

Chapter – 6

Impact of Schemes

Impact of development schemes in quantitative terms, can be interpreted as visibly present or absent structures and/or accountably found or missing facts, as a result of the implementation of the schemes. It, however, needs to be finally observed in qualitative terms of improving education level, standard of living and self-reliance. A blend of the two (that is quantitative and qualitative impact) is what we tried here to observe. Acknowledgement by respondents of having information about schemes and benefits gained from their implementation, along with the visible structures/facts were the criteria to sense the impact of schemes.

Before going into details of the **visible impact** of schemes as **negative or positive ones** a very fine impact of all the development schemes implemented through District Panchayat was visible as a logical identification of classes of people in the villages. It was not on the bases of their castes, religion, sex or even age but on the bases of their being literate / illiterate, resourceful / not so resourceful, knowledgeable / not so knowledgeable and needy for some external cooperation from the government or not so. The criteria that really make sense in the context of present times, to ponder upon for any society on its way to progress. The tables (6.1 to 6.7) show how **respondents from all different back grounds in terms of age, sex, caste, religion were equally and collectively enthusiastic about informing the state of affairs with regard to the development schemes. They actually seemed to be asking for improvement in situation.**

Young, middle age and old age (Table 6.1) all had responded to queries about various development schemes with equal enthusiasm. However, middle-aged group showed lesser interest (23%) towards development schemes. The reason could be that they already had a **'better'** experience of these schemes. The older group (40%) however had no alternative but to look forward to schemes and the younger group (37%) was comparatively inexperienced and hence, was still hopeful.

Table 6.1 : Age-group of Respondents

Age-group of respondent (in years)	No. of respondents	Percentage
18-35	25	36.8
36-50	16	23.5
51 and above	27	39.7
Total	68	100.00

Source : Formal interviews

Men still have perhaps better access to benefit from development schemes compared to women. It is interesting to note that even after 33 per cent involvement and participation of

women in Panchayati Raj Institutions, male and female ratio (69 per cent: 31 per cent) of respondents in this study was big (Table 6.2).

This **indicates** the need to make **special efforts and drive** so that **more of women** come forward to participate in development schemes.

Table 6.2 : Gender of the Respondents and their Proportion

Gender	No.of respondents	Percentage
Male	47	69.1
Female	21	30.9
Total	68	100.00

Source : Formal interviews

Not only that, the trend of **poor participation** of **women** was equally obvious in **all age groups**, of young (36%), middle age (25%) and old age (30%) people, more or less in similar proportions, compared to that of men (table 6.3).

Table 6.3: Depicting number of women and men respondents in three major age-group categories (youth, middle age and old age).

Age group of respondents	Sex		
	Male (%) N=47	Female (%) N=21	Total (%) N=68
18-35 years (Youth)	64.0 34.0	36.0 42.9	100.0 36.8
36-50 years (Middle age)	75.0 25.5	25.0 19.0	100.0 23.5
51 and above (Old age)	70.4 40.4	29.6 38.1	100.0 39.7
Total	69.1 100.0	30.9 100.0	100.0 100.0

Source : Formal interviews

Similar situation of male and female participation was found in all the castes (Table 6.4). Hence, women in rural areas belonging to all castes and age groups have been and still are much less participative. The situation requires attention for improvement because of two reasons: 1) **in statistical terms half of the population** which is not being taken seriously in scheme implementation would certainly **affect it's impact negatively** to the tune of **50%**.

And 2) **involvement of women has multiplier effect** in terms of more **acceptance and duration** of impact and hence, **sustainability** of any programme.

Table 6.4 Men and women Respondents from different categories of caste.

Caste Categories of Respondents	Sex		(% of Total (N=68))
	Male (%) (n=47)	Female (%) (N=21)	
General	6.4	9.5	7.4
OBC	17.0	14.3	16.2
SC	36.2	38.1	36.8
ST	40.4	38.1	39.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source : Formal interviews

Difference in interest of people from various caste categories, about the existence of schemes was quite obvious (Table 6.4). This inertness of a larger group of people (general category) can very well have it's own impact on success of the schemes (Box 6.1).

Box 6.1 : Inertness of non-beneficiaries

Premesh Malviya (28 years old), from Kesala Pnchayat on asking about performance of IAY and JD schemes said, "As my name is **not in BPL list now, I have nothing to do with these schemes**".

Source : case study 6

The proportion of respondents as Hindus (94.1 per cent) and Muslims (5.9 per cent, table 6.5) was quite comparable to their actual proportion, 95%: 4.5% in the district population on the whole (source: District Statistical Book for year 1999).

