

Civic Engagement in Public Expenditure Management

Case Studies

India: A Citizen's Report Card on Karnataka's Governance

Public Affairs Centre (PAC) has prepared a report card on the status of governance in Karnataka for Year 2000. Major highlights of the study are discussed below:

- Citizens in Karnataka have given a mixed verdict on the performance of the State Government during 2000. Though most citizens have not reported any deterioration in governance, only a small segment reports of improvements in their interactions with the government.
- In respect of essential services, there is wide variation in the performance of the agencies. Security and healthcare have received the worst ratings from the people. Drinking water, education and public transport seem have improved somewhat more relative to these services.

A good majority of the people in all regions are yet to experience a significant improvement in most of the essential services. Corruption is identified as a major area of concern, especially in electricity and health services and a cross section of public services and regulatory offices.

- b The feedback from agricultural sector and the rural population are the most negative among all sectors. Nearly three fourths of the industrialists and entrepreneurs felt positive about the actions of the Government this year in relation to their sector.
- b Urban Karnataka seems to be more upbeat about the current government's performance than the rural population.
- b Overall, the Report Card highlights some improvements in public services and regulatory activities, but of a limited nature. The vast majority of the people, however, are yet to feel the impact of these improvements. The continued prevalence of corruption and delays in public offices are a matter of concern. Whether all these signal a phenomenon of rural alienation in the making remains to be seen.

A Citizens' Report Card on Karnataka State's Governance

Samuel Paul# & Gopakumar K*.

Introduction

The newly elected Government of Karnataka completed one year in office in October 2000. Has the government performed well in the eyes of the citizens'? Though some reports of an evaluative nature have already appeared in the media, it is not an easy task to assess how well the Government has done in the short period of a year. Governance has many dimensions, not all of which are visible to everyone. Government may have initiated new policies and actions. Yet their impact may be difficult to gauge because it may take more than a year for the results to show. Similarly, actions taken or not taken in earlier years by preceding governments will no doubt influence the quality of governance in any given year. Apportioning credit or blame to anyone for what happens in a particular period is therefore hazardous and will not be attempted here. But any responsive government can be expected to set in motion changes for the better and get its machinery to be more responsive to the people even within a short period of one year.

One source that can provide useful information on how well the policies and actions of a government are affecting society is the people themselves. Based on their experience and observation over a year, citizens of the state from different walks of life can convey a sense of how the Government has impacted on their lives during this period. While their feedback will not adequately reflect everything that the Government has done, a "citizens' report card" will at least show whether things are moving in the right direction and whether their immediate impacts are favourable or otherwise as viewed by the public at large. A major part of the state budget, for example, is meant for the provision of essential services. If more resources are being allocated for certain uses or if personnel are being asked to be more responsive to the public, a report card will tell us whether the desired changes are in fact occurring. Systematic citizen feedback can therefore be a useful aid for the Government in redesigning its policies, services and other interventions.

It is against this background that the Public Affairs Centre (PAC) has prepared a report card on the status of governance in Karnataka at the end of the first year of the

Government. PAC has in the past brought out report cards on the public services in Bangalore and several other Indian cities. Its report card approach has been replicated in other countries too as a basis for civil society- government dialogues for improving services. PAC does not claim that people's experiences or perceptions represent the reality in all cases. But their interactions with public agencies and the resulting views will determine how they will react to a government or even vote in an election. If their feedback reveals certain patterns, those in authority should pay attention to them, if only to seek ways to correct people's perceptions and assessments.

This report card addresses three guiding questions:

- ☺ **How do the people of Karnataka rate the Government's performance in areas that matter most to them?**
- ☺ **What are the positive features and directional changes in governance that are appreciated by the people?**
- ☺ **What are the negative or neglected aspects of governance that need prompt attention?**

The report card presented here narrates a summary assessment of these different dimensions, based on a random sample survey covering the entire state. In order to ensure representativeness, two districts each from the four regions of the state (selected along distinct socio-economic patterns) have been included in the survey. Within each district, a sample of large and small villages and towns were selected. The resulting sample therefore has a reasonable mix of all household income levels and the different

productive sectors. Secondary data also have been used as a cross check wherever available.

