


Impact Assessment of PMAY-G

(Madhya Pradesh, Odisha & West Bengal)



Dr. W.R. Reddy, IAS
Dr. R. Ramesh
Prof. P. SivaRam



Centre for Rural Infrastructure
National Institute of Rural Development and Panchayati Raj
Rajendranagar, Hyderabad – 500 030

VISION

- ❖ The vision of NIRDPR is to focus on the policies and programmes that benefit the rural poor, strive to energise the democratic decentralisation processes, improve the operation and efficiency of rural development personnel, promote transfer of technology through its social laboratories, Technology Park and create environmental awareness.
- ❖ As a “think-tank” for the Ministry of Rural Development, NIRDPR, while acting as a repository of knowledge on rural development, would assist the Ministry in policy formulation and choice of options in rural development to usher in the change.

MISSION

- ❖ To examine and analyse the factors contributing to the improvement of economic and social well-being of people in rural areas on a sustainable basis with focus on the rural poor and the other disadvantaged groups through research, action research, consultancy and documentation efforts.
- ❖ To facilitate the rural development efforts with particular emphasis and focus on the rural poor by improving the knowledge, skills and attitudes of rural development officials and non-officials through organising training, workshops and seminars.

Impact Assessment of PMAY-G

(Madhya Pradesh, Odisha & West Bengal)

Dr. W. R. Reddy, IAS

Dr. R. Ramesh

Prof. P. SivaRam

CENTRE FOR RURAL INFRASTRUCTURE

National Institute of Rural Development & Panchayati Raj (NIRDPR)

Rajendranagar, Hyderabad – 500030, Telangana, India

www.nirdpr.org.in

© **National Institute of Rural Development and Panchayati Raj**

ISBN: 978-81-941674-7-1

December, 2019

Published by:

National Institute of Rural Development and Panchayati Raj

Ministry of Rural Development,

Government of India

Rajendranagar,

Hyderabad - 500030, Telangana, India

www.nirdpr.org.in

Printed at:

Sri Balaji Graphics

(Designers & Printers)

1-8-1/B/26, Cellar, Housefed Bhavan,

Baghlingampally, Hyderabad - 500044.

Telangana, India. © 93474 78010

sribalajipress@gmail.com

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Research is an integral part of NIRDPR's mandate. Measuring the progress which the country makes in providing various basic facilities such as drinking water, sanitation, rural roads, connectivity, housing and so on are vital for reaching the last man and to identify gaps, if any that require addressing. The current study on Pradhan Mantri Awaas Yojana (PMAY-G) takes a critical look into the changes that this Yojana has brought about in the lives of those who availed house under PMAY-G.

This study is an impact assessment of PMAY-G implemented in three States, namely Madhya Pradesh, Odisha and West Bengal. Without the support of the respective State governments, this study could not have been initiated. We put on record the cooperation extended by the Panchayats and Rural Development Departments of these three States. The Gram Panchayat functionaries and Awas Bandhu of PMAY-G in the study villages offered to take us to the house of every beneficiary, who we had selected at random from the universe received. They deserve a big 'thank you'. More than the beneficiaries of PMAY-G, we need to acknowledge the cooperation extended by non-beneficiaries, who were on the waiting-list. They answered all our questions patiently and threw lots of insights, which helped us during data analysis and interpretation.

Dr. W. R. Reddy, IAS, Director General, NIRDPR, threw this challenge to us and asked if we could do an impact assessment using Randomised Control Trial (RCT). When this study was being written up and finalised, he was very critical about the preliminary findings. Every question he posed made us go back to the data and bring in some more clarity to this report. He helped to finalise this report. Dr. Reddy also mooted a

discussion in the Faculty Forum on insights that emanate for writing a policy brief from this study.

Shri Santanu Bowmick, Research Associate, who collected most of the data required for this study deserves a special mention here. We must acknowledge the CDC team comprising Krishna Raj, Victor Paul, G. S. Ravi Kishore and V. G. Bhat for they have been very meticulous in their editorial work and have been on their toes to bring it out as scheduled.

Dr. R. Ramesh

Prof. P. SivaRam

December, 2019.

