



SOCIAL WELFARE ACTIVITIES OF VILLAGE PANCHAYAT IN USILAMPATTI TALUK IN MADURAI DISTRICT – A CASE STUDY

Dr. S. THANIKASALAM

Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology
University of Madras, Chepauk, Chennai-600 005

Abstract

Village Panchayats are playing very important role in providing the social welfare facilities to the village people. Involvement in solving the caste conflict, transport facilities, drinking water and drainage, street light etc. are the various forms of social welfare activities of the village Panchayats. In the present study an effort has been made to analyse the role of village Panchayats in social welfare facilities in Doddappanaickanur village. In this village only 35.0 per cent of the respondents are having good welfare facilities, 32.5 per cent of the respondents have moderate social welfare facilities and 32.5 per cent of the respondents have bad social welfare facilities. Respondents are not satisfied with toilet facilities as it is given thirteenth rank by them. The study reveals that road facilities, street light, primary health Centres, drinking water and transport facilities are given more importance by the Panchayats than housing, drainage and toilet facilities. There is a significant variation among the villages in providing basic amenities.

Keywords: Facilities, Respondents, Schemes, Amenities, Relationship, Ignorance

INTRODUCTION

Village panchayats are playing very important role in providing the social welfare facilities to the village people. Involvement in solving the caste conflict, transport facilities, drinking water and drainage, street light etc are the various forms of social welfare activities of the village panchayats. There are 10 questions regarding the welfare facilities. 5 point scale has been prepared. On

the basis of the scores the respondents were divided into good, moderate and bad. Quartiles were used for this purpose.

VILLAGE AND SOCIAL WELFARE FACILITIES

In the present study an effort has been made to analyse the role of village panchayats in social welfare activities in Doddappanaickanur Keeripatti,

Meikkilarpatti and Vagurani villages. In this village only 35.0 per cent of the respondents are having good welfare facilities, 32.5 per cent of the respondents have moderate social welfare facilities and 32.5 per cent of the respondents have bad social welfare facilities. In Keeripatti 45.0 per cent of the respondents have good welfare facilities, 27.5 per cent have moderate welfare facilities and 27.5 per cent are living with bad welfare facilities. In Meikkilarpatti 53.8 per cent of the respondents are provided good social welfare facilities, 25.0 per cent are provided with moderate facilities and 21.2 per cent with bad facilities. **(Ref Table – 1)**

In Vagurani 45.0 per cent of the respondents have good social welfare facilities and 31.2 per cent with moderate social welfare facilities and 23.8 per cent have bad social welfare facilities. When compared to all the villages only in Meikkilarpatti, more number of respondents have good social welfare facilities.

SEX AND SOCIAL WELFARE FACILITIES

When sex is compared with social welfare facilities, in Doddappaanaickanur more women (43.5%) than men (31.6%) have good social welfare facilities. In Keeripatti more

men (46.7 per cent) than women (40.0 per cent) have good social welfare facilities. In Meikkilarpatti more men (55.4%) than women (46.7%) have good medical welfare facilities. In Vagurani both men (45.3%) and women (43.8%) have more or less equally good welfare facilities. There is no much difference between men and women in having welfare facilities as in some villages men get more welfare facilities and in some villages women get more welfare facilities. **(Ref Table – 2)**

The chi-square values indicate that only in Doddappaanaickanur there is significant association between sex and social welfare facilities.

AGE AND SOCIAL WELFARE FACILITIES

When age is correlated with social welfare facilities, in Doddappaanaickanur 45.9 per cent of the respondents in the age group of 31-40 years have good social welfare facilities. Only 29.4 per cent of respondents in the age group of 51-60 years also have good social welfare facilities. In Keeripatti, 63.6 per cent of the respondents in the age group of 41-50 years have good social welfare facilities. But in Meikkilarpatti, 75.0 per cent of the respondents in the age group

of <30 years have good social welfare facilities. In Vagurani 59.1 per cent of the respondents in the age group of <30 years good social welfare facilities.

