

7.0 IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES AMONG SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS

7.01 The different sectoral programmes implemented in the sample villages are Housing programmes under IAY, Ashraya & Ambedkar schemes, Income Generating programmes by providing Milching cows, buffaloes, sheeps, artisan activities etc, improvement of production infrastructures such as assisting in irrigation, Horticulture and other land related activities and Employment generation through Area Development programmes.

7.02 The total number of beneficiary households under different sectoral programmes is given in Table - 7.1

Table - 7.1 : Total Number of Beneficiaries in the Sample Villages (1997 - 2000)

Sl. No.	Sample Village	Total Number of Beneficiaries			
		SC	ST	Others	Total
1	Arkalvadi	210*	*	116	326
2	Baagli	66	5	39	110
3	Kuntur	28	3	53	84
4	Tagarapura	48	11	38	97
5	Shindanapura	22	-	38	60
6	Agara	18	-	46	64
	Total	392	19	330	741

Note : * - Breakup is not available

7.03 The number of sample households benefited during the last three years under different programmes is given in Table - 7.2 below.

Table - 7.2 : Yearwise Distribution of Sample Households by Benefited Programme

Sl. No.	Programme	Number of Respondents Benefited During		
		1999 - 2000	1998 - 1999	1997 - 1998
1	Nirmal Karnataka Yojana	9	2	5
2	Group Housing Scheme	2	0	2
3	Ambedkar Housing Scheme	5	1	10
4	Neralu Bhagya	4	3	1
5	Tailoring Training	3	0	10
6	IRDP	6	34	100
7	Bhagyajyothi	17	9	11
8	Gobar gas	4	0	0
9	Ganga Kalyana	5	10	15

Table - 7.2 (Contd..) : Yearwise Distribution of Sample Households by Benefited Programme

10	Indira Awaz Yojana	3	10	19
11	ICDP	1	0	0
12	Agricultural Department	1	1	0
13	Jalanayana Abhivruddi	1	2	0
14	Ashraya House	0	6	24
15	Horticulture	0	4	0
16	Gadi Abhivruddi Yojana	0	0	2
17	100 Million	0	1	2
	Total	61	83	201

7.04 The number of beneficiaries benefited from various programmes given in Table - 7.2 above, could be classified into three major categories, such as Quality of Life, IRDP/Income Generating and Improving Production Infrastructure programmes. Based on the categorisation, the following Table - 7.3 gives the number of beneficiaries in the sample households surveyed. It is seen that the total number of beneficiaries is 345 and the number of sample households surveyed is 316. This is due to some households having received more than one benefit.

Table - 7.3 : Distribution of Sample Households by Benefited Programme

Sl. No.	Programme	Number of Sample Households Benefited During			
		1999 - 2000	1998 - 1999	1997 - 1998	Total
1	Improving Housing condition including sanitation	44	31	74	149 (43)
2	IRDP/SGSY for self employment & income generating	9	36	110	155 (45)
3	Improving Production infrastructure	8	16	17	41 (12)
	Total	61	83	201	345 (100)

Note : Figures in brackets denote percentage to total

7.05 It is observed from Table - 7.3 that IRDP/SGSY programme have been utilised by 45% of the sample households, while 43% have received housing assistance. The improvement in production infrastructure programmes have been utilised by 12% of the sample households.

7.06 As seen from the Table 7.3, the major development programmes benefited are the Housing, IRDP and Ganga Kalyana Yojana. These three programmes implemented in the sample villages has shown impact of different degrees. In the following paragraphs, the impact of these programmes are analysed.

Impact of Housing Programme

7.07 As already discussed earlier the different housing programmes implemented are the IAY, Dr. Ambedkar Ashraya Housing schemes. It is to be noted that Ashraya schemes not functioning since 1999 due to legal issues. In addition to these schemes, housing assistance under Neralu Bhagya, Gadinadu Abhivruddi programmes are also under implementation. All these schemes aim at the improvement in the living condition of the rural community. Also, there are Sanitation programmes under Nirmala Karnataka Yojana - a subsidy oriented programme, where the beneficiary has to construct household latrine.

7.08 In the Table 7.4 given below, the distribution of sample households benefited under all the Housing programmes is given.

