

# **JAWAHAR ROZGAR YOJANA :**

## **A QUICK STUDY**

### **1. The Study**

By merging the two erstwhile wage employment programme – National Rural Employment programme (NREP) and Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (RLEGP) the Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY) was started with effect from April, 1, 1989 on 80:20 cost sharing basis between the centre and the States. The main objective of the yojana was additional gainful employment for the unemployed and under-employed persons in rural areas. The other objective was the creation of sustained employment by strengthening rural economic infrastructure and assets in favour of rural poor for their direct and continuing benefits. Though the people below the poverty line were the target group for employment, the preference was to be given to the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and freed bonded labourers. Thirty percent of the employment opportunities were to be reserved for women in rural areas. Gram Panchayats were to be involved in the planning and implementation of the programme.

At the instance of the Planning Commission, the Programme Evaluation Organisation (PEO) undertook a quick study of the JRY with a view to assess the extent to which the Yojana helped in providing employment to the target group; analyse the type of assets created under the yojana including their quality and usefulness; comprehend the arrangements for the maintenance of assets created ; and study the problems encountered in the implementation of the Yojana.

### **2. Objectives of the Study**

The main objectives of the quick study were the following:

- i) to assess the extent to which the Yojana helped the target group in providing employment,
- ii) to analyse the type of assets created under the Yojana – their quality and usefulness,
- iii) to comprehend the arrangements for maintenance of assets created, and
- iv) to study the problems encountered in the implementation of the Yojana.

### **3. Sample Size/Criteria for Sample Selection**

Though JRY being implemented in all States/Union Territories, a closer analysis of data revealed that a little over 90 percent of the rural poor (population below poverty line ) and 80 percent of the total rural population lived in 10 States. These were: Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Rajasthan , Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal. In these States, rural population living below poverty line ranged from 26 per cent in Rajasthan to 48 per cent in Orissa. It was, therefore, decided to take up the study in these 10 States.

From each of these ten selected States, two districts one identified as `best performing` and the second as `least performing` with reference to percentage utilisation of available funds under JRY during 1990-91 - were selected. As it was a quick study, this criterion was considered most appropriate to reach the districts.

Similarly, from each of the selected districts, two Gram Panchayats – one `best performing` and the other `least performing` were selected.

From each selected Gram Panachayat, 15 beneficiaries, who worked under JRY and received wages were selected at random from the muster rolls for the year 1990-91 maintained by the Gram Panchayats.

On the basis of the above sampling design, 10 States, 20 districts, 40 Gram Panchayats and 600 beneficiaries were selected for the study.

### **4. Reference Period**

The field work was completed between the last week of November, 1991 and the first week of January, 1992. The study covered the period from April, 1989 to September 30, 1991.

### **5. Main Findings**

1. The percentage achievement in terms of mandays of employment generated was more than the percentage utilisation of total funds available during the years 1989-90 and 1990-91 at all levels.
2. The proportion of mandays of employment of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes to the total mandays of employment generated was more than 50 percent. But the women's share remained 22 to 25 percent at the

district level. However, at the selected Gram Panchayat level, it was 15 to 18 percent, only.