CONTENTS

Abbreviations	vi
Summary of Findings	vii
Chapter – 1: Introduction & Review of Literature	1
Chapter – 2: Design of the Study	11
Chapter – 3: Profile of the Study Area	18
Chapter – 4: Analysis and Discussion	33
Chapter – 5: Findings and Conclusion	53

ABBREVIATIONS

CG	: Control Group
DBT	: Direct Benefit Transfer
ESP	: Economic Stimulus Package
GP	: Gram Panchayat
IAY	: Indira Awaas Yojana
IEC	: Information, Education and Communication
LPG	: Liquid Petroleum Gas (cooking gas)
MGNREGS	: Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme
PMAY-G	: Pradhan Mantri Awaas Yojana – Gramin
PMUY	: Pradhan Mantri Ujjwala Yojana (cooking gas provision scheme)
MFI	: Micro Finance Institution
MIS	: Management Information System
NIRDPR	: National Institute of Rural Development and Panchayati Raj
ODK	: Open Data Kit (software for mobile-based data collection)
RCT	: Randomised Trial Control
SBM-G	: Swachh Bharat Mission – Gramin
SECC	: Socio-Economic Caste Census
SHG	: Self-Help Groups
TG	: Treatment Group

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This study on the impact of PMAY-G set out answering the following questions: (i) To what extent were the programme objectives met with regard to improving the physical living conditions of the target population; and (ii) socio-economic improvements experienced by the target population, as a result of owning a new house? These precisely mean the changes brought about by PMAY-G in physical facilities or subjective well-being of the people, who availed house under the scheme. Studying the convergence possibilities under PMAY-G and factors constraining effective convergence was also part of the study.

The study was conducted in three States, viz. Madhya Pradesh, Odisha and West Bengal (covering 24 Gram Panchayats in six districts, interviewing 1,382 PMAY-G beneficiaries). The methodology used was RCT (Randomised Control Trial), where the beneficiaries who availed house ‘already and are living in that house for the past six months to one year’ were taken as Treatment Group and those who were selected and have been put on the ‘waiting list’ (that they shall avail house in the upcoming years) were taken as Comparison Group. The following are some of the important findings of the study.

Findings

Type of House: The poor who were living in thatched houses, mud houses and houses with paddy straw roofs have got concrete roofed houses (58 per cent), partly concrete roof plus partly asbestos roofs (25 per cent), and fully asbestos roofs (17 per cent). Most of the houses are made of brickwork or cement block work. PMAY-G has provided better housing condition to the beneficiaries by providing pucca houses. In the comparison group, we found only 66 per cent of the houses electrified, whereas in PMAY houses, we found 81 per cent were electrified. PMAY-G has slightly reduced congestion in houses by providing two or more rooms. It has slightly reduced the congestion in occupancy by bringing the median

occupancy from 5 to 4.5. About 68 per cent of the households have mentioned about having got additional space for livelihood activities in-door.

Kitchen: PMAY-G has provided cooking space (kitchen) inside the house. This has changed the practice of cooking outside, but not to the extent it could have changed. PMAY-G beneficiaries seem to prefer having one more room to kitchen. Some have designed their houses to be all rooms and no kitchen. A few of them who have constructed kitchen also prefer cooking outdoors so as to use the kitchen space as another living room. This explains why Pradhan Mantri Ujjwala Yojana (PMUY), which provides LPG for cooking, had not picked up amongst the PMAY-G houses to the extent it could have.

Fuel for Cooking: Traditional *chulah* and firewood still remain the main cooking fuel even in PMAY-G houses. LPG is used only in 14 per cent PMAY-G houses in Madhya Pradesh, 20 per cent in Odisha, and 8 per cent in West Bengal. The PMUY (LPG for cooking) is not a big success under PMAY-G convergence. The price of LPG and voluntarily placing oneself under the pressure of having to find money to replace empty cylinders almost every month are reportedly another reasons for PMAY-G beneficiaries to abstain from applying for LPG for cooking. A third factor is that poor awareness level with regard to PMUY convergence, even among the *Awaas Bandu* (Local Motivators of PMAY-G).

Toilets: Among the PMAY-G households, 65 per cent has toilets, and 35 per cent do not have toilets. Out of the 65 per cent of the households who have toilets, on an average (all the three States put together) 10 per cent of them are not using. It shows that new houses constructed under PMAY-G have provided with toilets to every household but still, a good number of them do not use toilets. Most of these non-use cases are reported from Odisha, West Bengal, and very less from Madhya Pradesh. This is surprising and it requires probing in order to ascertain if the non-use/disuse is due to behaviour-related reasons or because of poor installations.

Drinking Water: In providing access to piped water supply through convergence with NRDWP, there has been no much headway made amongst PMAY-G beneficiaries. Most beneficiaries of PMAY-G houses get water through common water collection points only. The same holds good for other common facilities like waste collection, drainage and street lights too, which in turn, confirms poor convergence of PMAY-G with other programmes.

Additional Expenditure Incurred: It was found that about 80 per cent of the beneficiaries has invested additional funds for constructing their PMAY-G assisted houses. The median amount spent was Rs.60,000 in most cases, the amount spent ranges from Rs.50,000 to Rs.80,000. A few beneficiaries reported to have spent additional funds ranging from Rs.2,00,000 to Rs.6,00,000 but the number of such beneficiaries does not go beyond 10 at the maximum (out of 1380 beneficiaries interviewed). Therefore, such outliers (extreme cases) need not be taken as, the programme driving the beneficiaries to become indebted - as some studies argue. However, a matter of concern here is the source from which the beneficiaries generate the additional fund.

The main sources reported are private moneylenders and building material suppliers (54 per cent), friends and relatives (18 per cent). Five per cent of them have reported to have used up savings/sold out assets or pledged assets, etc. Hardly, 3 per cent have gone for SHG/MFI loans and less than one per cent of them have gone for nationalised banks. During informal interviews, it was found that they were aware that they could approach banks for availing a loan up to Rs. 70,000. Some report of having very little hope about convincing a banker to lend for the purpose of investing in a house being constructed under a government programme.

House Maintenance Expenditure: With regard to the house maintenance expenditure incurred by PMAY-G beneficiaries, most of them have reported 'zero maintenance'. The reason, possibly, could be because a new house does not require much

maintenance. Some beneficiaries have reported to have spent Rs. 2000- 6000, and their number is too small. Reportedly, the new PMAY-G house has lightened the house maintenance burden, which otherwise in the mud/dilapidated house, used to be too high almost every year.

Conclusion

Taking into account the physical facilities such as type of house, electricity connection, kitchen, toilet, bathroom, natural ventilation, natural light and space for livelihood activities, etc., when the overall objective well-being of the PMAY-G beneficiaries is measured in comparison to those on the waiting list, we can conclude that PMAY-G beneficiaries have the mean positive difference of 31.9 per cent in Madhya Pradesh, 26.9 per cent in Odisha and 39 per cent in West Bengal. The T-test conducted also shows a significant difference between the PMAY-G beneficiaries against the Comparison Group (those on the ‘waiting list’ living in the old dilapidated house). In terms of effect size (Cohen’s d), we find that as far as Madhya Pradesh and Odisha are concerned, the programme has made ‘Very Large’ effect; and in West Bengal, the programme has made a ‘Huge Effect’. On convergence possibilities - except with some programmes such as SBM-G or MGNREGS - the programme still has not made any perceptible headway.

In terms of subjective well-being (socio-psychological well-being), on indicators such as Social Status, Self-worth, Confidence Level, Feeling of Ownership, Feeling of Safety & Security, Self-perceived Improvement in Health, Overall Quality of Life, and Satisfaction about the New House, we find the PMAY-G beneficiaries feel much better, compared to the Comparison Group. It can be concluded that the new PMAY-G has made a significant impact on the lives of beneficiaries – both in terms of physical facilities provided and subject well-being.

Policy Implications

Policy issues with regard to PMAY convergence with other programmes require

major changes. For example, once a set of beneficiaries have been selected under PMAY-G, other facilities such as toilet, solar light, LPG and yard connection for drinking water provision, etc., from other programmes (e.g. SBM-G, NRDWP, PMUY, etc.) must be get marshalled into a pack and delivered. This can avoid the beneficiaries stepping into every office of the government that implements each of these programmes. Secondly, we find that Awas Bhandus (PMAY-G Local Motivators) in many places are doing commendable work in local coordination. They, in fact, seem to help speed up progress. But, they are unaware of the convergence possibilities. They can be trained in various schemes that a PMAY-G beneficiary can avail. Possibly, this can also facilitate convergence to take momentum.

CHAPTER – 1

INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Public housing programme in the country started with the rehabilitation of refugees' immediately after Independence and since then, it has been a major focus area of the government as an instrument of poverty alleviation. Rural housing programme, as an independent programme, started with Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY) in January, 1996. Although IAY addressed the housing needs in the rural areas, certain gaps were identified during the course of performance audit in 2014. These gaps include non-assessment of housing shortage, lack of transparency in the selection of beneficiaries, low quality of house, lack of technical supervision and lack of convergence, loans not availed by beneficiaries and weak mechanism for monitoring, and limiting the impact and outcomes of the programme. In order to address these gaps in the rural housing programme and in view of Government's commitment to providing "Housing for All" by 2022, the scheme of IAY has been restructured into Pradhan Mantri Awaas Yojana - Gramin (PMAY-G) with effect from 1st April, 2016.

PMAY-G aims to provide a pucca house with basic amenities to all house-less households and households living in kutcha and dilapidated house by 2022. The immediate objective is to cover one crore households living in kutcha house/dilapidated houses in three years from 2016-17 to 2018-19 and ensure construction of quality houses, using local materials, designs and masons specially trained in quality workmanship. For houses to become homes, adequate care for adopting a habitat approach through convergence is proposed.

Key Features of PMAY-G

- The minimum unit (house) size enhanced from the existing 20 sq.mt. to 25 sq.mt including a dedicated area for hygienic cooking.

- Enhancement of unit assistance from Rs. 70,000 to Rs. 1,20,000 in plains and from Rs. 75,000 to Rs. 1,30,000 in hilly States, difficult areas and IAP districts. The cost of unit (house) assistance is to be shared between Central and State governments in the ratio 60:40 in plain areas and 90:10 for north-eastern and hilly States.
- Identification of beneficiaries using SECC-2011 data. The identification and selection of the beneficiaries shall be done by the community through the Gram Sabha, from the SECC 2011 list, based on the housing deficiency and other social deprivation parameters.
- The beneficiaries of PMAY-G. in addition to being provided financial assistance, shall also be offered technical assistance in the construction of the house. If the beneficiary so chooses, he/she will be facilitated to avail loan from financial institutions for an amount of up to Rs. 70,000. A special module for orientation of beneficiaries for demystifying concepts of construction costs and process. All payments through DBT to beneficiary's Bank/Post office accounts registered in AwaasSoft MIS.
- Provision of toilets at Rs. 12,000 and 90/95 days of unskilled wage labour under MGNREGA over and above the unit cost.
- Use of effective convergence for provision of electricity, piped drinking water facility, rainwater harvesting, LPG gas connection under Ujjwala scheme, solar initiatives, backyard fruit plants, poultry, goatery, dairy shed, solid and liquid waste management, etc.
- Creating a menu of housing designs based on local typologies incorporating local materials, traditional knowledge and aesthetics. Specially designed mason training certificates proforma on-site to improve the quality of homes and enhance the skills of participants.

- Saturation approach in housing provision using Gram Panchayat, block or district as a unit, wherever possible.

Role of Gram Panchayat

Under the PMAY-G, Gram Panchayats have been given the most critical role to play in the actual implementation of the scheme. These include the following:

- The GP finalises priority list of eligible beneficiaries prepared on the basis of SECC-2011 data by convening a Gram Sabha.
- The GP through Gram Sabha prepares the list of additional beneficiaries who though eligible have been left out from the list of eligible beneficiaries.
- The GPs should ensure maximum participation in the Gram Sabha held to finalise the priority list of beneficiaries.
- They should arrange the meeting of beneficiaries either at the level of the Village Panchayat or for a cluster of Village Panchayats, depending on the number of beneficiaries, and facilitate the orientation of beneficiaries on different aspects of the scheme.
- The Gram Panchayats with the help of the Gram Sabha would identify families who cannot construct houses on their own and help in identifying NGOs/Civil Society Organisations of repute to handhold such beneficiaries to construct the houses in time.
- The GPs assist in identifying common land and other lands including government land for allotment to the landless beneficiary.
- The GPs may facilitate the beneficiaries in accessing materials required for construction at reasonable rates and also the trained masons needed for construction.

- The Gram Panchayats would ensure convergence with other schemes of the Centre and State so that the beneficiary of PMAY-G avails the benefits of these schemes.
- They should discuss the progress of the scheme in their scheduled meetings.
- They should also proactively assist the social audit teams to conduct Social Audit.
- The Gram Panchayat should identify and monitor the local level functionary who would be tagged with each house sanctioned for ensuring completion of the construction of the house without delay.

In order to enable the Panchayats to play its role effectively, the State government may do the following:

- Organise training programme to equip the Panchayats to carry out the tasks assigned to them.
- Provide the Panchayats IEC material, particularly on materials and building technologies.
- Provide a share of administrative expenses commensurate with workload.
- Issue an order specifying the roles and responsibilities of each tier of Panchayat as appropriate to the States.

The condition of housing in rural India continues to be problematic due to reasons such as, inter alia, poverty in rural areas; priority of the poor towards livelihoods search; lack of idea on cost-effective housing designs that the poor can afford; near absent institutional assistance when a poor person wants to construct a house. Therefore, they continue to live in an insecure habitat. Such conditions can also be attributed to ignorance and a sense of insecurity which significantly affect their

social life. The poor need institutional assistance, especially technical and financial. Importance of housing has been identified in almost every five-year plan document starting, perhaps from the ninth five-year plan (1997-2002) as an important aspect of social sector development.

There are studies that show (for instance, Sudarshnam and Ajantha Kumar, (2005)) social sector development demands appropriate policies and programmes formulated and ensured by adequate investment supported by State so that marginalised and vulnerable section of the population can access basic facilities [such as housing] based on their needs and not on their ability to pay. In the words of Gaur K.D. (1996), food and shelter are two necessary needs of an individual and the absence of the two is a curse to the society that can lead to social deprivation of the poor. Homelessness can be expressed in social segregation. Adequate effort must be put to remove poverty and houselessness. Sudarshnam and Ajantha Kumar (2005) further state that in terms of the durability of houses and other standards like sanitation, clean drinking water and others the situation is not up to standards. The rural houses are mostly huts, sheds, shacks and to call these a ‘house’ is not justifiable. According to Sudarshnam and Kumar (2005), rural houses are deficient in many aspects. They lack durability and are not conducive to hygienic living. Rural houses are not constructed in a proper manner in order to withstand natural calamities. Arguments given by Sudarshnam and Kumar bring out the issues that continue to exist in ongoing housing schemes in the country.

Pro-poor policies and programmes on rural housing are dire needs, given the size of the rural population, which continues to live in houses that are unsafe to live in. PMAY-G is another significant step towards fulfilling the housing needs of the poor. Researchers have analysed the impact of earlier rural housing programmes. Taking a dip into the existing research-based literature on this subject would be in order for being able to write a clear road map for a study on the impact of PMAY-G.

Review of Literature

(Anand, 2017) in his study titled: ‘Housing for the Poor and the Impact of IAY in Rural India: Present Context’ has analysed the impact of housing for rural poor in India in rural poverty eradication with reference to the major housing scheme of the Indian government, i.e., Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY). It is based on secondary data. He argues that rural housing has been marginalised both in wider policy discussions as well as within the debate on rural issues because rural housing needs are generally subordinated to urban housing needs in policy priority. Yet, housing is essential for the well-being and social security of rural households.