This report card does not claim to be comprehensive in terms of covering all aspects of the state's governance. But it does provide valuable end-user or citizen feedback and insights on key dimensions of governance that deserve the attention of policy makers and all other concerned stakeholders in the state. It is divided into two parts. The first part deals with the basic services that citizens use such as electricity, drinking water, street lighting, public distribution of food (PDS), roads, public transport, healthcare, primary education, and law and order (security), along with selected specialised public offices such as revenue inspector's office, sub-registrar's office, agricultural depot, BDA's office, commercial tax office and civil supplies office. The second part of this exercise probed the progress of the productive sectors of the state's economy and aspects of governance pertinent to them. In agriculture, we have gathered feedback both from farmers and wage earners. In industry, feedback was obtained from entrepreneurs and senior managers on the Government's contribution to the sector's well being. Traders and white collar employees have also been included in the sample. The total sample size was nearly 1600 respondents (both households and others). Both the household survey and exit poll were undertaken in this study. Fieldwork for this study was conducted by ORG-MARG Research Limited. Details of the sample and the methodology used are given in Annex 1.

I. Essential Public Services

Areas of probe

- b Improvements in quality & availability
- b Improvements in agency interfaces

Services Probed:

- b Electricity
- b Drinking Water
- b Roads
- b Public Bus Transport
- b Fair Price Shops
- b Health Services
- b Schools
- b Safety & Security

A total of 1184 respondents were contacted across the state to probe inputs on various dimensions of essential public services delivery. Of these around 10% were female respondents. Around 1/4 of the respondent reported to have studied up to secondary level. Illiterate constitute around 14%, primary level 24%, undergraduate 18% and graduate +18%. Over 1/3 of the respondents were working in the service sector in almost the same percentage reported to be skilled/unskilled worker. Twenty three percent were occupied in agriculture sector. Fifteen percent of the households in the sample reported a monthly income below the poverty line.

1.1 Electricity

-

- ◆ Availability of electricity connection is quite good with 96% of the respondents reporting a power connection at their residence. Almost 80% of the respondents reported having street-lights in their localities.
- ◆ No improvement has been experienced during the year in the supply of electricity by nearly half of the households in the state. Only a little over a third experienced any improvement.
- ◆ No change has been experienced by a majority of the public in dealing with the agency involved and in respect of corruption (nearly 70%). Eighty percent of the total respondents and 85% of rural respondents give credit to the government for improvements in power supply.
- ◆ Less than a third of the households consider street lighting in their locality as "good". Over a fifth report street lighting to be worse than last year. But over 60% have not detected any change from last year.

1.2 Water Supply

- ◆ Public sources (Including Household pipe connections, Public taps & Public Hand-pumps) account for 76% of the total available sources for drinking water in the state.
- ◆ Fifty two percent of the households have reported an improvement in the overall availability of water, with 5% of them noting a major improvement.

- ◆ On the issues of dealing with the agency and the prevalence of corruption, over 65% have not observed any change or improvements.

1.3 Roads & Public Transport

- ◆ Only a third of the households have noted any improvement in the overall condition of public roads. No improvement was the verdict of nearly 60%.
- ◆ Increased frequency of public bus transport has been reported by 42% of the households while for 45%, the frequency has remained unchanged. Over 75% of the respondents consider the quality of buses as average or bad.
- ◆ Overall, 47% of the people have noted an improvement in the public transport system compared to the last year. The feedback is relatively negative among rural respondents.

1.4 Public Distribution System & Ration Shops

- ◆ Eighty three percent of the households reported having ration cards; more than half of the households surveyed buy all the items they are entitled to.
- ◆ Only 30-36% of households have reported improvements in the quality and availability of food items in ration shops. Nearly two thirds have not noticed any change from last year. Feedback in this regard is relatively negative among rural respondents.

1.5 Government Health Services

- ◆ Less than half the households in the sample have used public healthcare facilities; the profile is different for the rural areas where the usage of public facilities is relatively higher (54%).
- ◆ In terms of the availability of doctors and medicines and also on hygiene conditions, 24-33% of the respondents have seen some improvement in this service, over the last year. Over two thirds have not experienced any change. Availability of medicines and overall hygiene conditions are given a relatively negative feedback by rural respondents (20% reporting deterioration).

1.6 Government Schools

- ◆ A third of the total households surveyed reported having school going children.
- ◆ In terms of overall quality and attendance of teachers, 40% of the households have noted some improvement over the last year.
- ◆ Feedback on infrastructure is relatively negative; 27-33% have noted an improvement. The least improvement has been noted in toilets (20%). Improvement in other facilities such blackboards, benches, textbooks, and drinking water, About 50-60% of the households felt that conditions have not changed or may have turned worse in the current year.

1.5 Safety & Security at the neighbourhood level

- ◆ Only 18% of the households have noted any improvement in the law and order situation in their localities. Status quo or worsening in the security situation has been reported by 72%

The emerging trends could very well be summarised by the following tables (See tables I & II):

Table 1: CITIZEN FEEDBACK ON ESSENTIAL PUBLIC SERVICES: Have things changed over the last one-year?

SERVICE	NO IMPROVEMENT	IMPROVEMENT	DETERIORATION
ELECTRICITY			
b Status of Power supply	48	34	11
WATER SUPPLY			
b Availability of water	46	52	1
ROADS			
b Overall condition of roads	58	41	1
PUBLIC BUS TRANSPORT			
b Improvement in public transport	49	47	-
PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (FAIR PRICE SHOPS)			
b Availability of supplies & Quality of foodgrains	61	34	6
GOVERNMENT HEALTH SERVICES			
b Availability of doctors, availability of	52	28	15

medicines and Hygiene & cleanliness			
GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS			
b Quality of infrastructure like benches, blackboards, textbooks, drinking water & toilets	57	29	6
b Quality of education	51	40	2
SAFETY & SECURITY			
b Perceptions on safety & security at the village/town level	67	18	5

Table II

GOVERNANCE INDICATORS: User feedback on selected services

SERVICE	NO IMPROVEMENT	IMPROVEMENT (+ve changes)	DETERIORATION (-ve changes)
ELECTRICITY			
b Ease of dealing with the department	61	26	8
b Instances of corruption	61	15	14
WATER SUPPLY			
b Ease of dealing with the department	67	24	6
b Instances of corruption	65	23	5
GOVERNMENT HEALTH SERVICES			

b Instances of corruption	50	22	19
---------------------------	----	----	----

Government's Performance on Essential Services: A Summary

In respect of essential services, as the tables above show, there is wide variation in the performance of the agencies. Security and healthcare have received the worst ratings from the people. Drinking water, education and public transport seem have improved somewhat more relative to these services.

On the issue of governance, probes on selected indicators reveal that progress has been quite slow. The following table sums up the scenario:

Corruption is identified as a major area of concern, especially in electricity and health services. Overall, it is interesting to note that improvements in the supply of services is more notable than improvements in aspects of governance such as ease of transactions and corruption control. A good majority of the people in all regions are yet to experience a significant improvement in most of the essential services.

II. Selected Public Offices

Public Offices Probed

- b Revenue Inspector's Office
- b Block Development Office
- b Sub Registrar's Office
- b Agriculture Depot
- b Commercial Tax Office
- b Food & Civil Supplies

To get a feedback on how important public offices are performing, exit polls were conducted across the state at six key public offices. Feedback from 325 respondents were collected using a separate questionnaire. The following section describes the major findings from this exercise.

-

- ◆ More than half of the respondents (56%) have visited one or more of these offices three times or more in connection with a service or problem. Less than a quarter of them have given a "good" rating. A majority consider them average or bad.
- ◆ About a fifth of those who dealt with these offices have achieved their purpose. Over 60% have work pending with these offices. Major reasons for this outcome given by the respondents are non-availability of the officials, time delays and corruption.
- ◆ Over 45% of the people felt that corruption was prevalent in these offices. Thirty per cent have actually paid bribes in connection with their work. Proportions paying a

bribe were larger in the revenue inspector's office and sub-registrar's office. The average bribe paid was Rs.522 across the offices. The largest average amounts were paid at the sub-registrar's office and commercial taxes office.

- ◆ An improvement in terms of transparency has been noted in these offices over the last year by a majority of respondents (59%). This is consistent with the finding that 44% of the respondents found an improvement in staff behaviour compared to the last year. Other supporting evidence comes from the field observation of 73 offices that three fourths of them had documents on norms and guidelines on their services.

User feedback on selected public offices is discussed below in Table 3 & Table 4:

Table III

User feedback on selected public offices

Public Offices	% visiting more than 3 times	Proportion paying bribes	Average amount of bribe
Revenue Inspector's office	56	47	129
BDO	52	27	403
Sub Registrar's office	68	39	1133
Agriculture depot	51	23	421
Commercial tax office	58	15	889
Food & civil supplies	40	27	142
Overall	56	30	523

Table IV

CHANGE INDICATORS: Have conditions improved in selected public offices

Public Offices	No Change	Improved	Deteriorated
Revenue Inspector's office	64	13	9
BDO	37	16	7
Sub Registrar's office	63	17	-
Agriculture depot	67	13	2
Commercial tax office	53	22	5
Food & civil supplies	67	-	-
Overall	57	15	5

Functioning of Public Offices: A Summary

As the tables above show, improvements in the working of these public offices are less impressive than in the essential services reviewed in the earlier section. Not much seems to have changed in the way these offices conduct their business. Frequency of visits,

corruption and delays are major reasons why the public is giving a negative rating to these offices. A silver lining in the cloud is the observation that a little more transparency seems to be evident in their working. Random checks of offices confirm that many of them have begun to provide information on their procedures to their customers.

III. Sector Profiles

3.1 Agriculture Sector

- ◆ Among respondents from the agriculture sector, 42% have indicated an increase in their crop production/income this year while 55% have said that there was no increase in their production or income.
- ◆ Nearly a third of the farmers have taken loans for agricultural purposes this year. It represents a marginal increase from last year (31%). There is also a slight decrease this year in their borrowings from moneylenders (31% to 27%).
- ◆ On the availability of inputs, the vast majority of farmers (70-80%) did not report any improvement from last year. The most adversely commented on facility was marketing. More than a quarter said that there was deterioration in marketing facilities while a tenth said there was an improvement. There was slightly more improvement in fertiliser availability than in other inputs. (See the table 5 below).

Table V

SUPPORT TO AGRICULTURE SECTOR: Feedback on specific themes

Support Inputs	No Change	Improved	Deteriorated
b Supply of irrigation water	71	18	9
b Availability of credit	70	19	9
b Availability of fertilisers	65	23	9
b Availability of seeds	71	17	10
b Availability of marketing facilities	61	11	26

- ◆ Only 12% of the farmers felt that government policies and actions were encouraging for their sector, while 47% felt that the record was discouraging. A substantial proportion (41%) did not express any views on this subject.

Though there has been some progress in this sector, agriculture is one sector that has given a relatively negative feedback on the Government's functioning. This assessment may well have been influenced by the lack of support on the marketing front and the high expectations of farmers about government interventions.

3.2 Skilled and Unskilled Workers

-

-

- ◆ A little over half of all workers (51%) were employed during the year. There is no major change in this regard from last year. Average daily wages of less than Rs. 50 per head were received by 47% of them. The rest received higher wages as they were employed in offices, business and other services.
- ◆ Only 30% of the workers were aware of their minimum wage entitlement. About 8% of the workers confirmed that government personnel had enquired about their wages in the course of the year. The percentage was the same in the previous year too.
- ◆ A very low proportion (3%) of the workers stated that they benefited from any of the Government's welfare programmes. This finding was uniform across the regions. Even if the beneficiaries are taken as a proportion of BPL households, their share will only be 12%.

3.3. Industry Sector

Interviews were held with senior managers/owners of 54 industrial enterprises in different parts of the state. The major industries covered were engineering, electrical, machinery, software and IT, agri-business and iron and steel.

- ◆ A little less than half of all respondents reported an increase in their production and profitability during the year under review. But nearly 54% said that their production

had not gone up. Those with increased production attributed it to their marketing strategy and improved quality. The rest attributed their failure to increased competition and recession.

- ◆ On their interactions with Government, over a third noted an improvement in respect of inspections (excise, labour, etc). But over 43% felt that no change has taken place. In respect of commercial taxes, only 20% felt that there is an improvement with 43% saying that no change has occurred. A majority engaged in exports felt that airport and clearance facilities have improved.
- ◆ A majority (53%) rated electricity as "good" this year. Over a third rated it as average. But nearly 70% noted an improvement in the sector.
- ◆ Roads were rated as bad by 39% while only 28% considered them good. Almost half of the respondents did not report any change from the previous year.
- ◆ Nearly three fourths of the respondents felt positive about the actions of the Government this year in relation to their sector. Nearly 19% disagreed with this assessment. Very few were ambivalent on this issue.

4.0 An Overall Assessment

The entire sample (excluding industry) was also asked for their assessment of whether the Government had served them better this year compared to the last. About a quarter answered in the affirmative while 52% were negative in their response. Nearly 24% were undecided on this issue. Regions 2 and 3 led in the positive rating of the Government.