The chi-square values indicate that except Keeripatti, in all other villages namely Doddappanaickanur, Meikkilarpatti and Vagurani there is significant association between age and social welfare facilities. (Ref Table – 3)

CASTE AND SOCIAL WELFARE FACILITIES

When analysing the relationship between caste and social welfare facilities, 32.0 per cent of the backward class people have good social welfare facilities, 54.5 per cent of the respondents with most backward class people have good social welfare facilities and 19.5 per cent of the scheduled caste respondents have good social welfare facilities. In Keeripatti 33.3 per cent of the most backward class people have good social welfare facilities. In Meikkilarpatti 71.1 per cent of the backward class people have good social welfare facilities.

In Vagurani 60.0 per cent of the scheduled caste people have good social welfare facilities. Except in Vagurani, in all other villages only the backward and most

backward class people have good social welfare facilities.

The chi-square values indicate that only in Doddappanaickanur and Meikkilarpatti there is significant association between caste and social welfare facilities. (Ref Table – 4)

SATISFACTION ABOUT BASIC AMENITIES AT THE VILLAGES

Satisfaction about basic amenities of the villages have been assessed with the help of 16 factors on a 5 point rating scale. They include drinking water, toilet facilities, drainage, street light, road, schools, primary health Centres, veterinary hospital, social forestry, dairy form, housing irrigation, library and cremation ground. Table explains the village wise distribution of the respondents on the basis of basic amenities. Among these, road facilities are given first rank by the respondents as it secured the mean score of 4.4. Street light and primary health centres are given second and third rank respectively (mean score 4.2 and 4.0 respectively).

They are also satisfied with drinking water (mean score (3.9)) and transport facilities (mean score (3.8)). Housing is given 8th rank by the respondents. Toilet facilities are given thirteenth rank by the respondents. Forestry

is given last rank. It is inferred from the above table that road facilities, street light, primary health Centres, drinking water and transport facilities are given much importance by the Panchayats than housing, drainage and toilet facilities.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE STUDY

Regarding satisfaction about basic amenities, respondents are first satisfied with road, then street light and third, the primary health center. Housing is given eighth rank by the respondents. Respondents are not satisfied with toilet facilities as it is given thirteenth rank by them. The study reveals that road facilities, street light, primary health Centres, drinking water and transport facilities are given more importance by the Panchayats than housing, drainage and toilet facilities. There is a significant variation among the villages in providing basic amenities. Female respondents are not satisfied with basic amenities than male respondents. There is significant variation among the respondents on the basis of caste about basic amenities. There is also a relationship between income and satisfaction about basic amenities. When the respondents expressed their problems in getting the benefits of various schemes, interference of dominant caste was given the

top position and their inability to meet the initial expenses as the second one. They accept that all the schemes are good as they satisfy the needs of the people. Males have opined that they have more problems in getting the benefits of the scheme. This may be due to ignorance of women about various problems in getting the scheme. There is no association between age and problem in getting benefits of various schemes. There is an association between caste and problems in getting the benefits of various schemes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

DB. 1997. *Emerging Asia - changes and challenges*. Manila, Asian Development Bank.

ADB. 1999. *Asian Development Outlook, 1999*. New York, Asian Development Bank, Oxford University Press.

Adishesiah, M., Mukherji, P.S., Hegde, R., Das Gupta, A. & Fernandes, G. 1994. *Decentralized planning and Panchayati Raj*. New Delhi, Institute of Social Sciences and Concept Pub. Company.

Agnihotri, V.K., Krishna, S. & Mukherjee, A. 1994. Human resource development for *panchayats*. In Amitava Mukherjee, ed.

Decentralization, panchayats in the nineties, pp. 89-106. New Delhi, Vikas.

Annamalai, V. 2000. *Role of gram panchayats in managing common property resources for the benefit of rural poor: a study in Karnataka and Haryana. Case Studies Series 10*, Hyderabad, India, National Institute of Rural Development.