Compared to urban areas, rural areas are more deprived. With incomes generally lower than the urban areas and seasonal unemployment, many households find it difficult to gain ownership of homes. This has implications for social sustainability of rural communities and is causing increased polarisation as younger people migrate to the urban areas in search of jobs leaving behind their old folk and children, resulting in a negative impact on rural enterprise and economic viability. He concludes that a house must have connectivity to drinking water supply, sanitation, electricity, etc., in order to give a feeling of security to its inhabitants. Housing, as a basic need, has evolved as a prime component not only in providing shelter but also by providing employment opportunities and aiding local development. This article puts across that the emphasis of rural housing should be more on inclusiveness and on quality improvement. When a poor man owns a house, it helps in giving him a self-identity, and that the housing sector has a positive impact on the overall standard of living of the rural people.

(Kumar K. K., 2016) in his research paper titled: ‘Impact of Rural Housing Schemes on Human Development in India – An Analysis’ has analysed the problems of rural housing programmes on human development in Karnataka taking into account, besides IAY, other major programmes of the Government of India. This study argues that housing is known to have multiple linkages with the rest of the economy and investments in housing have orchestrated impact in the region and on the

broader economy. This paper intends to analyse the various major housing schemes of the Government of India. It is based on secondary data. The authors have attempted to explain the multiplier effect of the housing programme to the weaker sections of the population in Karnataka. They have found that the State Government of Karnataka has been very pro-active in creating a multiplier effect combining IAY with other major development programmes in order to gear up human development efforts in the State.

(Kumar, June 2014) has made a review of the work of the Working Group on Rural Housing for the Twelfth Five-Year Plan, which was published in *Economic and Political Weekly* (Vol.49, Issue No.26-27). The working group has estimated the rural housing shortage in India to be 43.13 million in 2012. Using the latest data sets - Census 2011 and the National Sample Survey housing condition round for 2008-09 - and the improved methodology used by the technical group on the urban housing shortage, this paper re-estimates the rural shortage to be 62.01 million in 2012. Households living in temporary houses and in congested conditions were found to be mainly responsible for the rural housing shortage. The results suggest the need for holistically focusing on eradicating shelter deprivation in rural India and contributing to an enhancement of the quality of life of the people.

Drawbacks in terms of provision of sanitation, drinking water and others in preceding housing project were analysed by Nirmal Kumar et al. (2004). They have concluded that rural houses are not treated as engineering structures. Rather, they are built without proper planning of drainage, sewage and lack a building plan. It has been observed that the technical knowledge related to the construction of building and rural infrastructure is not percolating down to remote villages. Therefore, measures must be taken in order to strengthen the dissemination of information relating to the transfer of technology, use of environment-friendly materials and credit /subsidy/ finance, etc. Avtar (2005) confirms that the issue pertaining to the scenario of convergence of various schemes is quite miserable. A village where rural housing programme has been implemented lack basic amenities like water

supply, sanitation, disposal of wastewater, solid waste, etc. This can be attributed as causes for the environmental deterioration and pollution of common resources such as land, water, soil and air in rural areas. One thing which comes out on the scene is the persistent connectivity of sanitation and basic amenities which establish linkages with the housing schemes. These basic amenities are related to health and are generally taken as a social indicator in the overall assessment of social well-being. The place of childbirth was considered as an important facilitating factor for maintaining improved health, particularly of infants. However, a child delivered in unhygienic condition (home) has a direct bearing on his/her birth (Veena Kumari and Singh, 2004). Veena and Singh argue that housing is a key input in economic, social and civic development. On the social side, housing in better times generates wealth by appreciating in value, providing secure premises for income-generating activities and opening the door to credit. Incremental investment in the housing allows poor families to improve their asset base over time, as resources become available. Moreover, clean and warm housing is an essential input for disease prevention and healthcare.