Table 6.5 : Religion of the Respondents

Religion	No. of respondents	Percentage
Hindu	64	94.1
Muslim	4	5.9
Total	68	100.00

Source : Formal interviews

Interestingly 45.6 per cent of all the respondents were having 4 and less number of family members and only around 6 per cent respondents had 9 and more members in their families (table 6.6). These facts reflect that the **small family** concept has become prevalent in **ST, SC and OBC** families, **even in tribal rural areas in Madhya Pradesh too.**

Table 6.6 : Family size of the Respondents

Family-size	No. of respondents	Percentage
1-4 members	31	45.6
5-8 members	33	48.5
9 members and above	4	5.9
Total	68	100.00

Source : Formal interviews

More number of scheduled tribe (39.7%) respondents coming forward to respond followed by SC (36.8%), OBC (16.2%) and General (7.4%) categories of castes indicates more aggressiveness of the people from these categories in similar order (Table 6.7).

Table 6.7 : The Respondents from different castes

Caste	No. of respondents	Percentage
General	5	7.4
OBC	11	16.2
SC	25	36.8
ST	27	39.7
Total	68	100.0

Source : Formal interviews

Visible Impact : the negative impact of the development schemes were visible in following cases :

1. Wide spread **corruption** for all the schemes including IAY, Rashtriya Bridhawastha Pension, Rashtriya Parivar Sahayata Yojana (case study 14, 20,18).
2. As mentioned earlier that on studying **finer aspects of facts**, through case studies and informal discussions, even IAY (a better known and with visible structures) couldn't be called a better performing scheme, as visible from details here. Since, **biased/wrong selections** of beneficiaries where **other than genuine beneficiaries or sarpanch** himself also got a house allotted (case study 13,14,16), the way the funds were given with **deducted money** (case studies 14, 20, 29), the **material supplied** in place of money (case study 19, 35) that too by village **secretaries and sarpanch** (case study 14), or **substandard** supplies of **material** (case study 16) and **delayed** release of **installments** (Box 6.3, case study 10,16).

3. Some of the beneficiaries had undergone **indebtedness** due to improper process of implementation under Prime Minister Rojgar Yojana (Box 5.3) and Jeevan Dhara.
4. The impact of schemes like **Matratva Sahayata Yojana** could not be found Positive, where the **lump sum money** was taken after delivery of the beneficiary, to distribute sweets (rather than for three scheduled nutritional supplements to her during pregnancy). Similarly in all of **Rashtriya Parivar Sahayata Yojana** cases (except one) the beneficiaries were spending funds on **Mrityubhoj** (a **socio-cultural tradition**, in place of investing the money received through schemes on some small occupational business.
5. **Kherala Panchayat** under Hoshangabad Block at a distance of 6 –7 kms from the district headquarters consisted of three parts namely Kherala, Dugeria and Patlai. There were antagonistic relations in all the three parts. *People from Patlai complained that their village is lagging behind because sarpanch was not from their Tola (part of the village). The same was the reaction of people from Kherala and Dugaria, about the ex-sarpanch. Favour was only for those sections that had voted for the Sarpanch. In Kherala Panchayat people had many complaints about the **corrupt practices** and **lack of commitment** on the part of **present** as well as **past Sarpanch**. Which was obvious by **non-implementation of most of the schemes (Table 5.4), poor situation of roads, school and panchayat buildings and larger number of labourers** (case study 14 & 15). Either **acceptance to corruption** and **other shortcomings** of the system by beneficiaries who had suffered or **frustration** due to **faulty** implementation of scheme (case studies 14, 20,27, 28).
6. It appeared that going through the experience of new BPL census (selection criteria) had made **people more manipulative** who started **hiding facts**, for example a large number of old age respondents said that they were staying all alone by themselves, gives doubt about genuineness of their statement (table 6.6).
7. **Jeevan Dhara** though in demand in Kesala block, even after the scheme has been stopped, seems to be **attractive due to its being a grant** to the small farmer.

In Positive Terms:

However, apparently the positive impact in terms of number and visibility of structures, was found for **IAY** in all the four blocks (see chapter 5) where 65% respondents knew about scheme (table 5.10), and 43% respondents were benefited by the scheme (table 5.11) and had a house of their own.

Another case of visible impact was that of Rajiv Gandhi Jal Mission Scheme. In quantitative terms **70 – 80** farmers were **directly** benefited by the scheme. However, indirectly the scheme benefited **300 – 400 people**, since **ground water level of area** increased and lots of **employment generation** was noticed in the block. Migration of labourers has become

almost negligible, rather labourers from adjoining Panchayat and even blocks are coming to Kesala.

