



Performance of Panchayati Raj Institutions Members in Indira Awaas Yojana Scheme

Namita Shukla and Kiranjot Sindhu

Department of Extension Education and Communication Management
Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana - 141 004 (Punjab)

ABSTRACT

Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) have three tier systems with governmental powers. To fulfil the housing needs of rural people, government launched Indira Awaas Yojana scheme in which house and land are provided to the below poverty line landless people in order to improve the quality of life. PRIs play a vital role in implementation and monitoring of IAY scheme so it was felt necessary to assess the knowledge of PRI members about the scheme and their performance. A descriptive research design was used in four districts with two blocks in each district and three villages from each block were selected randomly. A sample of 184 elected PRI members was selected which consisted of 40 Zilla Parishad, 48 Panchayat Samiti and 96 Gram Panchayat members. The data were collected by using self-structured interview schedule and was analyzed by using frequency, percentage and mean score. It was found that less than 36 per cent of PRI members knew about different aspects of the scheme. Nearly one third of PRI members were knowledgeable about the role of PRI members in implementation and monitoring of IAY scheme. Majority of the PRI members who were knowledgeable about their expected roles were always performing their roles. The percentage of Panchayat Samiti members was higher than Zilla Parishad and Gram Panchayat in performing their respective roles.

Key Words: Knowledge, Role performance, IAY, Panchayati Raj Institutions.

INTRODUCTION

Rural development programmes require proper institutional structure for its formulation and implementation. Panchayat Raj Institutions (PRIs) fulfilled this need of rural development programmes. PRIs are local self-governing bodies that ensure opportunity for people's participation and involvement in the formulation and implementation of rural development programmes. PRIs were developed with powers, functions and financial resources. So the Constitution 73rd (Amendment) Act, 1992 provided a new dimension to the concept of Panchayati Raj (Ramya, 2014). PRIs are statutorily elected bodies at village, block and district levels with local government powers.

Approximately one third of rural and urban human populations had no adequate housing facilities. Government has the responsibility to fulfil the housing needs of the poor (Ananth, 2017) so the

Government of India launched some developmental schemes. These schemes were implemented to reduce the gap between rural and urban populations that help to reduce the imbalances and speed up the development process. (Ramya, 2014).

Indira Awaas Yojana

Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY) was launched during 1985-86 and was renamed as Pradhan Mantri Grameen Awas Yojana on 20th November 2016. It is a centrally sponsored scheme of Ministry of Rural Employment, Government of India. IAY is one of the most important poverty alleviation programmes in the country which play a vital role in the upliftment of the living standard of poor people in rural areas. This scheme is being implemented in all the districts of the state through Rural Development Department, Karnataka. The main objective is to provide the financial support to the scheduled castes/ scheduled tribes freed, bonded

labourers and also to other non-scheduled castes/scheduled tribes rural poor below the poverty line. (Shivana and Kadam, 2017).

Salient Features of the scheme

The PRI members and District Rural Development Agency are actively involved in the implementation of the Scheme. One of the important features of this scheme is to allot the houses invariably in the name of women as a crucial step of government for women empowerment. In order to introduce transparency in the selection of beneficiaries, Gram Panchayat wise permanent waitlists are prepared by the States/UTs. Construction of an IAY house is the sole responsibility of the beneficiary. Contractors and specific type or design are not allowed. Individual household latrine and smokeless chullah are required to be constructed along with each IAY house. (Biswas, 2015)

Funding of IAY

Funding is shared between the central and state governments in ratio of 75:25. However, in the case of North Eastern States and Sikkim, the ratio is 90:10. The funds have been reserved for various categories like 60 per cent of total for SC/ST households and 40 per cent for non-scheduled castes/scheduled tribes below poverty line rural households, 3 per cent funds for the disable persons living in below the poverty line in rural areas. Emphasis is also laid on the use of cost effective, disaster resistant and friendly environment technologies in rural housing. (Shivanna and Kadam, 2017)

All the tiers of PRIs have been assigned role in implementation and monitoring of the scheme. Therefore, it was felt necessary to assess the knowledge of PRI members about the scheme, role and actual performance in implementation and monitoring of development schemes.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A descriptive research design was used in four districts with two blocks in each and three villages from each selected block for the present study. Forty elected Zilla Parishad members (ten from each

district), forty eight Panchayat Samiti members (six from each block) and ninety six Gram Panchayat members (four from each village) were selected. Self-structured interview schedule was prepared to collect the data regarding the knowledge of the PRI members on different aspects of IAY scheme. This was followed by a schedule regarding their knowledge of expected roles to be performed by different levels in implementation and monitoring of the scheme which was termed as knowledge of role performance. The response was elicited as yes or no. Further, only the respondents knowledgeable about the roles in their own level were interviewed about their actual role performance. Actual role performance response was elicited as never, sometimes and always and scored as 1, 2 and 3 respectively. Mean score was worked out for each role performed. The collected data were analyzed by using frequency and percentage.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Knowledge of PRI members regarding IAY scheme

The data (Table 1) show that less than 36 per cent PRI members were knowledgeable about the restructured name (35.87%) and aim of IAY scheme (34.78%). More than 30 per cent PRI members knew about beneficiaries (31.52%), place of publicizing list (31.52%), amount of assistance (32.61%) and verification of priority lists (32.61%). Officer responsible for forwarding list and number of days in publicizing lists were known to 29.35 per cent PRI members. One fourth of PRI members were knowledgeable about the schemes under IAY (26.09%) and the reason of preparing gap analysis report (27.17%).

Regarding the members/officers responsible for conducting IAY at different level of PRI, 29.35 per cent respondents were knowledgeable at village level followed by block level (27.17%) and district level (26.09%). Less than 30 per cent of PRI members knew about monitoring (27.17%) and social audit (29.35%) under the scheme.

Performance of Panchayati Raj Institutions Members

Table 1. Distribution of PRI members according to their knowledge regarding IAY scheme.

| Sr. No. | Area | Total (n=184) | |
|---------|--|---------------|------------|
| | | Frequency | Percentage |
| 1. | Restructured name of IAY | 66 | 35.87 |
| 2. | Aims of IAY | 64 | 34.78 |
| 3. | Beneficiaries | 58 | 31.52 |
| 4. | Officer responsible for forwarding the list of beneficiaries from Gram Sabha | 54 | 29.35 |
| 5. | Place of publishing selected beneficiaries list | 58 | 31.52 |
| 6. | Amount of assistance for beneficiaries | 60 | 32.61 |
| 7. | Number of days in publicizing beneficiaries lists within Gram Panchayat | 54 | 29.35 |
| 8. | Level of PRI responsible for verification of priority lists | 60 | 32.61 |
| 9. | House construction | 54 | 29.35 |
| 10. | Schemes under IAY | 48 | 26.09 |
| 11. | Reason of preparing gap analysis report | 50 | 27.17 |
| 12. | Members/Officers responsible for conducting IAY at different level of PRI | | |
| | District level | 48 | 26.09 |
| | Block level | 50 | 27.17 |
| | Village level | 54 | 29.35 |
| 13. | Monitoring | 50 | 27.17 |
| 14. | Social audit | 54 | 29.35 |
| 15. | House inspection at different level of PRI | 55 | 29.89 |
| 16. | Number of days decided for submission of complaints regarding deletion and change in ranking beneficiaries | 60 | 32.61 |

Percentage of inspection of the construction to be done varies at each level. Only 29.89 percent knew about it. Only 32.61 per cent knew about number of days for submission of complaints regarding deletion and change in ranking beneficiaries. Batta (2011) found lack of awareness regarding developmental schemes among women Panchayat members in Punjab. Similarly, Ashok (2014) reported low level of awareness at Gram Panchayat level across the country. The study was also supported by Doddamani (2014). However, Sharma and Didwania (2013) found high level of awareness about IAY scheme among the elected Gram Panchayat members in Haryana. Similarly, Kumar (2012) found most of the Panchayat members knowledgeable in the study conducted in Jammu and Kashmir.

