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 analyses 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.
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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 Doddappanaickanur 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 Doddappanaickanur there is significant association between sex and social welfare facilities.

AGE AND SOCIAL WELFARE FACILITIES

When age is correlated with social welfare facilities, in Doddappanaickanur 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 respondent s 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.
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Table 1- Village and Social Welfare Facilities

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

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage

Table 2- Sex and Social Welfare Facilities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Sex/Educational facilities</th>
<th>Doddappanaickanur</th>
<th>Keeripatti</th>
<th>Meikkilarpatti</th>
<th>Vagurani</th>
<th>Grand total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36 (31.6)</td>
<td>4 (9.5)</td>
<td>114 (100.0)</td>
<td>14 (46.7)</td>
<td>8 (26.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20 (43.5)</td>
<td>7 (15.2)</td>
<td>46 (100.0)</td>
<td>4 (40.0)</td>
<td>3 (30.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56 (35.0)</td>
<td>5 (3.5)</td>
<td>160 (100.0)</td>
<td>18 (45.0)</td>
<td>11 (27.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The given text contains statistical analysis and a table with data related to age and social welfare facilities. Here is the conversion into a formatted table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Age/ Educational facilities</th>
<th>Doddappanaicka nur</th>
<th>Keeripatti</th>
<th>Meikkilarpatti</th>
<th>Vagurani</th>
<th>Grand total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good Moderate Bad Total Good Moderate Bad Total Good Moderate Bad Total Good Moderate Bad Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>17 (7.7)</td>
<td>22 (10.0)</td>
<td>5 (2.7)</td>
<td>18 (7.5)</td>
<td>24 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (4.2)</td>
<td>2 (40.0)</td>
<td>2 (20.0)</td>
<td>1 (4.0)</td>
<td>19 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>1 (4.5)</td>
<td>37 (10.0)</td>
<td>8 (2.7)</td>
<td>12 (4.0)</td>
<td>19 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (3.2)</td>
<td>1 (14.2)</td>
<td>3 (42.9)</td>
<td>4 (21.0)</td>
<td>4 (15.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>41-50</th>
<th>51-60</th>
<th>&gt;60</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>13(3.0)</td>
<td>2(18.2)</td>
<td>10(10.0)</td>
<td>43(10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>7(63.6)</td>
<td>3(37.5)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>10(25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>2(18.2)</td>
<td>2(22.2)</td>
<td>9(10.0)</td>
<td>24(55.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>11(27.5)</td>
<td>6(37.5)</td>
<td>16(40.0)</td>
<td>52(32.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>3(60)</td>
<td>3(60)</td>
<td>3(60)</td>
<td>160(60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>4(60)</td>
<td>2(30)</td>
<td>2(30)</td>
<td>18(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>4(60)</td>
<td>4(60)</td>
<td>4(60)</td>
<td>40(60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>5(60)</td>
<td>5(60)</td>
<td>5(60)</td>
<td>43(60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>4(60)</td>
<td>4(60)</td>
<td>4(60)</td>
<td>20(60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>2(30)</td>
<td>2(30)</td>
<td>2(30)</td>
<td>17(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>2(30)</td>
<td>2(30)</td>
<td>2(30)</td>
<td>80(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>2(30)</td>
<td>2(30)</td>
<td>2(30)</td>
<td>36(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>2(30)</td>
<td>2(30)</td>
<td>2(30)</td>
<td>25(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>2(30)</td>
<td>2(30)</td>
<td>2(30)</td>
<td>360(30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 34.90 \text{ df}=8 \]

Significant at 1% level

\[ \chi^2 = 5.440 \text{ df}=8 \]

Not Significant

\[ \chi^2 = 18.08 \text{ df}=8 \]

Significant at 5% level

\[ \chi^2 = 25.35 \text{ df}=8 \]

Significant at 1% level

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage.