CHAPTER 9

Summary and Findings

The social development has emerged with the new force and is almost at the top of agenda in national politics of developing countries, of Asia Africa and Latin America because of significant no of people reside in rural areas in these countries.

So in the third world where rural population often outnumbers urban ones, this is strong moral input to look the development of rural people and rural areas. Certainly development is no presence of opportunity but also actual utilization by the people for whom these are intended. Creation of facilities necessary for such utilization. Gunnar Myrdal views equality as the central issue in development programme of under development. In nut shell I could reveal that the environment of total quality life and its availability to all success of community living in rural areas.

Social political and economic transformation of the country unfolding development of more recent year have in one way or the other created a condition for fulfilling the need and want of common people of country due to development programmes after democratic devolution.

The soul of country lies in the villages and village folks become 67% population of the country living in the village. The social culture and economic frame work of country determined by the committed deeds of rural people.
Poverty reduction and its eventual elimination has been one of major goals of the developmental policy in India, since independence. Several poverty elimination programmes have been in place for long time now. There are maximum centrally sponsored scheme and implemented by the state are prevalent. Though there has been reduction in percentage of population below poverty line since 1970, problem still remain formidable with 260 million people living below poverty line. In fact according to world bank India had 455 million people living below poverty line in 2005.

A majority of poor in rural areas continue to depend on agriculture for want of other livelihood outside the sector. About 52% of work force and over 60% of population depends on agriculture which now accounts for just 17% of GDP, thus preventing rural poverty wider than urban divide.

Despite of implementing plethora of policies and programme for eradication of poverty and to promote livelihood opportunity the ground reality is not transformed so far. Right from 1st development programme namely CDP to MNREGA, access of economic resource to the common people met to some extent but qualitative economic growth and quality social development are not attained till date which was observed in the field study.

Uttar Pradesh which is most populated state is also least developed state there were 30 million household in state of about 25 million were rural household, the state gifted with fertile soil is one of the most poorest state in
India. In terms of socio economic indicator the state is far behind from any other state. It was obvious reason to select Kanpur district of UP because of Industrial sickness of Kanpur, and thereafter effected to rural Kanpur. The major objective of present study is explore and analyze relation between implementation of developmental programmes and transformation in terms of Economic Growth, Qualitative Social Development and Environmental Sustainability.

The present study is a modest beginning in field research of sociology of development and rural sociology. It seeks to analyse the social & economic contours of the rural development programmes on basis of information elicited from the respondents.

Present study focuses on habitation, employment generation, economic self sufficiency and social capital formation through programmes like SGSY, that's why I have taken in consideration IAY (1985), JRY (1989), SGSY (1959) and NREGA 2005 for analysis.

The important aspect of these development programmes is to be analysed in different perspective, like it should not cover only economic growth because growth is only unidirectional. It has to be supported by social development and programmes has to also be seen in long term vision with angle of environmental sustainability.
Environmental Sustainability provides a gaze of society water resources endowments and environmental sustainability history as well as institute mechanism to change future pollution and resources used trajectories. It is an important step to ensue sustainable development by empowering the intrinsic linkage between environmental management and socio economic development.

After CDP, JRY stated in 1989 was milestone in history of development programme to provide employment to every citizen of country. JRY has points for reading its impact on the employment scenario of country despite of sectoral, regional and geographical differences.

The true test of development is the number of people who have secured employment and number of family who have prospered as result, as long as there is wide spread unemployment in country we account claim that we are truly independent. In order to ensure unified level of employment and self sufficiency through social networking and social engineering of trust. Self Help Groups (SHG’s) are motivating force. Therefore SGSY was obvious choice to select for study. To some extent it was also needful to provide minimum number of days guarantee for employment to ensure every citizen of country, hence NREGA was selected for study. The NREGA was bringing revolutionary change in lives of people of Rural India.
In India a major section of society is still living in mud houses or without houses. IAY was remarkable programme to provide adequate habitat to every citizen of India, with basic amenities. Despite of so called social commitment to provide habitat to people, a major chunk of population was living in slums or unauthorized colony whether it urban India or rural India. That's why researcher has planned to evaluate Indira Awas Yojna in his study area.

To ascertain the impact of Rural Development programme particularly IAY, JRY, SGSY, NREGA on beneficiary the attempt has been to enumerate the caste, sex, age, occupation and landmark along with other facilities.

The several part of the present research work was outbound and field investigation. It was conditional to substantiate the first part of study, Field investigation were based on two aspects 1st on general awareness and the connect of correspondent in terms of knowing the impact of real development on their lives. Second direct benefit as housing employment and economic rehabilitation. In terms of general awareness of concern it was encouraging to see that in all studies 4 villages of Kalyanpur and Bilahur Block 71 to 75% respondents gave a positive reply to the awareness of all development programmes including shadow benefit on environmental sustainability. Development programme like PMGSY, Water Shed, DPAP, Waste land Development Programme, Irrigation, Water Conservation, Sanitation based programme, Infrastructure based programme across all the lines of sex, age caste and occupation.
No gross variation was observed among respondents of different caste and educational categories. It was observed during the study that majority of respondents were of age 40-50 (46.7%).