Knowledge of PRI members about their role performance regarding IAY scheme

The data (Table 2) show that the percentage of Gram Panchayat members knowing about different roles ranged between 30.43 to 33.7 per cent. Similarly, regarding the role of Panchayat Samiti in implementation and monitoring of IAY, it was found that less than one third of PRI members were knowledgeable of the expected roles.

Role of Zilla Parishad under the scheme was known to only 26-34 per cent members. Hence, it can be inferred that very few members knew the role of different PRI levels in implementation and monitoring of this scheme. Similarly, a negligible knowledge about the roles was found by Kumar (2012) in Jammu and Kashmir.

Table 2. Distribution of PRI members according to their knowledge about role performance regarding IAY scheme.

| Sr. No. | Aspects of Role performance | Total (n=184) | |
|-----------|--|---------------|------------|
| | | Frequency | Percentage |
| A. | Role of Gram Panchayat | | |
| 1. | Identification of eligible beneficiaries | 62 | 33.70 |
| 2. | Addition of left out eligible beneficiaries | 62 | 33.70 |
| 3. | Finalising priority list of eligible beneficiaries and Permanent Waitlist | 58 | 31.52 |
| 4. | Identification of land for landless beneficiaries | 62 | 33.70 |
| 5. | Facilitate beneficiaries with trained masons and required construction materials at reasonable rates | 62 | 33.70 |
| 6. | Discuss the progress of scheme in scheduled meetings | 62 | 33.70 |
| 7. | Identification and monitoring of local level functionary for construction of house | 56 | 30.43 |
| B | Role of Panchayat Samiti | | |
| 8. | Registration of beneficiaries | 58 | 31.52 |
| 9. | Issue of sanction order to beneficiaries | 60 | 32.61 |
| 10. | Orientation of the beneficiaries | 54 | 29.35 |
| 11. | Map a village functionary to beneficiary | 54 | 29.35 |
| 12. | Tag a trained mason to beneficiary | 56 | 30.43 |
| 13. | Monitoring progress and timely instalment release to the beneficiary | 52 | 28.26 |
| C | Role of Zilla Parishad | | |
| 14. | Finalisation of the block wise Permanent Waiting List | 62 | 33.70 |
| 15. | Allotting land to the landless beneficiaries | 60 | 32.61 |
| 16. | Sensitizing the beneficiaries | 60 | 32.61 |
| 17. | Mason training plan | 58 | 31.52 |
| 18. | Collective sourcing of material through MGNREGA | 50 | 27.17 |
| 19. | Coordinate with banks for loan disbursement to beneficiary through DLBC (District Level Bankers Committee) | 50 | 27.17 |
| 20. | Monitor special projects | 48 | 26.09 |
| 21. | Monitor progress of construction as per timeline | 52 | 28.26 |
| 22. | Monitor reporting on Awasoft | 56 | 30.43 |

Actual role performance of different tiers of PRI members

The members knowledgeable about the roles were further interviewed to determine the actual role they were playing in implementation and monitoring. Out of the knowledgeable respondents, the level to which they were performing the roles was determined (Table 3). Majority of Gram Panchayat members were always performing their roles in identification of eligible beneficiaries (72.73%) and

finalising priority list of eligible beneficiaries and permanent waitlist (55.56%). While extent of role performance was lower in case of other aspects.