APO. 1994. *Rural development policies and strategies; report of an APO seminar 14 - 22 September 1993, Islamabad, Pakistan*. Tokyo, Asian Productivity Organization.

Aziz, A. 2000. Democratic decentralization: experience of Karnataka. *Economic and Political Weekly*, XXXV(39): 3521-6.

Bendavid-val, A. 1991. *Rural area development planning, principles, approaches and tools of economic analysis, Vol. 1&2, (27/1 &27/2)*. Rome, Training Service, Policy Analysis Division, Economic and Social Policy Department, FAO.

Bennet, R. 1988. *Improving training effectiveness*. Hants, England, Gower Publishing Company Limited.

Bhatnagar, O.P. 1987. *Evaluation methodology for training: theory and practice*. New Delhi, Oxford Company.

Bishop, S. & Taylor, D. 1996. *Training for change: activities to promote positive attitudes of change*. New Delhi, Viva Books Pvt. Ltd.

Bohra, O.P. 2000. Decentralization and devolution of powers and functions to panchayats. *Journal of Rural Development*. 19(2):185-197.

Cernea, M.M. ed. 1991. *Putting people first, sociological variables in rural development*. New York, World Bank, Oxford University Press.

Chambers, R. 1992. *Rural appraisal; rapid, relaxed and participatory*. Sussex, United Kingdom, Institute of Development Studies. (Discussion paper 311).

Chandel, B.S. & Jain, S.P. 1998. Do Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) harbinger grass root level growth in agricultural R & D process: an enquiry through SWOT analysis. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 53(3): 465-477.

Choudhury, R.C. & Jain, S.P. eds. 1999. *Patterns of decentralized governance in rural India: a study in 19 states* (Vol. I&II). Hyderabad, India, National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD).

Choudhury, R.C. & Jain, S.P. eds. 2001. *Emerging patterns of decentralized rural institutions* (Vol. I & II). Hyderabad, India, NIRD.

Christopher, E.M. & Snaith, L.E. 1995. *Leadership training - a source book of activities*. New Delhi, Viva Books Pvt. Ltd.

CIRDAP. 1987. *Manual for training of IRD functionaries. Planning, management and methodology*. Dhaka, Center for Integrated Rural Development for Asia and Pacific.

Das, M.K. 2000. Kerala's decentralized planning: Floundering experiment, *Economic and Political Weekly*, XXXV(49): 4300-3.

FAO. 1990. *Training manual for decentralized planning (district level) Vol. 4*. Rome, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

FAO. 2001. *Decentralized rural development and the role of self-help organizations*. Bangkok, FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific.

FAO, UNESCO & ILO. 1990. *Training for agriculture and rural development: 1989-90*. Rome, FAO Economic and Social Development Series, No.48.

GOAP. 1999. *Andhra Pradesh: Vision 2020*. Hyderabad, India, Government of Andhra Pradesh.

GOI. 1957. *Committee on plan projects: study team. (Chairman: Balwantrai, G. Mehta)*. New Delhi, Planning Commission, Government of India.

GOI. 1989. *Training for district planning - report of the study group*. New Delhi, Planning Commission, Government of India.

GOI. 1996. *Approach paper to the Ninth Five Year Plan (1997-2002)*. New Delhi, Planning Commission, Government of India.

Gopala Swamy, T.P. 1990. *Training technology - agriculture and rural development*. International Training and Development Conference Papers, New Delhi, Indian Society for Training and Development and Planning Commission.

Harigopal, K. 1995. *Conflict management*. New Delhi, Oxford & IBH.

Hegde, R. 1994. Local self-government in Karnataka: planning from below. In Malcolm Adiseshiah *et al.*, *Decentralized planning and Panchayati Raj*. New Delhi, Institute of Social Science and Concept Pub. Company.