Table – 7.4: Number of Sample Households benefited under Housing Programmes

Category	1999-00	1998-99	1997-98	Total
Landless	5	12	30	47
Marginal	5	5	22	32
Small	4	2	5	11
Medium	0	1	1	2
Large	0	0	0	0
Total	14	20	58	92

7.09 It is observed from the above Table - 7.4 that 29% of the sample households have been given full assistance under different housing programmes during the last three years. It is to be noted here that these households have completed the house and are living in the new house. There are many other households in the sample villages who have been listed under the housing programme but are at different stages of completion.

7.10 The category-wise distribution of sample households benefited under different housing programmes (Table -7.4) reveals that 51% are landless households and 35% are the marginal farmers. The small and the medium farming households constitute the remaining 14%. As already seen, there is no large farmers among the sample households.

7.11 It is difficult to measure the impact of this programme economically. However, the impact of Housing programme could be analysed in relation to the health condition of the sample households. As already seen that there has been no major diseases occurred in the sample households. This has been, as perceived by the sample households is complemented by the improvement in the availability of medical facilities.

Impact of Livestock Programmes

7.12 One of the major income generating programme is the livestock programme through providing subsidy. It is seen that these programmes have been implemented by the Zilla Panchayat through Bank's subsidy, Animal Husbandry Department and also under Jalanayana Programme.

7.13 In the following Table – 7.5 the number of sample households benefited from the livestock programme and who have retained the asset is given.

**Table – 7.5 : Number of Sample Households benefited under IRDP
(Livestock) and Holding Livestock**

Category	1999-00		1998-99		1997-98		Total	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
Landless	2	1	12	7	64	32	78	40
Marginal	2	1	15	13	31	16	48	30
Small	2	2	6	4	5	3	13	9
Medium	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	6	4	34	24	100	51	140	79

*Note : A – Number of Sample Households received livestock
B - Number of Sample Households received livestock and hold them*

7.14 It is seen from Table – 7.5 that 140 (44%) of the sample households have been given assistance under livestock programme. However, it is observed that, 79 (56%) of these beneficiaries have retained the assets created under this programme. As observed from the table the retention capacity of the assets created is 51% for the 1997-98 beneficiaries as compared to 71% for the 1998-99 beneficiaries.

7.15 Among the different categories of beneficiaries the marginal and the small farming sample households have better retaining capacity of assets created under this programme. It is seen that 63% and 69% of beneficiaries in these two groups have retained the livestock provided to them, while in the case of landless households it is 51%.

7.16 The impact of the livestock programme on the sample households who have retained the assets is analysed taking the 1997-98 and 1998-99 beneficiaries separately. This could give impact for three and two years respectively. In Table – 7.6 and Table – 7.7 below the annual income generated by different categories of sample households are given.

Table – 7.6 : NUMBER OF SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS BENEFITTED UNDER LIVESTOCK PROGRAMME IN 1997 – 98 AND INCOME GENERATED																			
CATEGO RY	ANNUAL INCOME (Rs.) GENERATED																		
	NIL			< 1000			1000 – 2500			2500 – 5000			5000 – 7500			> 7500			
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	
Landless	18	11	11	1	1	2	2	2	3	6	9	8	5	7	4	0	1	5	
Marginal	7	8	3	0	0	0	4	2	3	4	2	6	2	0	1	0	3	3	
Small	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	
Medium	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total	27	20	16	1	1	2	6	4	6	10	12	14	7	7	5	1	5	9	

Note :- A : 1997 – 98; B : 1998 – 99; C : 1999 – 2000;

Table – 7.7 : NUMBER OF SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS BENEFITTED UNDER LIVESTOCK PROGRAMME IN 1998 – 99 AND INCOME GENERATED

CATEGORY	ANNUAL INCOME (Rs.) GENERATED											
	NIL		< 1000		1000 – 2500		2500 – 5000		5000 – 7500		> 7500	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
Landless	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	1	4
Marginal	8	6	0	1	1	2	0	0	1	1	1	1
Small	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Medium	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	12	10	0	1	1	2	2	2	5	2	2	5

Note :- A : 1998 – 99; B : 1999 – 2000;

- 7.17 It is seen from Table – 7.6 that 26 (51%) out of the 51 beneficiary sample households of 1997-98 who have retained livestock, were not able to generate income during the first year. It declined to 43% during 1998-99 and to 29% during 1999-2000. This shows that the 51 sample households who have been benefited with livestock during 1997-98 have been able to retain the asset and generate some income from it. This is a positive sign of the proper utilization of the livestock programme.
- 7.18 It is interesting to observe that 9 of the 51 sample households could generate income of more than Rs.7500 by 1999-2000. Also, 5 of the landless sample households have improved income to above Rs.7500 during the last three years.
- 7.19 The landless sample households who have retained livestock received during 1997-98 could generate income gradually over the three years. In the first year 14 (43%) of them could generate income and it improved to 20 (67%) during 1998-99 and to 22 (69%) during 1999-2000 showing increasing utilization of livestock by the landless households.
- 7.20 The analysis of the 1998-99 sample beneficiary households (Table – 7.7) under livestock programme, reveals that, 14 (58%) of the 24 sample households could not generate income during the first year, which was improved to 50% in the second year. As observed among the 1997-98 beneficiary sample households, the 1998-99 beneficiary sample households do also show improvement during the two years.

Impact of Ganga Kalyana Programme

- 7.21 Ganga Kalyana Programme relates to improvement in agricultural practices by providing irrigation facilities through energised borewells. This programme is one of the major programmes under the improvement of production infrastructure category.
- 7.22 The number of beneficiaries covered under Ganga Kalyana Yojana during the last three years among the sample households is given in the Table – 7.8.

Table – 7.8 : Number of Sample Households benefited under Ganga Kalyana Yojane

Category	1999-00	1998-99	1997-98	Total
Marginal	3	8	10	21
Small	1	3	4	8
Medium	1	0	3	4
Large	0	0	0	0
Total	5	11	17	33

- 7.23 It is seen from Table – 7.8 above that during the last three years 33 sample households have been benefited under Ganga Kalyana Programme, thus constituting 19% of the land holding sample households covered under this programme. The distribution of different categories of farmers benefited shows 64% are marginal farmers followed by 24% of small farmers and 12% of medium farmers.
- 7.24 During the different years under review, beneficiaries the covered under this programme has been 10% during 1997-98, 6% in 1998-99 and 3% in 1999-2000. The total coverage of different categories of farmers during the last three years among the sample households surveyed are 18% - marginal farmers, 17% - small farmers and 44% - medium farmers.
- 7.25 The impact of the Ganga Kalyana Programme in the sample households benefited under this programme is analysed in Table – 7.9 and Table – 7.10. These Tables give the distribution of the benefited sample households based on the yearly income generated per acre after implementation of the programme.

Table – 7.9 : NUMBER OF SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS BENEFITTED UNDER GANGA KALYANA PROGRAMME IN 1997 – 98 AND INCOME GENERATED PER ACRE

CATEGO RY	INCOME (Rs.) GENERATED PER ACRE																	
	NIL			< 1000			1000 – 2500			2500 – 5000			5000 – 7500			> 7500		
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C
Marginal	8	5	6	1	1	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	2	2
Small	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
Total	9	5	6	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	3	2	0	2	2

Note :- A : 1997 - 98; B : 1998 - 99; C : 1999 - 2000;

Table - 7.10 : NUMBER OF SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS BENEFITTED UNDER GANGA KALYANA PROGRAMME IN 1998 - 99 AND INCOME GENERATED PER ACRE

CATEGORY	INCOME (Rs.) GENERATED PER ACRE											
	NIL		< 1000		1000 - 2500		2500 - 5000		5000 – 7500		> 7500	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
Marginal	2	1	0	0	2	2	2	4	1	0	3	3
Total	2	1	0	0	2	2	2	4	1	0	3	3

Note :- A : 1998 - 99; B : 1999 - 2000;

- 7.26 It is seen from Table – 7.9 and Table – 7.10 above, that there has been an increase in the income per acre over the years. Among the beneficiary sample households of 1997-98, 9 (53%) of beneficiary could not generate income during the first year while in subsequent years this proportion has been reduced to 30%. In the case of the beneficiary sample households who have received benefit under this programme during 1998-99, the income generation is better than the 1997-98 beneficiaries. In this case, only 2 (18%) of the sample households could not generate income during the first year while in the second year, income has been generated by 10 (91%) of the sample beneficiaries who have received benefits in 1998-99.
- 7.27 During the survey period the community in the sample villages have appreciated, the Ganga Kalyana Programme. They have expressed that this has been the only productive programme where the irrigation facilities have improved the economic conditions of the small and marginal farmers.

Medical Services

- 7.28 The progress of different health and family welfare programmes implemented in the district is given in Table - 7.11. It is seen that the achievement of different programmes during 1999 - 2000 is quite significant.

Table – 7.11 : Progress under Health and Family Welfare Services (April 1999 - March 2000) - Chamarajanagar District

Item	Target (No.)	Achievement (No.)	% of Achievement
I - Family Welfare Programme			
Vasectomy	1006	3	0.30
Tubectomy	9054	7990	88.25
IUD	12869	9228	71.71
Nirodh	4000	5902	147.55
Oral Pills	3780	3763	99.55
II - Vaccination			
BCG	21000	19289	91.85
DPT+Polio	21000	19168	91.28
Measles	21000	18001	85.72
DPT - Booster	21000	17130	81.57
TT – Mothers	27000	21556	79.84
III – Distribution of Iron Tablets			
Mothers	11500	18737	162.93
Mothers	11500	6413	55.77
Children	54000	28009	51.87
Children	54000	9820	18.19

- 7.29 The Department of health and Family welfare is disseminating health education through its programmes such as education of girl child, conducting of jathas and workshops on health & hygiene education, prevention of AIDS etc,. The department has organised 32 such related programmes in the district during the period January to June 2000.
- 7.30 The reported cases of diseases from January to June 2000 is given in Table – 7.12 below. It is observed from Table – 7.12 that diahorreha is the most common disease reported in the district during this period.

**Table – 7.12 : Reported Cases of Diseases
in Chamarajanagar District**

Sl. No.	Disease	No. Reported
1	Gastro Enteritis	40
2	Diahorreha	6323
3	Viral hepatitis	23
4	Typhoid	53
5	Measles	5
6	Malaria	38
7	Dog bite –Simple	687
8	Snake bite	27

7.31 Among the sample villages Arakalvadi village in Chamarajanagar taluk has 20 bed Primary Health Centre. In addition there are private doctors with clinics. Whereas for the other five sample villages the medical facility is available at a distance of 3 to 5 kms. The only source of medical facility for these five sample villages is the Primary Health Centre. Also, people go to the taluk head quarters for utilising medical facilities. The Table – 7.13 gives the distribution of sample households utilising different medical facilities.



**Table – 7.13 : Distribution of Sample Households
by Utilising Medical facilities**

Facility	No. of Sample Households	%
Primary Health Centre	222	70
Government Hospitals	56	18
Private	38	12
Total	316	100

7.32 There has been no incidence of major diseases in the sample households. It is reported in about 3 % of the sample households have persons with bronchial and arthritic problems.

Views of the Sample Households

7.33 The views expressed by the sample households about the different welfare programmes implemented by the government is presented in Table – 7.14.

**Table – 7.14 : Views of the Sample Households
about the Welfare Programmes**

Sl. No.	Views	No. of Sample Households	%
1	Good & Useful	93	29
2	Proper Identification and Monitoring	44	14
3	Housing scheme is good	38	12

**Table – 7.14 (Contd..) : Views of the Sample Households
about the Welfare Programmes**

Sl. No.	Views	No. of Sample Households	%
4	Timely Completion of Schemes is needed	15	5
5	Assistance to irrigation	16	5
6	Creating Awareness about different welfare programmes	13	4
7	Livestock improvement	14	4
8	Continuance of IRDP	11	3
9	Timely release of loans and subsidy	9	3
10	Avoid middlemen	7	2
11	Others	6	2
12	No Response	50	16
	Total	316	100

7.34 The following observations could be made from the Table - 6.30 above :

- 29 % of the sample households perceive that the welfare programmes implemented by the government are good and useful.
- Proper identification and monitoring of the programmes is felt necessary by 14 % of the sample households.
- Housing scheme has been appreciated by 12 % of the sample households
- Five percent of the sample households view that timely completion of the schemes will lead to success of the programme.
- Another five percent of the sample households view that providing irrigation facilities through Ganga Kalyana Yojana will help in the improvement in agricultural sector.
- Awareness creation on different welfare programmes and training on the activities is viewed as important by 4 % of the sample households.
- Assisting in the improvement of livestock will help in the generation of income from livestock as perceived by four percent of the sample households.
- Timely release of loans and subsidy has been perceived by 3 percent of the sample households. While a similar percentage of sample households feel that IRDP should be continued with proper monitoring.