Actual role performance of Panchayat Samiti members ranged from 62 to 75 per cent. Majority of Panchayat Samiti members were always performing their roles in implementation and monitoring of IAY scheme. In case of Zilla Parishad members, majority (75.0%) were always performing their roles in finalisation of the block wise permanent

Performance of Panchayati Raj Institutions Members

Table 3. Distribution of knowledgeable PRI members according to their actual performance regarding IAY scheme.

| Role performance | Extent of actual performance | | | | | | Mean score |
|---|------------------------------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------------|
| | Always | | Sometimes | | Never | | |
| | f | % | f | % | f | % | |
| <i>Gram Panchayat</i> | | | | | | | |
| Identification of eligible beneficiaries (n=22) | 16 | 72.73 | 2 | 9.09 | 4 | 18.18 | 2.55 |
| Addition of left out eligible beneficiaries (n=22) | 8 | 36.36 | 10 | 45.45 | 4 | 18.18 | 2.18 |
| Finalising priority list of eligible beneficiaries and Permanent Waitlist (n=18) | 10 | 55.56 | 2 | 11.11 | 6 | 33.33 | 2.22 |
| Identification of land for landless beneficiaries (n=24) | 6 | 25.00 | 2 | 8.33 | 14 | 58.33 | 1.64 |
| Facilitate beneficiaries with trained masons and required construction materials at reasonable rates (n=22) | 8 | 36.36 | 4 | 18.18 | 10 | 45.45 | 1.91 |
| Discuss progress of scheme in scheduled meetings (n=22) | 6 | 27.27 | 6 | 27.27 | 10 | 45.45 | 1.82 |
| Identification and monitoring of local level functionary for construction of house (n=16) | 6 | 37.50 | 4 | 25.00 | 6 | 37.50 | 2.00 |
| | Mean score | | | | | | 2.05 |
| <i>Panchayat Samiti</i> | | | | | | | |
| Registration of beneficiaries (n=16) | 12 | 75.00 | 2 | 12.50 | 2 | 12.50 | 2.63 |
| Issue of sanction order to beneficiaries (n=16) | 10 | 62.50 | 2 | 12.50 | 4 | 25.00 | 2.38 |
| Orientation of the beneficiaries (n=14) | 10 | 71.43 | 2 | 14.29 | 2 | 14.29 | 2.57 |
| Map a village functionary to beneficiary (n=14) | 10 | 71.43 | 2 | 14.29 | 2 | 14.29 | 2.57 |
| Tag a trained mason to beneficiary (n=14) | 8 | 57.14 | 2 | 14.29 | 4 | 28.57 | 2.29 |
| Monitoring progress and timely instalment release to the beneficiary (n=12) | 8 | 66.67 | 2 | 16.67 | 2 | 16.67 | 2.50 |
| | Mean score | | | | | | 2.49 |
| <i>Zilla Parishad</i> | | | | | | | |
| Finalisation of the block wise Permanent Waiting List (n=24) | 18 | 75.00 | 2 | 8.33 | 4 | 16.67 | 2.58 |
| Allotting land to the landless beneficiaries (n=24) | 18 | 75.00 | 2 | 8.33 | 4 | 16.67 | 2.58 |
| Sensitizing the beneficiaries (n=22) | 8 | 36.36 | 8 | 36.36 | 6 | 27.27 | 2.09 |
| Mason training plan (n=22) | 10 | 45.45 | 6 | 27.27 | 6 | 27.27 | 2.18 |
| Collective sourcing of material through MGNREGA (n=16) | 4 | 25.00 | 8 | 50.00 | 4 | 25.00 | 2.00 |
| Coordinate with banks for loan disbursement to beneficiary through DLBC (District Level Bankers Committee) (n=20) | 8 | 40.00 | 10 | 50.00 | 2 | 10.00 | 2.30 |
| Monitor special projects (n=20) | 6 | 30.00 | 12 | 60.00 | 2 | 10.00 | 2.20 |
| Monitor progress of construction as per timeline (n=24) | 8 | 33.33 | 8 | 33.33 | 8 | 33.33 | 2.00 |
| Monitor reporting on Awassoft (n=24) | 10 | 41.67 | 8 | 33.33 | 6 | 25.00 | 2.17 |
| | Mean score | | | | | | 2.23 |

waiting list and allotting land to the landless beneficiaries. Extent of role performance was lower in other aspects.