- Hope, A & Timmel, S.** 1994. *Training for transformation: a handbook for community workers. Book I, II and III.* Zimbabwe, Mambo Press.
- IDS, PRIA & others.** 1999. *Strengthening participation in local governance - the use of participatory method; workshop report.* Institute of Development Studies and PRIA.
- IFAD, ANGOB & IRRI.** 2001. *Enhancing Ownership and sustainability: A Resource book on participation,* Manila, International Fund for Agricultural Development.
- IIED.** 1994. *A trainers guide for participatory inquiry.* London, Sustainable Agriculture Programme, International Institute for Environment and Development.
- IIED.** 1995. *Participatory Learning and Action: A Trainers Guide.* London, International Institute for Environment and Development.
- Issac, T.T.M. & Harilal, K.N.** 1997. Planning for empowerment: people's campaign for decentralized planning in Kerala. *Economic and Political Weekly*, XXXII(1&2): 4-11.
- Iyer, K.G.** 1994. Land as the vital resource with the *panchayats*. In Amitava Mukherjee, ed. *Decentralization, panchayats in the nineties*, pp. 108-127. New Delhi, Vikas.
- Jain, S.P.** 1979. Competing conceptual images of *Panchayati Raj*. *Behavioural Sciences and Rural Development*. II(2):79-95.
- Jain, S.P.** 1994. Training for Panchayati Raj: A framework. In S. P. Jain and Thomas Hochgesang, eds. *Emerging Trends in Panchayati Raj in India*, pp. 209-224. NIRD and Konrad Adenauer Foundation.
- Jain, S.P.** 1996. *Action plan for training of Panchayati Raj functionaries.* Hyderabad, India, National Institute for Rural Development (NIRD).
- John, M.S. & Chathukulam, J.** 1999. Decentralized planning and *panchayats* in Kerala. *Kurukshetra*, 47(12): 20-3.
- John, O.** 1999. *Gram sabhas: The live wire in planning process in Kerala*, *Journal of Rural Development*, 18(2): 307-318.
- Joshi, G.V.** 1995. *Gram sabha* in Karnataka: a non-starter? *Kurukshetra*, 43(7): 113-16.
- Kempton, J.** 1995. *Human resource management and development - current*

issues and themes. London, Macmillan Press Ltd.

Kerrigan, J.E. & Jeff, S.L. 1987. *Management Training Strategies for Developing Countries*, Boulder and London, Lynne Rienner Publishers.

KKU. 1987. *Rapid rural appraisal - proceedings of the 1985 international conference*. Khon Kaen, Thailand, Rural Systems Research and Farming Systems Research Projects, Khon Kaen University.

LBSNA & FAO. 1995. *District planning: lessons from India - planning guide, training materials for agricultural planning, 37/1*. Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration, Mussoorie, India and Agricultural Policy Support Service, Policy Assistance Division. Rome, FAO Technical Co-operation Department.

Lynton, R.P. & Pareek, U. 1990. *Training for development*. New Delhi, Vistaar Pub.

Maetz, M. & Auieti, M.G. 1987. *Training for decentralized planning: lessons from past experience*. Rome, FAO.

Mathur, H.M. 1983. *Training of development administrators*. Kuala Lumpur,

United Nations Asian and Pacific Development Centre.

Mathur, J.S. 1982. *Training needs of block development officers*. Hyderabad, India, NIRD.

Mathur, O. ed. 1981. *Training for regional development planning: perspective for third development decade*. Singapore, United Nations Centre for Regional Development.

Meenakshisundaram, S.S. 1999. *Gram sabha: lessons from Karnataka. Kurukshetra*, 48(1): 55-60.

Meenakshisundranam, S.S. 2000. The role of local government institutions in decentralized planning for rural development: the states of Karnataka and Kerala, India. In Hans Detlef Kammeier and Harvey Damaine, eds. *Decentralization local governance and rural development*, pp.49-62. Bangkok, Asian Institute of Technology.

Mercado, C.M. 1988. *Guide to Evaluating Training*. Manila, Philippines, UNDP Asia and Pacific programme for Development Training and Communication Planning (DTCP).