Every respondent in Kesala Panchayat under Kesala block **knew** about the scheme, it's **implementation strategy and its benefits**. People even knew what **hurdles** they faced and how did they overcome those. And also about the nature of impact of scheme with regard to target group, that it was not individualistically targeted one but for a collective benefit. They were aware that it was a long-term, land development programme and was sustainable with its impact in qualitative terms (case study 1,5,8 & informal interviews).

Such a **strong impact** has been **rare** to see and know about a particular scheme. Beneficiaries could realize the impact in qualitative terms of agricultural development through increased production, more money-in-hand, raised standards of living, better clothing, and schooling for kids (Box

Model Panchayat: In Raipur Panchayat of Hoshangabad Block it was found that efforts of one person (ex-sarpanch) made the Panchayat, a kind of model for the whole district of Hoshangabad. It also increased enthusiasm of the local people, other members in Panchayat and people even at the so-called higher tiers of administration, that is, from the block and the district to take the development schemes in the right spirit. Educated, alert and active Sarpanch with right perspective of development schemes makes a very powerful functionary. All the schemes here were **well documented** to be easily accessible to any villager (photograph 1) and were being implemented, by and large, **in the right perspective**. On talking to the people and some Panchayat functionaries it was very much clear that the programmes were not limited to the walls of the Panchayat building only but were percolating down to the people too. Some of the important schemes are Maternity Benefit Fund, Indira Awas Yojana, Balika Samridhi Yojana, and Rashtriya Parivar Sahayata Yojana. Apart from beneficiary oriented schemes, there were various other developmental schemes being undertaken by the Panchayat. The Panchayat has constructed a number of roads, water treatment tanks, toilets, schools and a huge wall to save the Panchayat from the river Tava, which flows at the outskirts of the village. And people were happy with the situation of schools, roads and drinking water facilities (case studies 24 25& 26).

JD was another scheme where impact in terms of details of the scheme known to people was visible. The scheme now has been merged with the Swaran Janyanti Swarojgar Yojana (a year before).

Bottlenecks

Every stage of a development scheme needs to be taken very carefully to make it successful or effective. Any kind of carelessness can affect it adversely and may distort it, make it ineffective or totally unsuccessful. From the stage one at policy making level to the last stage of beneficiary level all those factors which affect the implementation process, need to be understood well by all those involved in the implementation process. **Total commitment,**

accurate understanding and proper sensitization of all the people involved, at all levels is a necessity. Lack of any of these, gives rise to sensitive points, which act as bottleneck.

In present study it was found that **even** the **schemes**, which were **visibly well understood** and were **doing better**, had various **bottleneck** points. These bottlenecks differ from place to place and time to time for the same scheme, as people dealing with schemes and their different attitude affects the programme differently. Various **bottlenecks observed** were as below:

Beneficiary Selection Process:

New BPL List : In the **latest census** of persons below poverty line (BPL), selection of beneficiaries made on the bases of consumption criteria, were being criticized by poor in all the villages from all four blocks, as it had left the deserving candidates out of the list. Many old age people said that till the last year they were getting money under **Rashtriya Bridhawastha Pension** which now has been stopped because now they are no more the beneficiaries according to the new list of BPL. How could it be practically possible that just by getting the meager amount of pension for the past few years they have crossed BPL and are in a better financial situation, to not to be the candidates for the scheme.

Box 6.2 : Anguish of villagers for New BPL Selections

Mr. Dinesh Tiwari, Up Sarpanch of Kesala Panchayat, **was angry about the new BPL survey** In his opinion **names of lot many deserving people have been deleted from the BPL list**, where as names of many **non deserving people** have been **included** in the list as beneficiaries. Hence, **Panchayat is not in a position to provide help to the real poor** due to the **non-availability of their names in the BPL list**. **The Panchayat has lodged a complaint to the concerned officials for re-survey of BPL beneficiaries.**

Source : Case study 3

At panchayat level: The next important stage of selection was when out of many deserving candidates from the BPL list, only **a few beneficiaries** are **identified** for each of the scheme on the basis of targets set (at district/State level) for each financial year. The names of more number of people than the target set are sent to the block for final approval. Many a times **only more needy people were left** and rest were selected. At times **by hiding the facts** a few **non-deserving candidates** got the scheme **benefit**. Where as the very needy and deserving were left for the next, or next to next year to be favoured. As in IAY even gram sarpanch proved that he had only a few acres of land and a nuclear family and hence, got a house under IAY (case study 14).

At block level: At the block level when the **names** of more number of people **from Gram Panchayat** are sent for **final approval** of the candidates selected, **according to the target set is third and final round** of selection of beneficiaries. Here **some of the names are again dropped out.**

At **all stages of selection** of beneficiaries mentioned above **favours** were done by **manipulating the facts** in accordance.

Time of release of money: Even if selection of beneficiaries was done properly, the time of delivery of installments remains a very crucial stage, to make the scheme practically effective or ineffective: for example in – Jeevan Dhara: The scheme, though was known and implemented in Kesala block but at places where land was rocky (very hard) and water level was very low it became **unsuccessful mainly due to either delay in the last installment or nonpayment of the last installments**. It had caused a **great loss** either to the beneficiary – as due to lack of money, work was stopped and half-done pit was filled back. **The work stopped forever**. **Half of the money spent before went waste** making the **whole effort** of taking **loan futile** and causing **indebtedness** to the **beneficiary** or to the **implementing agency (DRDA in this case)** to **repay double** the amount **spent** by the beneficiaries. At these bottleneck points mainly in release of money, people with vested interests, try to exploit the situation and cause undue losses, usually to the beneficiary. There were **instances in IAY** too where last installment was not paid in time (before the rainy season and the half-constructed house thus was falling, Box 6.3).

**Box 6. 3: Undue long Delay in Payment in next installment
In IAY**

Bhikhu Lal a resident of Taku Panchayat of Kesala block, **two years ago filled in his form to avail the housing facility under Indira Awas Yojana**. At that time amount of the yojana was Rs.10, 000. **Till date he has been given only Rs. 4000 in two equal installments and one quintal of wheat**. He is waiting for the rest of the amount but even after many visits to the block office he is still waiting. **In the office, although nobody denies his due payment but constant visits with no result has made him pessimistic**. Till date his house hasn't been build. **He is afraid that his house will come down in the rainy seasons if the money is not given to him for the construction of the roof**. One of the walls of the house has already come off. According to the provision of the Indira Awas Yojana the beneficiary has to build his house by the term fixed by the block officials, only after that they receive the money. **If the beneficiary due to any reason fails to construct his house or his house collapses he is debarred from the next installment**. **So, delay in the release of money some times leads to the falling of the houses due to rain and this results into the discontinuing of his next installment too**. Bhikhu Mal is the victim of such a case.

Source : Case study 10

Points of conflict: In **community based programme**, where large number of people are involved, points of conflict arise. In Rajiv Gandhi Jal Mission, otherwise a successful programme in Kesala Block, it was found that problems arose at certain points where things were not **unanimously acceptable** amongst all the concerned beneficiaries for example,

- During collection of **10 %** of the **total money**, for long term **maintenance** of the **check dams** from beneficiaries, where the defaulters were hampering the smooth implementation of programme.
- While making **committees** there were problems related to other group activities like **ego clashes, struggle** for leadership etc.
- **Delays** in committee meetings for construction work
- **Water logging** on the agricultural lands, which were selected as the site of the check-dams, became an **issue** amongst the concerned farmers.

All these points were causing **delay and affecting** the **implementation** of the programmes and could be called bottlenecks to be dealt with carefully.

Lack of right Perspective : In two of the development schemes where **improper timings of fund-release and improper utilization of money was due to lack of right perspective and sensitivity** of the beneficiaries, their relatives and dealing implementers (like Sarpanch/Secretary or block level officials for the scheme). Rather it was such a commonly observed phenomenon, that it looked like a trend in implementation (for both schemes. For example in **Rashtriya Parivar Sahayata Yojana** the money meant for starting an occupation by dependents of the deceased earning member of the family, is being spent in '**mrityubhoj**' kind of ceremony. The **dependent members** hence remain in totally **helpless** situation **despite** getting **money and favour** in the form of **scheme**.

Similarly an improper release of money, as a **lump sum** amount in Matratve Sahayata Yojana, is being **used only for buying sweets** at the end of delivery and in place of the basic purpose of providing three separate installments for better nutritional supplements to the beneficiary women at different intervals during the period of pregnancy.

Lack of right perspective and hence improper timing for release of money was the **reason for the objectives of the schemes remaining unfulfilled**. **All** the concerned people as **implementers, beneficiaries and their relatives need to be sensitized (through training programmes)** to have **the right perspective about the scheme** i.e. about it's **basic purpose** as well as **long term impact to avoid bottlenecks**.