Role performance scores of Zilla Parishad (2.23) members in performing their own role were higher than Gram Panchayat (2.05). In case of Panchayat Samiti, it was found that majority was always performing their role and hence resulted in high mean score in each aspect. The extent of role performance was highest at Panchayat Samiti (MS 2.49) followed by Zilla Parishad (MS 2.23) and lowest at Gram Panchayat (MS 2.05) level.

Kumari and Singh (2015) also found low level of performance among the Gram Panchayat members. Similar results were also reported by Deshpande *et al* (2013). Involvement of PRI members in implementation of rural development schemes was found to be negligible in Andhra Pradesh (Reddy, 2014). It may be due to the lack of provision of knowledge of the members about the expected roles.

CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that less than 36 per cent of PRI members knew about the scheme. Nearly one third of PRI members were knowledgeable about the expected role performance of PRI members in implementation and monitoring of IAY scheme. Majority of the PRI members who were knowledgeable about the roles were always performing their respective roles. Percentage of Panchayat Samiti members always performing their respective roles was higher than Zilla Parishad and Gram Panchayat. Hence it can be concluded that the actual role performance of Panchayat Samiti members under the scheme was more than those of other levels.

REFERENCES

Ananth P (2017). Housing for Poor and the Impact of IAY in rural India: Present context. *Int J Humanities Social Sci Res* 3(1): 54-56.

- Ashok V (2014). Problems and Prospects of Empowerment of Weaker Sections in Grama Panchayaths in Rural Karnataka. *Int J Advanced Res in Mgt and Social Sci* 3(2): 101.
- Batta J (2011). Role of Women Members in Gram Panchayats. M.Sc (HECM) thesis, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana.
- Biswas S (2015). The Role of Indira Awaas Yojana in Addressing Rural Homelessness: An Evaluation. *Int J Humanities Social Sci Studies* 2(2): 364-374.
- Deshpande A R, Soni M C, and Shekhawat S S (2013). Role performance of Gram Panchayat members in Agricultural Development programmes. *Indian Res J Ext Edu* 13 (2): 89-92.
- Doddamani K N (2014). Empowerment of Women Representatives in Panchayati Raj Institution in Gulbarga District in Karnataka. *J Res Agri and Anim Sci* 2(3): 09-14.
- Kumar S (2012). The Present Status of Decentralization of Governance in Haryana: A Study of Kaithal District. *Int J Res in Engineering, IT and Social Sci* 2 (9): 29-31.
- Kumari A R and Singh N (2015). Evaluating the Role Performance of Elected Women Members in Panchayati Raj Institution. *Indian Res J Ext Edu* 15(7): 28-30.
- Ramya T (2014). Role of Panchayati Raj Institutions in Rural Development: The Study of a Tribal Village in Arunachal Pradesh. *Int J Humanities and Social Sci Studies* 1(3):503-20.
- Reddy K E (2014). Role of Panchayati Raj Institutions in Rural Development with Special Reference to Anantapuramu District of Andhra Pradesh. *Int J Humanities and Social Sci Studies* 1(2): 98-106.
- Sharma R and Didwania M (2013). Performance Analysis of MGNREGA: A Case Study of District Jind. *Int J Business Eco Mgmt Res* 3(2): 156-59.
- Shivanna T and Kadam R N (2017). An Evaluation of Indira Awas Yojana in Challakere Taluk of Chitradurga District, Karnataka. In: Proceedings of the Third, International Conference on Emerging trends in Engineering, Technology, Science and Management 11 June 2017, New Delhi pp. 302-05.

Received on 08/3/18

Accepted on 30/6/18