3. The financial performance during 1991-92 has further revealed that during the first nine months period (Upto December , 1991), at all India and State level, the achievements remained less than 50 percent. This shows that more than 50 percent of the available funds were utilised only during the last quarter and major works were being taken up during the terminal quarter.
4. Based on the data collected by the field teams, it is observed that 35.9 percent of the total population in all the selected Gram Panchayat was available for employment. Of these, 14.8 percent and 14.3 percent were actually employed during 1989-90 and 1990-91, respectively. However, in the first half of 1991-92 (Upto September , 1991) only 3 percent of those available for employment were employed. This shows that the Yojana had provided negligible employment during the first half of the year and major work was left to be done during the second half.
5. Of the total women available for employment , women employed under the Yojana declined from 7 per cent in 1989-90 to 4 per cent in 1990-91.
6. It has been noted that of 40 selected Gram Panchayats, 2 in 1989-90 and 6 in 1990-91 did not utilise the funds at all. In the first half of 1991-92, 19 Gram Panchayats did not report any utilisation of funds.
7. The Gram Panchayats which had utilised the funds could provide employment, to a person , for an average number of 11.44 and 15.68 days during 1989-90 and 1990-91, respectively . This shows that the Yojana did not provide employment to the extent expected.
8. At the beneficiary level, it was observed that all the selected beneficiaries did not get employment in all the years under study.
9. It has been revealed that the illustrative list of works, as per JRY Manual has become the exhaustive list at the operational level. However, `other works , amounting to more than the illustrative list were created based on the local needs. This was observed in the case of 75 per cent of the selected Gram Panchayats.

10. All the assets were created in almost all the selected States. However, the position was not the same in respect of selected districts and the Gram Panchayats.
11. It was observed that, the quality of assets created was not upto the mark in 56 per cent of the Gram Panchayats.
12. Eight-nine per cent of the selected beneficiaries had expressed that assets created were useful.
13. It was observed that no adequate attention was given to the maintenance of assets by the selected States, Districts, and Gram Panchayats.
14. The quality of maintenance of assets was found to be good only in a few Gram Panchayats.
15. In each of the selected States 30 per cent reported that the prescribed wage : material ratio in respect of pucca works was not workable and that the supervision and monitoring were inadequate.
16. Thirty percent of the States reported the late receipt of funds and the same percentage reported that the funds allocated were inadequate.
17. Forty percent of the selected States were facing the problem of inadequacy of technical staff at the Block level.
18. At the Gram panchayat level it was felt that wage : material ratio was not workable. The Panchayat Secretary was over worked, and the plan of action instead of being prepared by Gram Panchayat was prepared by the block agency thereby ignoring the felt needs of the area. In respect of technical problems at the Gram Panchayat level, it was reported that technical guidance was not available, measurement of works was delayed, and operational area of the Junior Engineer was too big.
19. Other problems reported at the Gram Panchayat level were engagement of contractors for execution of works, lack of proper maintenance of muster rolls factions in the **Gram Panchayats**, etc.

## 5. Major Suggestions

1. The number of persons available for employment and who actually got employed under JRY was not maintained at any level. It is, therefore, suggested that, this being an important aspect of wage employment programme, such information may be maintained in the interest of proper planning and execution of the Yojana.
2. As **Gram Panchayats** are mainly responsible for planning and execution of the Yojana, it is suggested that the Gram Panchayat elections may be held regularly and in time.
3. The illustrative list of works given in the JRY Manual, issued by the Ministry of Rural Development has become the exhaustive list at the operational level. Seventy five percent of the Gram Panchayats had constructed more number of assets other than those given in the illustrative list,. It is, therefore, suggested that assets as per the felt need of the area may be taken up and illustrative list should serve only as a guide line. However, in construction of assets like veterinary hospital, bus shelter, social forestry, Anganwadis, etc. the sectoral departments may take primary responsibility and JRY funds should serve as an additionality.
4. As the quality of maintenance of assets in most of the cases was found to be either average or poor, it is suggested that Gram Panchayats may be involved so as to ensure a regular and good quality maintenance of the assets. A regular supervision and monitoring of the maintenance of assets should be ensured at higher level.
5. Training of Pradhans of the Gram panchayats and proper awareness of the Yojana may be ensured by the implementing agencies at the State and District levels. As the programme has to be executed by the Gram Panchayats and is meant to benefit the local people it is suggested that the involvement of contractors may be discouraged.
6. It may be ensured that the plan of action is prepared at the Gram Panchayat level and not by the block authorities wherever being practised.
7. Last but not the least, it is suggested that the Yojana be implemented on selectivity basis- in the areas of concentration of the poor. This is important particularly at the Gram Panchayat level.