MHHDC. 2003. *Human development in South Asia 2002: Agriculture and rural*

development. Islamabad, Mahbub ul Haq Human Development Centre.

Mill, Cyril R. 1980. *Activities for trainers: 50 useful designs*. California, University Associates.

MORD. 2001. *Report of the task force on devolution of powers and functions upon Panchayati Raj institutions*. New Delhi, Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India.

Mukherjee, A. ed. 1995. *Participatory rural appraisal methods and applications in rural planning*. New Delhi, Vikas Pub. House Pvt. Ltd.

Mukherjee, N. 1993. *Participatory rural appraisal: methodology and applications*. New Delhi, Concept Pub.

Mukherjee, N. & Mukherjee, A. 2000. Grassroots governance, *Panchayati Raj Institutions and natural resource management*. *Wasteland News*, XV(4): 55-59.

NIRD. 1996. *Role of local self-government in rural development. Proceedings of international workshop, Hyderabad 27 November - 3 December 1995*. New Delhi, AARRO Publications.

NIRD. 2001. *India Panchyati Raj Report (Vol. I & II)* Hyderabad, India, National Institute of Rural Development.

NU. 2001. *Capacity building for local resources decentralization*. Phitsanulok, Thailand, Faculty of Humanity and Social Sciences, Naresuan University.

Pal, M. 1997. Participation planning and the Kerala *Panchayati Raj Act*. *Kurukshetra*, XLV(6 & 7): 95-102.

Parikh, K.S. ed. 1999. *India Development Report: 1999-2000*. New Delhi, Oxford Pub.

Punia, R.K. ed. 1992. *Women in agriculture, Vol.2: education, training and development*. New Delhi, Northern Book Centre.

Raju, M.R. 1998. *Panchayati Raj in Kerala: problems and prospects*. *Kurukshetra*, April, 70-71.

Rao, V. 1987. *Training needs of social welfare organizations: report of the workshops on identifying training social welfare organization needs held between August 1985 and September 1986*, Mumbai, India, Tata Institute of Social Sciences.

Saxena, N.C. 1994. *Panchayats and common land afforestation in India*. In

Amitava Mukherjee, ed. *Decentralization, panchayats in the nineties*, pp. 45-61. New Delhi, Vikas.

Shaw, M.E., Corsini, R.J., Blak, R.R. & Morton, J. 1980. *Role playing - a practical manual for group facilitators*. California, University Associates Inc.

Singhal, C.S. 1999. People’s participation in watershed management - case study of

village Nada, Hyderabad. *Journal of Rural Development*, 18(4): 557 -564.

Sivanna, N. 1997. Role of *panchayat* in poverty alleviation programmes: a study in the state of Karnataka. *Journal of Rural Development*, (Special issue on *Panchayati Raj*), 16(4): 633-650.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1- Village and Social Welfare Facilities

S. No.	Villages	Good	Moderate	Bad	Total
1.	Doddappanaickanur	56 (35.0)	52 (32.5)	52 (32.5)	160 (100.0)
2.	Keeripatti	18 (45.0)	11 (27.5)	11 (27.5)	40 (100.0)
3.	Meikkilarpatti	43 (53.8)	20 (25.0)	17 (21.2)	80 (100.0)
4.	Vagurani	36 (45.0)	25 (31.2)	19 (23.8)	80 (100.0)
	Total	153 (42.5)	108 (30.0)	99 (27.5)	360 (100.0)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage

Table 2- Sex and Social Welfare Facilities

S · N o ·	Sex/ Educ atio nal fac ilit ies	Doddappanaickan ur				Keeripatti			Meikkilarpatti					Vagurani				Grand total
		Go od	Mo de rate	B ad	Tot al	Go od	Mo de rate	Bad	Tot al	Go od	Mod e rate	Bad	Tota l	Good	Mod e rate	Bad	To tal	
1	Ma le	36 (31.6)	33 (28.9)	45 (39.5)	114 (100.0)	14 (46.7)	8 (26.6)	8 (26.7)	30 (100.0)	36 (55.4)	16 (24.6)	13 (20.0)	65 (100.0)	29 (45.3)	20 (31.3)	15 (23.4)	64 (100.0)	273 (75.8)
2	Fe ma le	20 (43.5)	19 (41.3)	75 (52.2)	46 (100.0)	4 (40.0)	3 (30.0)	3 (30.0)	10 (100.0)	7 (46.7)	4 (26.7)	4 (26.6)	15 (100.0)	7 (43.8)	5 (31.2)	4 (25.0)	16 (100.0)	87 (24.2)
	To tal	56 (35.0)	52 (32.5)	120 (32.5)	160 (100.0)	18 (45.0)	11 (27.5)	11 (27.5)	40 (100.0)	43 (53.8)	20 (25.0)	17 (21.2)	80 (100.0)	36 (45.0)	25 (31.2)	19 (23.8)	80 (100.0)	360 (100.0)

	$\chi^2=8.799$ df=2 Significant at 1% level	$\chi^2=0.134$ df=2 Not Significant	$\chi^2=0.448$ df=2 Not Significant	$\chi^2=0.201$ df=2 Not Significant
--	---	--	--	--

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage.

Table 3- Age and Social Welfare Facilities

S. No.	Age/ Edu catio nal facil ities	Doddappanaicka nur				Keeripatti				Meikkilarpatti				Vagurani				Gra nd tota l
		Go o d	M o d e r a t e	Bad	Tot al	Go o d	Mode rate	Bad	To tal	Go o d	Mo der ate	Bad	Tot al	Good	Mode rate	Bad	To tal	
1.	<30	0	17 (77.3)	5 (22.7)	22 (100.0)	2 (40.0)	2 (40.0)	1 (20.0)	5 (100.0)	18 (75.0)	5 (20.8)	1 (4.2)	24 (100.0)	13 (59.1)	6 (27.3)	3 (13.6)	22 (100.0)	73 (203)
2.	31-40	17 (45.9)	12 (32.5)	8 (21.6)	37 (100.0)	1 (14.2)	3 (42.9)	3 (42.9)	7 (100.0)	12 (63.2)	4 (21.0)	3 (15.8)	19 (100.0)	4 (40.0)	4 (40.0)	2 (20.0)	10 (100.0)	73 (203)

3.	41-50	19 (44.2)	11 (25.6)	13 (30.2)	43 (100.0)	7 (63.6)	2 (18.2)	2 (18.2)	11 (100.0)	4 (33.3)	6 (50.0)	2 (16.7)	12 (100.0)	8 (50.0)	6 (37.5)	2 (12.5)	16 (100.0)	82 (22.7)
4.	51-60	10 (29.4)	10 (29.4)	14 (41.2)	34 (100.0)	3 (37.5)	2 (25.0)	3 (37.5)	8 (100.0)	3 (33.3)	2 (22.3)	4 (44.4)	9 (100.0)	0	1 (11.1)	8 (88.9)	9 (100.0)	60 (16.7)
5.	>60	10 (41.7)	2 (8.3)	12 (50.0)	24 (100.0)	5 (55.6)	2 (22.2)	2 (22.2)	9 (100.0)	6 (37.5)	3 (18.8)	7 (43.7)	16 (100.0)	11 (47.8)	8 (34.8)	4 (17.4)	23 (100.0)	72 (20.0)
	Total	56 (35.0)	52 (32.5)	52 (32.5)	160 (100.0)	18 (45.0)	11 (27.5)	11 (27.5)	40 (100.0)	43 (53.8)	20 (25.0)	17 (21.2)	80 (100.0)	36 (45.0)	25 (31.2)	19 (23.8)	80 (100.0)	360 (100.0)
		$\chi^2=34.90$ df=8 Significant at 1% level				$\chi^2=5.440$ df=8 Not Significant				$\chi^2=18.08$ df=8 Significant at 5% level				$\chi^2=25.35$ df=8 Significant at 1% level				

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage.