

Impact of Swaranjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana

Karamvir

Research Scholar, CMJ University, Shillong, Meghalaya

Abstract: Poverty is predominantly a rural phenomenon. Agricultural wage earners, small and marginal farmers and casual workers engaged in non- agricultural activities, constitute the bulk of rural poor. Small land holdings and their un-remunerative productivity are the cause of poverty among agrarian populace. Poor educational and health standards; and lack of other vocational skills also perpetuate poverty. Due to the poor physical, social and financial capital base, a large proportion of the people are forced to seek employment in vocations with extremely low levels of productivity and wages. The creation of employment opportunities for the unskilled workforce has been a major challenge for development planners and administrators. Substantial number of landless and small farmers is dependent on wage employment and experience employment seasonally. The worst affected are the women and children. To provide employment and eradicate poverty, the government introduced several schemes and one among those schemes is SGSY.

INTRODUCTION

In this paper, an attempt has been made to analyze the socio- economic background of the selected respondents and their perceptions about SGSY so as to find out and judge the impact of the scheme. The views and perceptions of the beneficiaries, officials and Panchayat members have been collected and the related data has been presented in various tables. The perceptions have been formulated on the basis of information given by beneficiaries, officials and Panchayat members. Observations and discussion were also held during the course of research.

CASTE- WISE DISTRIBUTION

Cast-wise distribution of the selected respondents has been presented in Table 4.1. Caste-wise distribution of beneficiaries shown in the Table 4.1 indicates that 8.3 percent beneficiaries belong to the General Caste whereas 36.7 percent

Table 4.1

Beneficiaries' Caste-wise Distribution

Sr.No.	Category	Frequency	Percent
1.	SC	132	55.0
2.	BC	88	36.7
3.	General	20	8.3
	Total	240	100.0

hail from backward classes and majority (55 percent) of respondents are selected from Scheduled Castes. Thus, an overwhelming majority of the beneficiaries belongs to schedule castes and backward classes.

EDUCATIONAL STATUS

Table 4.2 reveals the education-wise distribution of beneficiaries. Data reflect that 47.1 percent beneficiaries are primary pass followed by 34.2 percent who are illiterate whereas 16.2 percent beneficiaries have the qualification of middle and remaining 2.5 percent are matriculate. So the majority of illiterate beneficiaries have been selected for the study.

Table- 4.2

Education-wise Distribution of Beneficiaries

Sr. No.	Education	Frequency	Percent
1.	Illiterate	82	34.2
2.	Primary	113	47.1
3.	Middle	39	16.2
4.	Matric	6	2.5
	Total	240	100.0

It is believed that the understanding of educated persons about their surrounding area is more comprehensive than illiterate persons. Further the facilities provided by Government are more quickly and easily picked up by the literate persons than the illiterate ones. Educational status of Panchayat members is presented in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3

Education-wise

Distribution of Panchayat Members

Sr. No.	Educational Status	Frequency	Percent
1.	Illiterate	16	10.7
2.	Literate	18	12.0
3.	Primary	15	10.0
4.	Middle	33	22.0
5.	Matric	54	36.0
6.	Secondary and above	14	9.3
	Total	150	100.0

So far as educational status of Panchayat Members is concerned the Table shows that 36.0 percent respondents are matriculates, 22.0 percent are qualified upto middle standard, 12.0 percent are literate, 10.7 percent illiterate whereas 10.0 percent Panchayat Members are qualified upto primary standard and only 9.3 percent respondents have the qualification of secondary and above level. It can be said that around 70.0 percent Panchayat Members have the qualifications between middle and matric standard.

OWNERSHIP OF LAND

In a query, the respondents were asked as to whether they had agricultural land or not. A considerable percentage i.e. 28.3 respondents reported that they had their own agricultural land while 71.7 percent denied (Table 4.4) for having the agricultural land. Further the respondents were asked as to how much land they possessed, 55.9 percent told that they had upto 1 acre land whereas 32.3 percent respondents told that they had 1 to 2 acres of agricultural land and remaining 11.8 respondents reported that they had 2 to 3 acres agricultural land. From the above analysis, it can be concluded that 28.3 percent beneficiaries had the agricultural land. It has also been found that 11.8 percent beneficiaries had 2 to 3 acres agricultural land. As per government criteria above APL family are ineligible for the scheme. Yet some having more than two acres of land have been selected for scheme of SGSY due to nepotism and favouritism.

Table 4.4

Beneficiaries' Ownership of Land

Sr.No.	Response	Frequency	Percent
--------	----------	-----------	---------

1.	Yes	68	28.3
2.	No	172	71.7
	Total	240	100.0
If 'Yes' Then Tell			
1.	0-1	38	55.9
2.	1-2	22	32.3
3.	2-3	8	11.8
	Total	68	100.0

AGE-WISE DISTRIBUTION

Age-wise distribution of respondents of different categories is given in Table 4.5, 4.6 and 4.7.

Table 4.5

Age -wise Distribution of Beneficiaries

Sr.No.	Age (in Years)	Frequency	Percent
1.	Less then 20	12	5.0
2.	21-30	46	19.2
3.	31-40	98	40.8
4.	41-50	84	35.0
	Total	240	100.0

As given in Table 4.5, 5.0 percent beneficiaries were below 20 years age group and 19.2 percent beneficiaries were from 21-30 years' age group, 35.0 percent respondents were from the age group of 41-50 years. While 40.8 percent selected respondents were from the age group of 31-40 years. Table reflects that 75.8 percent beneficiaries were in the range of 30 to 50 years' age group.

AGE-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF PANCHAYAT MEMBERS

Table 4.6 shows that 45.3 percent respondents are in the age group of 31-40 years, 29.3 percent respondents are in the age group of 41-50 years followed by the age group of 51-60 years i.e. 22.7 percent and rest of them 2.7 percent are above 60 years. Thus, the maximum Panchayat members are in the active age group of 31-40 years.

Table 4.6

Age- wise Distribution of Panchayat Members

Sr. No.	Age in Years	Frequency	Percent
---------	--------------	-----------	---------

1.	31-40	68	45.3
2.	41-50	44	29.3
3.	51-60	34	22.7
4.	Above 60	4	2.7
	Total	150	100.0

AGE-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF OFFICIALS

Age-wise distribution of officials is given Table 4.7 shows that 59.6 percent respondents are in the age group of 31-40 years followed by 30.8 percent with the age group of 41-50 years whereas 9.6 percent respondents are in the age group of 51-60 years. Maximum numbers of official respondents are also in the age group of 31-40 years.'

Table 4.7

Age-wise Distribution of Officials

Sr. No.	Age (in years)	Frequency	Percent
1.	31-40	31	59.6
2.	41-50	16	30.8
3.	51-60	5	9.6
	Total	52	100.0

DESIGNATION OF PANCHAYAT MEMBERS

Designation of Panchayat members is shown in Table 4.8. It reveals that an overwhelming majority i.e. 98.0 percent are the Panches of the Panchayat whereas only 8.0 percent are Sarpanches.

Table 4.8

Designation- wise

Distribution of Panchayat Members

Sr. No.	Designation	Frequency	Percent
1.	Sarpanch	12	8.0
2.	Panch	138	92.0
	Total	150	100.0

ACTIVITIES

To make any scheme successful, its activities must be result-oriented. Table 4.9 reveals that 91.7 percent beneficiaries were engaged in dairying and remaining 8.3

percent beneficiaries were engaged in activities relating to rural artisan.

Table 4.9

Distribution of

Beneficiaries According to Activities

Sr.No.	Activities	Frequency	Percent
1.	Dairying	220	91.7
2.	Rural Artisan	20	8.3
	Total	240	100.0

So the overwhelming majority of beneficiaries were engaged in dairying activity.

CONCLUSION

It is observed from the Table 4.10 that 54.7 percent respondents reported that their SHGs were running their activities properly whereas, 45.3 percent disagree with this. Furthermore, they were asked as to why SHGs were not running their activities properly, 58.8 percent said that the beneficiaries do not use their money in the activities actually, while 41.2 percent said the beneficiaries are not well trained to run the activities. So, it is found that the debt given to the beneficiaries is not utilized properly to run the SHGs activities, they spend this money on other items of their use. On the other hand, training is not provided sincerely regarding economic activities to the beneficiaries.

REFERENCES

Books

1. Bhaduri, Amit, Development with Dignity: A Case for full Employment, National Book Trust, New Delhi, 2005.
2. Bhatia, B.S. and Batra, G.S., (Eds.), Rural Development management, Deep & Deep Publications Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2000.
3. Bhattacharya, Vivek Ranjan, The New Strategy of Development in Village India- Progress under Revised 20 Point Programme, Dhawan Printing Works, New Delhi, 1983.
4. Chauhan, I.S. and Bias, V.S., (Eds.), Social Structure and Rural Development, Rawat Publication, New Delhi, 1995.

5. Cheema Shabbir, G., (Ed.), Rural Development in Asia - Case Studies on Programme Implementation, Sterling Publications Ltd., New Delhi, 1985.
6. Das, Purnendu Sekhar, (Ed.), Decentralized Planning and Participatory Rural Development, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi, 2005.
7. Dayanandan, R, (Ed.), Sustainable Development, Opportunities and Challenges, Serial Publications, New Delhi, 2005.
8. Etienne, Gilbert, (Ed.), Rural Development in Asia - Meetings with Peasants, Sage Publications, New Delhi, 1985.
9. Gaur, Archana, Integrated Rural Area Development, H.K. Composing Agency, New Delhi, 1985.
10. Gedam, Ratnakar, Poverty in India, Deep & Deep Publications, New Delhi, 1995.
11. Goel, O.P., (Ed.), Role of NGOs in Development of Social System, Isha Books, Adarsh Nagar, Delhi, 2004.
12. Gupta, V.S., Communication Development and Civil Society, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi, 2004.
13. Haq, Mahbud UL, The Poverty Curtain, Choices for the Third World, Columbia University Press, New York, 1976.
14. Hoggart, Keith and Bullen, Henry, Rural Development - A Geographical Perspective, Croom Helm Ltd., Beckenham, 1987.
15. Islam, Rizwanul, (Ed.), Strategies for Alleviating Poverty in Rural Asia, International Labour Organisation Asian Employment Programme (ARTEP), Bangkok, 1985.