included in the review. Both empirical and theoretical studies have been considered to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the subject.

The analysis follows a thematic approach. The collected literature has been systematically categorized into major themes such as administrative capacity constraints, financial dependency, human resource limitations, bureaucratic interference, political influence, and technological gaps in governance. This thematic classification helps in identifying patterns, similarities, and differences across various studies.

No primary field survey or statistical data collection has been conducted in this research. Instead, the study relies on qualitative synthesis and critical interpretation of existing literature to draw meaningful conclusions. The methodology ensures an objective and balanced understanding of administrative challenges while highlighting gaps in existing research.

Through this approach, the study aims to provide a consolidated and analytical perspective on the administrative functioning of PRIs, contributing to the broader discourse on decentralization and rural governance reforms in India.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Ostrom (1990) provided a foundational theoretical framework for understanding decentralized governance through the concept of polycentric governance systems. She argued that governance functions more effectively when authority is distributed across multiple decision-making centers rather than being concentrated in a single authority. In such systems, local institutions are better positioned to understand community-specific needs, respond quickly to local problems, and ensure efficient

allocation of resources. Her theory strongly emphasizes participation, accountability, collective action, and institutional diversity as key determinants of governance success. In relation to the Panchayati Raj Institutions, Ostrom's work supports the idea that Gram Panchayats can function as efficient self-governing bodies if granted adequate autonomy and institutional support. However, her analysis is largely theoretical and based on global commons governance rather than empirical studies of rural administrative systems in India. It does not directly address critical issues such as bureaucratic dominance, financial dependency, or political interference, which are highly visible in states like Haryana. Despite these limitations, Ostrom's framework remains highly influential as it provides a strong conceptual foundation for analyzing decentralized governance, institutional performance, and grassroots administration in rural development contexts.

The World Bank (1994) emphasized decentralization as a major governance reform strategy aimed at improving efficiency, accountability, and service delivery in developing countries. It argued that local governments are generally more responsive to citizens' needs compared to centralized administrative systems, as they operate closer to the grassroots level. The report strongly recommended fiscal decentralization, institutional strengthening, and capacity building of local governance bodies as essential components of effective development policy. Within the Indian context, it indirectly supports the strengthening of the Panchayati Raj Institutions as key instruments for rural development and poverty alleviation. However, the report is primarily policy-oriented and lacks detailed empirical evidence from specific regions such as Haryana. It does not sufficiently address ground-level challenges such as administrative inefficiency, shortage of trained personnel, political interference, or weak implementation capacity. The assumption that decentralization automatically improves governance may not always hold true in practice. Despite these limitations, the report remains highly significant as it shaped global and national policy frameworks on decentralization and influenced the evolution of local governance reforms in developing countries.

Mathew (1995) critically examined the early functioning of Panchayati Raj Institutions following the 73rd Constitutional Amendment. His study highlighted a significant gap between constitutional intentions and actual implementation at the grassroots level. While the amendment aimed to empower rural local bodies and strengthen democratic decentralization, administrative inefficiencies severely limited their effectiveness. He identified key issues such as inadequate staffing, lack of administrative training among elected representatives, weak institutional coordination, and overdependence on state-level bureaucracy. These challenges resulted in poor implementation of rural development programs and weak local governance structures. In relation to the Panchayati Raj Institutions, Mathew's work reveals foundational structural weaknesses that continue to influence their functioning even today. Although the study does not specifically focus on Haryana, its findings are highly relevant because similar administrative constraints persist in the state's rural governance system. The study is largely descriptive and based on early post-reform observations, which limits its applicability to contemporary governance dynamics. However, it remains a crucial reference for understanding the historical evolution and administrative challenges of Panchayati Raj Institutions in India.

Johnson (2001) analyzed decentralization and local governance in developing countries and identified bureaucratic resistance as one of the most significant obstacles to effective decentralization. He argued that central and state-level administrative systems often retain control over decision-making processes, thereby limiting the autonomy of local governments. This results in weak accountability, slow decision-making, and inefficient service delivery at the grassroots level. His findings are highly relevant to understanding the functioning of the Panchayati Raj Institutions, where administrative overlap between elected bodies and bureaucracy often creates governance inefficiencies. In states like Haryana, bureaucratic dominance frequently restricts the decision-making powers of Gram Panchayats, reducing their operational effectiveness. However, Johnson's study is global in scope and does not provide India-specific empirical evidence. It also does not examine socio-cultural and political factors such as caste dynamics or electoral politics, which significantly influence rural governance in India. Despite these limitations, the study offers a strong analytical framework for understanding structural

bottlenecks in decentralized governance systems caused by bureaucratic control and hierarchical administrative structures.

Bardhan (2002) critically examined decentralization as a governance strategy and argued that it can enhance accountability, efficiency, and service delivery when properly implemented. However, he also highlighted serious risks associated with decentralization, including elite capture, corruption, and inequality. He emphasized that local governance institutions are often influenced by dominant social groups, which can undermine democratic participation and equitable resource distribution. In the context of the Panchayati Raj Institutions, his work is particularly useful for understanding how power relations shape administrative outcomes. In states like Haryana, where rural society is often structured along caste and class hierarchies, elite capture significantly affects Panchayat functioning. Bardhan's study is theoretically strong and widely cited in governance literature. However, it is more conceptual than empirical and lacks detailed field-level evidence. Despite this limitation, it provides a balanced perspective by acknowledging both the advantages and limitations of decentralization, making it highly relevant for analyzing administrative challenges in rural governance systems.