Occupation plays an important role in shaping personality of an individual. The upbringing of individual is effected by occupational environment. It was observed that 63.5% respondents were from agricultural labor and 21% from business related to agriculture and only 5.5% were engaged in trading sector.

Land is only productive asset for rural folks, so its ownership does matter for means of subsistence as well as it is matter of self esteem or prestige in surrounding. In order to know land ownership of the studied villages. It was observed that in madarpur village of bilhaur maximum respondents were owning a small chunk of land ie < 2 hectare. Similarly in Baheda village 72% respondents are having less than 2 hectare, only 10% of respondents of this village owning more than 4 hectare land. It can be seen in table 3.4 Singhpur Kacchar village of Kalyanpur Block has 68% respondents less than 2 hectare of land.

Similarly in chaukhandi village of Kalyanpur block respondents 74% owning less than 2 hectare of land. there are 16% respondents who are middle level farmers owning less than 4 hectare land. Analysis of table 3.4 reflects that majority of population belongs to small land ownership group.
And major share of land in concentrated in hands of 10 % population. It is generally believed that the urban residents are environmentally aware than the rural counterparts, but it is not true in several manner because govt is intended to provide the rural development programme in framework of environmental sustainability.

To ensure environmental sustainability one the target under the goal is to integrate the principle of sustainable development in country policy and prevention and reversal of loss environmental resources.

Environmental sustainability is a multi-dimensional process which is influenced by socio-economic conclusion as poverty as well as political choices, public awareness and policy measures. Environmental Sustainability Index helps in projects overall state of environment and should create awareness and importance of environmental sustainability in overall growth & development. So few programme which may have shadow benefit on environmental sustainability like PMGSY, Water Shed, DPAP, Waste land development were considered for present study.

According to Table 5.1 42.75% were aware about PMGSY and 55.25% were benefitted by this programme in terms of environment. The watershed development programme has conventionally believed in treating degraded land with the help of low cost and locally accrued technology. In Table 5.2 it is concluded that 55.25% respondents feel benefitted by PMSGY and in Table
5.3 42.25% have responded positive in respect of benefit to environment by PMGSY.

Table 5.4 reflects that approx 45% were aware about watershed development programme which is in directly benefitting to the people of the area in terms of availability of water, live stock and themselves. Respondents in Table 5.5 46.75% gave positive response regarding benefit by watershed development programme.

It can be concluded from the Table 5.6 that 48.75% respondents fell that they were aware that environment has been benefitted by this programme and rest 51.25% respondents feel that there has been no benefit.

In Table 5.7 response for awareness about DPAP 50% were positive, in next Table 5.8 regarding benefit by DPAP 47% respondents were positive about being benefitted by the programme. Benefit to the environment from DPAP generated response of 50% positive in Table 5.9.

In Table 5.10 the respondents answer to the question of whether they have been benefitted by waste land development programme 42% respondents gave positive response.

Table 5.11 generated response to the question of availability of drinking water to all, 75.75% had a positive response to the mentioned question. In next Table 5.12 76.25% respondents gave positive response to the question of government assistance in availability of drinking water access.
points. And in question similar to above lines that whether government helped you in irrigation water 87% responded positive, which is concluded in Table 5.13. Regarding the effect of use of fertilizer and its side effect on the agriculture soil, awareness was limited to less than 50% ie only 47.5% were aware about side effects of fertilizer on there soil is shown in table 5.14.

In Table 5.15 the respondents were asked about education of government programmes and the result was shocking that only 39.25% respondents were educated about the implemented Rural Development programmes, which indicates that if the beneficiary is not even aware about the schemes how will he get benefitted by them, hence the government should also focus on the education of the beneficiary.

Due to rural developmental programme implemented in the area the spectrum of economic growth enlarged but the true test of growth is employment poverty elevation, availability of good houses, safe drinking water and elimination of gender inequality, at same time adequate electricity and appropriate roads, it is observed during study that despite of large spectrum of economic growth it is no where qualitative.

SC, ST & OBC and women suffer from many discrimination it is essential that they are made stake holder in our development process and to take some steps to increase social and economic status. We also need to pay
attention to our environment. It is our responsibility to preserve and pass it to future generation.

The detailed understanding of Qualitative Economic Growth can be understood by Per Capita Income, Rural Purchasing Power, Infrastructural Development, Self Employment, Household Income and Quality Of Life. In Table 6.1 77% respondents believe that per Capita Income has increased and rest 23% feels otherwise. In Table 6.2 it was revealed that 75% of respondents feel that purchasing power has increased and 25% purchasing power has not increased.