A disaggregation of this evidence provides valuable insights into the ways in which different segments of society view and experience the state's governance in comparative perspective. See table 6 below:

Table VI

**HAS THE GOVERNMENT SERVED ITS' CITIZENS better
this year as compared to last? What different VOICES
narrate!**

Sector	YES	NO	CANNOT COMMENT
b Farmers/Cultivators	19	64	17
b Labourers	14	47	39
b White collar workers	40	50	10
b Traders	25	39	36
b Entrepreneurs/Industrialists [#]	74	19	07
b RURAL respondents	20	60	20
b URBAN respondents	28	45	27
<i>OVERALL</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>52</i>	<i>24</i>

#. The figures are deduced from a different survey of 54 respondents.

Unskilled and skilled workers give the Government a slightly better rating than farmers. Nearly 14% of the workers have rated the performance of the Government positively while 47% did not agree with this assessment. But almost 40% were unable to give a verdict. Among those in government or private sector service, 40% felt that governance had improved while nearly 50% disagreed. Among small traders, 25% gave a positive rating to the Government while 39% were negative. In brief, farmers, workers, and traders are among the segments of society that are least impressed by the performance of the Government in its first year.

There is also a clear pattern in the way different income groups have rated the Government's performance. Across the state, of the households earning less than Rs.3000 per month, 18% felt that the Government had served them better this year while 36% of the households with incomes above Rs. 3000 per month affirmed improvement over the past year. This is a significant difference. The evidence points to a much more negative assessment of the Government by the lower income and rural population than by the higher income and urban population.

Along rural-urban divides, the feedback suggests that health services and quality of school infrastructure emerge as areas of concern in the rural sector. Also, corruption seems to be more significant for the rural population in accessing and using the basic services.

5.0 Conclusions & Recommendations

In summary, the report card does not provide any evidence of deterioration in any aspect of governance in the year 2000 compared to the preceding year. It does show some improvements in public services and regulatory activities, but of a limited nature. The vast majority of the people, however, are yet to feel the impact of these improvements. The continued prevalence of corruption and delays in public offices are also matters for concern. It is clear that the basic routines in the working of the Government remain largely unchanged. A major challenge for the Government is how to turn around this situation.

The feedback from the productive sectors of agriculture and industry shows a greater degree of polarisation in assessments. Needless to say, such assessments will be influenced also by the expectations of the people involved. The relatively negative rating of the Government's performance by farmers may be attributed largely to the limited improvements in input supplies and the problems in marketing their products. The fate of workers and small traders is closely linked to the buoyancy of the farm sector. That nearly half of the workers have employment only for less than a year and that only about 10% of BPL families benefit from welfare programmes are matters of concern. The rather more negative rating of the Government by the lower income and rural people is worrisome and deserves special attention. It is unrealistic to expect a Government to solve the problems of all sectors simultaneously in a short period. Nevertheless, it is a warning to the Government to review its priorities with sensitivity and care. Those who have received somewhat more attention from the Government such as industry and employees in the organised sectors are the segments of society that have rated the state's governance more positively. We cannot, however, hope that the newer types of industry will be the engine of growth for the farm and rural sector in the short term. The fast growing IT industry, for example, has limited backward and forward linkages and its

labour requirements are for highly specialised skills. The assumption that the rural sector's problems will be automatically taken care of by the expansion of new industries is therefore unrealistic.

Implications for Policy and Action

The report card findings have important implications for the Government. There are some clear messages in the citizen feedback which if acted on by the Government may increase the effectiveness of its policies and programmes. Government may also wish to undertake more in depth analysis of problems before taking corrective action.

1. There is considerable scope for improving the quality and responsiveness of most of the public services examined here. Service delivery is clearly the weakest link in the chain of governance. Government's goal should be to get these services satisfactorily to the vast majority of the population. But in practice, since we know that some of the service providers are lagging behind others, there is a case for paying special attention to the weaknesses in the poorer performers. While resource constraints may be part of the problem, more systematic monitoring alone could help improve their performance in the short run. The general tendency of governments is to attempt reforms or restructuring in all services and departments. Is there any merit in sequencing these efforts by adopting a campaign mode and concentrating on the reform of one service provider at a time?
2. In the medium term, significant improvements in essential public services and public offices cannot be achieved without radically reforming and redesigning the basic routines and systems associated with them. No amount of exhortation and threats are

likely to make a difference to these old traditions and routines. Today there is a window of opportunity to bring in e-governance methods to create entirely new systems and practices in place of the old. Experiments along these lines could be launched in almost all the services/offices surveyed here without creating any threats to the employment of existing staff. Evidence from other states clearly demonstrates that the receptivity to these changes is very high among the public.

3. A disturbing finding pertains to the extremely low utilisation of the Governments employment programmes by poor households (only 12% of BPL families claiming to benefit from such programmes). Our finding has been corroborated by other larger studies of specific programmes which have observed that workers from other states have been brought to Karnataka for employment while local labour was available. Formal reports may still show local persons on the muster rolls. It is quite possible that poor people tend to understate the personal benefits they are supposed to receive. It will require a more detailed study to verify whether such a bias is present in this response. But we can verify whether this response is consistent with the overall assessment of the Government given by the low-income households. The poorer households (workers) have given the most negative rating for governance, with only 14% saying that Government has served them better this year. If the employment programmes had benefited them significantly, it is doubtful that such a pessimistic assessment would have emerged. The consistency between these two findings is worrisome. A deeper probe into this phenomenon may shed much needed light on the real situation.

4. One thing that stands out among the findings is the widely differing ratings of the Government given by the rural sector and the urban and industrial sectors. A detailed diagnosis of this phenomenon is in order. Industrialists have not yet experienced improvements in all infrastructure or services. Nor have a majority of them done

better in economic terms. Nevertheless, a vast majority among them claim that the present Government has worked better for them. The reasons for this could be several. Those in industry may have felt the impact of new and positive measures of the Government in some areas of interest to them. More importantly, they may have a better appreciation of the Government's intentions and initiatives that could potentially benefit them in the future. This may also apply more broadly to the urban households too. This implies that Government's communication and interactions with urban groups and the industry sector may have been better and more visible. It is necessary for the Government to see whether there is a gap in this regard with respect to the farm and rural sector, a sector admittedly more complex than industry. It may well be that farmers do not see any new state initiatives that will benefit them. Alternatively, even if such initiatives exist, farmers and rural workers may not be adequately aware of them. The challenge for the Government is both to pay greater attention to the rural sector's problems and to communicate the same effectively to the rural population.

5. In India, we spend a great deal of time planning and designing programmes. We need a more balanced approach that pays equal attention to the task of adapting and responding to the problems and opportunities that arise on the ground as the plans get translated into action. More than policy deficiencies, it is the failure on this front that has hurt the effectiveness and impact of our development efforts over the past several decades. Needless to say, this in turn has been exacerbated by the lack of timely information, and more importantly, the lack of interest in seeking and using information for corrective action including the redesign of programmes and policies. This report card is an example of how this gap can be remedied to a great extent through the generation and analysis of timely citizen feedback.

APPENDICES

Sample Selection & Methodology

Study area and sample size

In order to have a representation of respondents/people from all part of the state, all geographic region were covered under the study. In each of the region atleast 2 districts were visited. Thus following districts were selected from each geographic region.

Karnataka - AP (North Karnataka) - Region - I

- Bidar
- Gulburga

Karnataka - Maharashtra & Goa (West Karnataka) - Region - II

- Uttar Kannada
- Dhakshin Kannada

Central Karnataka - Region III

- Shimoga
- Hassan

South Karnataka - Region - IV

- Mysore
- Kolar

In each of the district 2 taluks were randomly selected and again in each taluk, one large village (having 5000+ population) and one small (having <1000 population) were

covered. In each region 296 respondents (atleast 148 in each district) were contacted. Thus a total of 1184 respondents across the 4 regions were contacted. This sample estimate was worked on 2 percent of Standard Error and 95 percent of Confidence Level.

Exit Poll

For exit poll, a total of 325 respondents visiting Revenue Inspector Office, Sub Registrar Office, Commercial Tax Office, Agriculture Depot, Block Development Office and Civil supplies office were contacted. These interviews were held at the above offices located either at taluk or the hobli visited during the study.

Methodology

A three-pronged strategy was adopted for the study. Primary research was conducted among a cross section of society and their opinion on current as well as previous government was elicited. In addition to household interview to capture on the spot opinion, exit poll among visitors of various government departments was also conducted. In order to corroborate the findings from the primary research, secondary information was obtained from respective departments. However, details on number of pending cases and crime rates could not be obtained. In addition to this interviews with the top management of industries were also conducted.