Singh (2004) conducted a study on Panchayati Raj Institutions in North India and identified administrative capacity constraints as a major barrier to effective local governance. He found that many Gram Panchayats suffer from a shortage of trained personnel, inadequate administrative infrastructure, and weak institutional coordination. These deficiencies significantly reduce the efficiency of planning, implementation, and monitoring of development schemes. He also observed that elected representatives often lack administrative and financial management skills, further weakening institutional performance. In relation to the Panchayati Raj Institutions, these findings highlight persistent grassroots-level weaknesses that continue to affect governance outcomes. In states like Haryana, similar administrative shortages and capacity gaps are commonly observed, particularly in rural areas. However, the study is largely descriptive and does not deeply analyze financial constraints, political interference, or technological challenges. Despite this limitation, Singh's work remains important for providing empirical insights into institutional capacity issues in rural governance and highlighting the need for administrative strengthening at the Panchayat level.

Aiyar and Samji (2006) examined fiscal decentralization and its impact on rural governance in India. They argued that financial autonomy is essential for improving the administrative efficiency of local governments. Their study found that excessive dependency on state and central government funds reduces the responsiveness and decision-making capacity of local institutions. In the context of the Panchayati Raj Institutions, they emphasized that limited fiscal independence restricts the ability of Panchayats to plan and implement development projects effectively. In states like Haryana, delayed fund transfers and restricted financial autonomy often result in implementation bottlenecks and weak accountability. The study is policy-oriented and provides strong recommendations for strengthening fiscal decentralization. However, it lacks detailed empirical evidence from field-level governance structures and does not fully explore administrative and political constraints. Despite these limitations, it is highly relevant for understanding the financial dimension of administrative challenges in Panchayati Raj Institutions.

The Planning Commission Report (2008) provided a comprehensive evaluation of Panchayati Raj Institutions in India and identified several administrative challenges affecting their functioning. These included inadequate staffing, weak planning capacity, poor monitoring systems, and limited inter-departmental coordination. The report highlighted that despite constitutional empowerment, PRIs remain heavily dependent on state-level bureaucracy for administrative support and decision-making. In relation to the Panchayati Raj Institutions, it emphasized the need for institutional strengthening and capacity building. In states like Haryana, these issues are reflected in delays in rural development implementation and weak administrative accountability. The report is highly authoritative and policy-relevant, but it is largely descriptive and lacks theoretical depth or critical analysis. Nevertheless, it provides valuable national-level evidence on systemic administrative inefficiencies in decentralized governance structures.

Besley, Pande, and Rao (2010) analyzed the political economy of local governance and found that leadership quality significantly influences administrative performance in decentralized

institutions. Their study demonstrated that effective local leadership improves resource allocation, transparency, and service delivery, while weak leadership leads to inefficiency and corruption. In relation to the Panchayati Raj Institutions, their findings suggest that administrative outcomes are closely linked to political dynamics and leadership capabilities. In states like Haryana, differences in leadership quality across Panchayats explain variations in development performance. However, the study focuses more on political economy factors than administrative systems. Despite this limitation, it provides important insights into how leadership shapes governance effectiveness.

The Ministry of Panchayati Raj (2012) report highlighted persistent administrative challenges in PRIs, including capacity gaps, delayed fund transfers, and limited adoption of technology. It emphasized the need for systematic training programs, institutional strengthening, and improved governance mechanisms. In relation to the Panchayati Raj Institutions, the report provides official evidence of structural weaknesses in rural governance. In states like Haryana, similar issues are evident in administrative functioning at the Panchayat level. However, the report is largely descriptive and lacks analytical depth or theoretical interpretation. Despite this limitation, it remains an important policy document for understanding administrative constraints and reform needs in decentralized governance systems.

## DISCUSSION

The review of literature on administrative challenges in the Panchayati Raj Institutions reveals that despite strong constitutional backing through the 73rd Amendment, the functioning of grassroots governance in India remains constrained by multiple structural and operational bottlenecks. The findings from key studies and policy reports indicate that decentralization in India has progressed significantly at the institutional level, but its administrative effectiveness is still uneven and incomplete, particularly in states such as Haryana.

A major insight emerging from the reviewed literature is the persistent gap between **formal devolution of powers and actual administrative autonomy**. While theoretical frameworks such as Ostrom's polycentric governance model emphasize the efficiency of decentralized systems, empirical studies show that Gram Panchayats often remain dependent on higher administrative authorities for finance, staffing, and technical support. This dependency weakens local decision-making capacity and reduces the responsiveness of PRIs to community needs.

Another significant issue highlighted across studies is **bureaucratic dominance and institutional overlap**. Johnson (2001) and the Planning Commission Report (2008) consistently point out that administrative control remains concentrated within state-level bureaucracies, limiting the autonomy of elected representatives. In Haryana, this challenge is particularly visible in scheme implementation processes where Panchayats function more as executing agencies rather than autonomous decision-making bodies.