Table 6.3 the response to the question of more money to buy other than necessities is 74.5% positive, as they feel that yes there is more money to buy other than necessities.

Table 6.4 & 6.5 indicate that 43% have been benefitted by roads and 89.5% feel that they have been benefitted by the developments of Hospitals and Schools.

Table 6.6 the 48.5% respondents have been benefitted by the employment opportunities and while 51.5 % feel contrary to the development programme.

Table 6.7 shows 75% of the respondents feel that total household income has increased while rest 25% feels otherwise.
The concept of Total Quality Life has been important in development programmes, in Table 6.8 42.25% were positive regarding improvement in Total Quality Life while rest 57.25% felt that there has been no significant increase in TQL.

Social Development is a process which result in the transformation of social structure in a manner which improves the capacity of the society to fulfill its aspirations. Development implies a qualitative change in the way the society carries out its activities, such as through more progressive attitudes and behavior by the population. Social development can be explained as qualitative changes in the structure and framework of society, that help the society to better realize its aims and objectives. The basic mechanism driving social change is increasing awareness leading to better organization.

There are three stages of development:

a) Physical Stage
b) Vital Stage
c) Mental Stage

The physical stage is characterized by the domination of the physical element of the human personality.

The vital stage of society is infused with dynamism and change. The vital activities of society expand markedly. Society becomes curious, innovative and adventurous. During the vital stage emphasis shifts from
interactions with the physical environment to social interactions between people.

Mental stage has three essential characteristics: practical, social, and political application of mind.

Factors that effect the Social development

a) Home Environment.
b) Socio Economic Status Of Family.
c) Love & affection.
d) Participation in Social Organizations.
e) School Programmes.

In Table 7.1 96.25% respondents are aware of JSY programme and only 3.75% were not aware of the programme. In the next Table 7.2 it was concluded that 77% respondents were benefitted by the programme and rest 33% did not. In Table 7.3 the awareness of NRHM is 73.75% while the benefit in Table 7.4 is concluded to 47.5% , which indicates that awareness is there but respondents were not able to use the facilities.

The food intake may have increased but the data in Table 7.5 shows that nutritional intake has not increased in great numbers, only 39.5% people feel that there is increase in nutritional intake of food.

Education status has been focus in the rural development programmes and many programme have started to address the issue as SSA(Sarva
Siksha Abhiyan). In Table 7.6 60% respondents feel that the education standard has increased while rest feel otherwise. In Table 7.7 inspite of increase in education standards the participation of girls has not increased drastically only 36% feel that it has increased while rest 64% feel contrary.

National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (henceforth NREGA) is a revolutionary Act of the Government of India with tremendous potentiality of eradicating unemployment situation in the country.

It was brought under purview of an Act for rural employment at an unprecedented scale in order to provide employment when other employment alternatives are scarce or inadequate. The principal objective of launching of NREGS is to uplift the backward socio-economic conditions of rural people of India. The scheme provides a legal guarantee for at least 100 days of paid employment in every financial year to adult members of any household willing to do unskilled manual work related to public work at the statutory minimum wage of ₹120 per day in 2009 prices.

In success of Rural Development Programme the awareness of programme is very important.

In Table 8.1 it is shown that 77% of the respondents were aware of the programme while rest 33% were not aware of the programme, which is contrary that this programme was very important for all the rural peoples.
In Table 8.2 the % of respondents who were benefitted by the NREGA was 72.25% and rest feel that they are not benefitted.

Table 8.3 72.5% respondents who feel that there family income has increased due to MNREGA and rest 27.5% feel otherwise for the same scheme of Central Govt. In Table 8.4 the respondents were asked that their current income is sufficient or not ,in response to this question 77% gave a positive response while 33% gave a negative response.

In Table 8.5 , the question asked with the respondents in regarding to the employment that whether it is seasonal or all year the response to that 75.75% told that they had all year opportunity while rest 24.25% responded otherwise.

In Table 8.6 the respondents were inquired regarding increase in their standard of living due to govt programme, in response to this question 76.25% answered positive while other were negative.

In Table 8.7 respondents replied that 77% positive to question that did they get any help in self employment while rest 23% were negative on the response.

Table 8.8 , it was concluded that 75.75% respondents were having a skill set while rest 24.25% were not having any skill set.
In Table 8.9 respondents were asked about education of Rural Development Programmes 39.75% feel that they have been educated about the programme while rest 60.25% feel that there has been no education on Rural Development Programmes.

In Table 8.10 the respondents 38.5% were aware of the rights and 61.5% were not aware of the rights.

The overall analysis suggests the following -

Plethora of policies and programme to uplift minimum standard of living for rural folk and to provide multidimensional development for the common people implemented from six decades to some extent gone in vain. The ambitious rural development programme like SGSY, IAY, JRY, NREGA by and large succeed to reach the target groups. It is worth mentioning that right from 1st development programme till this 5 yr programme very recent phenomenon of environmental has not been taken into consideration by bureaucracy and implementing agency of government. After independence breakdown in cottage industries, depletion of natural resources, pity condition of agriculture and product and derailed economy of India, economic growth and development is prime concern at that time that's why ample of policy and programme launched in India. For makeover of economic and self sufficiency of country at economic front but policy makers and government focused on quantitative variable only, like GNP, NNP, and per capita income. While at
the same time it was important and relevant to upgrade qualitative variables of economy.

In the present study the programmes which were selected for in-depth analysis and assessment shows that phenomenon of qualitative economic growth. The crux of any development programme lies in post implementation impact on common people, which can be perceived by the social development in a country or society. It is needful to mention having in-depth analysis of IAY, JRY, SGSY, MNREGA revealed that qualitative social development in sustainable form has not been received so far although for villages of two blocks in Kanpur district which were surveyed reflect that internal power disagreement of village is changing very fast. Their social harmony, we feeling, gregariousness and village kinship are under threat. Structural functional form of village institution and social institution are changing the shape. The phenomenon of quality of life is not limited to basic minimum needs factor of technology and consumption, adequate employment all education are becoming relevant.

The major finding of present study given below-

1) The growth and development in reform phase has become skewed relatively higher growth rate in GDP has remade in consequential to poverty reduction. The absolute number of poor declined marginally. Income and poverty inequality across four villages and even within village
has increased significantly. Jobless growth has led to overall increase in rate of open unemployment because of dependence on agriculture and its declining growth rate.

NREGA is providing entitlement of 100 days of employment at minimum wage to every household with promise to ensure 1/3 employment to women workers. Study of four villages shows that wage payment remains irregular, engineers unable to visit work site frequently. There is acute shortage of expert in the field and timely payment of wage remains a difficult task.

The phenomenon of social audit has been found to be very useful in checking malpractice in wage distribution, fondling the muster roll, it has also been observed that it improves level and quality of work. Another important aspect of payment is to create community asset and filling gap between community asset and rural infrastructure. It was also observed that due to MNREGA, there is reduction in migration particularly distress migration through three main effects.

Employment security, social happiness and carrying & saving effects. It is also observed that statistically minimum wage under NREGA through which rate is higher than the statistically in state. The programme had a high work force participation. Natural resources through water consumption, land development and afforestation project taken up in large income in NREGA.
NREGA has also shown remarkable institutional impact by strengthening grass root democracy and by creating space for civil society organization, and this social audit strength of transparency and public accountability in government has been made public.

2) The robust and consistent growth in Indian economy has contributed to environmental degradation in long term, which have implication for sustainability of growth in all the four programme. The phenomenon of environmental sustainability was not majorly focused although through water conservation, land development, and aorestation activities MNREGA has been successful to provide for green economy despite of quantitative growth in rural economy. Policy makers and planners are not consulting very important factor for life sustainability ie environment. Researcher astonished to see with study that few programme have shadow effect on environmental sustainability like Water shed development, PMGSY, DPAP, Waste land development programme.

3) It is also reveled by the study that during implementation of all four programme the 4P model (Public, Private, Panchayat & Partnership ) has not been taken into consideration.

4) Hypothesis framed by researcher that institutional impact consisting strengthening of grass root democracy and transparency and public accountability in governance has been in only two programme, they are
NREGA and SGSY. About IAY and JRY grand programme of that time have not considered above factor. Democratic values must be in nucleus of every rural development programme before implementation.

The true test of development is number of people who have secured employment and number of family who has prospered as result.

Qualitative economic growth can’t be achieved without industrial development. The marginal community (Section of society) like SC, ST, OBC and women must get opportunities to share the main stream output of economy.

The present study shows that to some extent the per capita income, rural purchasing power, self employment and household income increase significantly. It is also noteworthy to that Total quality of life of respondents of study has been improved. Quality expansion in the context of their element that makeup in social fabric has increased.

**Recommendations**

- Quality economic development should be the aim.
- The effect on natural resources should be considered.
- While planning factor of Environmental Sustainability should be inculcated.
• Improvement should not just be economic but it should be improvement in total quality of life.

• Strengthening of information, education and communication of All rural Development Programmes

• Improving the participation of women Programmes

• Awareness about all programmes should be made easily available

• Beneficiary Accounts may be opened preferably in the name of women workers to empower them

• Banking system to be made more cooperative

• Strengthening of computerized MIS at Block Level

• Adequate Full time trained staff for helping the beneficiaries

• Written applications for work should be encouraged

• Planning to be strengthened and made transparent

• Work-site facilities to be improved

• Need of shift from project mode to mission mode

• Multi-faceted strategy for mission-mode