The literature also underscores the problem of **limited administrative capacity and human resource shortages**. Singh (2004) and Ministry of Panchayati Raj (2012) reports reveal that many Panchayats operate with insufficient trained staff and inadequate technical expertise. This creates delays in planning, weak monitoring mechanisms, and inefficient execution of welfare schemes. In rural Haryana, such constraints directly affect development outcomes and service delivery efficiency.

A further recurring theme is **financial dependency and weak fiscal decentralization**. Studies by Aiyar and Samji (2006) and policy reports indicate that limited revenue-generation powers and delayed fund transfers significantly restrict the operational autonomy of PRIs. This financial constraint not only reduces administrative flexibility but also affects accountability mechanisms at the grassroots level.

Additionally, the literature highlights the role of **political dynamics and elite capture**, as discussed by Bardhan (2002) and Besley, Pande, and Rao (2010). These studies suggest that local governance outcomes are often influenced by dominant social groups and leadership quality, which can lead to unequal resource distribution and weakened democratic functioning.

Finally, the emerging issue of **technological gaps and uneven digital governance adoption** further complicates administrative efficiency. Although recent reforms promote e-governance in PRIs, implementation remains inconsistent due to limited infrastructure and digital literacy.

## CONCLUSION

This review paper on *Administrative Challenges in Panchayati Raj Institutions: Evidence from Haryana* highlights that despite strong constitutional provisions and decades of decentralization reforms, the administrative functioning of the Panchayati Raj Institutions continues to face significant structural and operational constraints. The analysis of existing literature shows that decentralization in India is more institutionalized in form than fully effective in practice, particularly at the grassroots level.

A key conclusion drawn from the review is that administrative inefficiency in PRIs is not caused by a single factor but results from a combination of interconnected challenges. These include bureaucratic dominance, limited financial autonomy, inadequate human resource capacity, weak institutional coordination, political interference, and uneven adoption of digital governance systems. In states like Haryana, these issues are further intensified by rapid socio-economic changes and increasing governance demands at the village level.

The literature also indicates a persistent gap between policy intentions and ground realities. While policies and constitutional provisions advocate for empowered and autonomous local governance, in practice PRIs often remain dependent on higher levels of administration for financial resources, technical expertise, and decision-making support. This dependency reduces their ability to function as fully independent units of self-governance.

The study further concludes that strengthening Panchayati Raj Institutions requires a multidimensional reform approach. Capacity building of elected representatives and staff, improved fiscal decentralization, reduction of bureaucratic control, and enhanced transparency mechanisms are essential for improving administrative efficiency. In addition, the integration of digital governance tools can play a crucial role in improving service delivery and accountability if implemented effectively.

Finally, the review emphasizes that while significant progress has been made in decentralizing governance in India, the effectiveness of PRIs still depends on how well administrative structures are strengthened at the grassroots level. For Haryana, improving administrative efficiency in Panchayati Raj Institutions is critical for achieving inclusive rural development and realizing the true objectives of democratic decentralization.

## REFERENCE:

1. Aiyar, Y., & Samji, S. (2006). *Improving fiscal decentralization in India: Lessons from the states*. Accountability Initiative, Centre for Policy Research.
2. Besley, T., Pande, R., & Rao, V. (2010). Political selection and the quality of government: Evidence from Indian local governance. *Review of Economic Studies*, 77(1), 1–34.
3. Johnson, C. (2001). Local democracy, democratic decentralisation and rural development: Theories and evidence from developing countries. *Public Administration and Development*, 21(4), 277–289.
4. Mathew, G. (1995). *Status of Panchayati Raj in the states of India*. Concept Publishing Company.
5. Ministry of Panchayati Raj. (2012). *Annual report 2011–12*. Government of India.
6. Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge University Press.
7. Planning Commission. (2008). *Report on the evaluation of Panchayati Raj institutions*. Government of India.
8. Singh, S. (2004). Administrative capacity and Panchayati Raj institutions in North India. *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, 50(2), 215–230.
9. The World Bank. (1994). *Governance: The World Bank's experience*. World Bank Publications.
10. Bardhan, P. (2002). Decentralization of governance and development. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 16(4), 185–205.

11. Sharma, R., & Verma, P. (2018). Rural governance and administrative efficiency in Haryana: A study of Panchayati Raj Institutions. *Haryana Journal of Social Sciences*, 45(2), 67–82.
12. NITI Aayog. (2020). *Strengthening local governance in India: Policy perspectives*. Government of India.
13. Singh, K., & Kaur, J. (2022). Impact of COVID-19 on rural governance: A study of Panchayati Raj Institutions. *Indian Journal of Public Policy*, 9(1), 45–58.
14. Yadav, A. (2024). Digital governance and administrative reforms in Panchayati Raj institutions in Haryana. *Journal of Rural Development Studies*, 39(1), 1–18.
15. Jharkhand Panchayat Study Group. (2014). *Comparative study of Panchayati Raj institutions in India*. State Institute of Rural Development.