Research carried out by Srinivasan (1988) came up with the idea of applying appropriate technology in the construction of rural houses. He viewed that in the context of increasing housing needs, resources available for construction need to be appropriated in the best possible manner. According to Srinivasan, locally available resource must be incorporated in construction to the maximum extent. The familiarity of the local artisans with correct uses of indigenous material and acceptance by the people are positive advantages. Srinivasan (1988) found that a large number of rural houses are constructed with non-durable material like mud, grass thatch, etc. Such construction requires frequent maintenance besides being highly vulnerable to fire and natural hazards like rain, floods and earthquakes. The livable quality of the houses leaves much to be desired. The technology should aim at improving the durability and livability of houses. Extension of the same argument has been located in the work of Mathur (1989) where he linked rural housing technology with poverty eradication. According to him, adoption of appropriate technologies can contribute

largely to mitigate the economic and social problems faced by rural poor families in eradicating poverty by the use of self-reliance in building technology, conservation of energy and maximum use of local reserves with gainful utilisation of traditional skills. Concern for appropriate technology in rural housing was also discussed by Dutt (2002). He discussed that one of the major problems in rural housing is the lack of awareness and information about the various technical inputs required for habitat development.

Significance of having household assets was highlighted by Abhiroop Mukhopadhyay and Indira Rajaraman (2012) with reference to economic benefits suggesting that housing is the major durable asset owned by households and in rural India, it has more significance. Housing varies by quality and therefore, transition in housing quality is potentially useful makers of the confidence of a household in its future income stream.

Kumar K. K. (2016) has conducted one of the recent studies on the impact of rural housing within the realm of human development. Kumar also linked the housing scheme with larger rural economy. He took a detailed study of some villages in Karnataka and has built an argument that housing project has multiplying connectivity with other policies and schemes which need to be viewed in the pretext of human development. PMAY-G can be one of the schemes which can help in bringing an appropriate assessment of many policies for the benefit of rural poor through its mechanism or provision of convergence. One of the main concerns affecting rural development is bringing about a qualitative change in the lives of rural poor through scheme convergence within and across ministries. The Habitat Development Working Group on Rural Housing (12th Five Year Plan, 2011) came with a recommendation that a 'hamlet' should be treated as the 'unit of convergence' rather than a village. The convergence of IAY with schemes delivering other elements of a holistic habitat such as sanitation, water supply, domestic energy and insurance cover needs to be strengthened. Convergence also needs to be explored with MGNREGA and Backward Regions Grant Fund (BRGF) for the physical development of habitats.

Development Facilitators, (2009), New Delhi has conducted an evaluation of rural housing programme (IAY) under Economic Stimulus Package (ESP) in selected Naxal-affected districts of Jharkhand, Bihar and Odisha. This study has been carried out for the Research Division of NITI Aayog, GoI, New Delhi. (i) The study found that earning of respondents in post-ESP regime was noted to have increased marginally, and the proportion of beneficiaries not meaningfully engaged in any activity prior to ESP intervention noted to be declined after getting an IAY house (ii) Increased scope for work opportunities were reported as beneficiaries were engaged in construction activities of other fellow IAY beneficiaries, 44 per cent reported scope for exposure to other avenues of employment as women IAY beneficiaries were engaged in small business activities by becoming members in Self-Help Groups (SHGs) (iii) Other valued non-monetary outcomes perceived by a majority of beneficiaries was reduction of discomforts or inconveniences after having pucca units and indicating possession of pucca IAY dwelling units had impacted sustainable living (iv) Augmentation of social security was indicated to be one of the impacts as migration by younger people leaving behind elderly persons was reduced after possession of IAY houses. Increased wage employment opportunity nearby through MGNREGS was stated to have diminishing effects on seasonal migration of adolescents and youths (v) Use of savings to better health of household members by ensuring sanitation and drinking water within households. Over-all, the level of satisfaction owing to the possession of IAY units depicted positive valuation of dwelling units by respondents in terms of fostering societal rejuvenation and improved social status.

Studies conducted have focused on ‘benefits of rural housing programme as a component in some other larger studies or social impact of housing with specific indicators. New PMAY – the revised/revamped rural housing programme - has not been studied for its socio-economic impact on the rural poor. Hence, this study is taken up.

CHAPTER – 2

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The Pradhan Mantri Awaas Yojana – Gramin (PMAY-G) was launched in the month of April 2016, which aims at providing a *pucca* house with basic amenities to all houseless households and those households living in *kutcha* and dilapidated house, by 2022. The immediate objective is to cover 10 million households living in *kutcha*/dilapidated houses in three years from 2016-17 to 2018-19. In addition to enhanced financial assistance and the increased size of the house, several other features such as beneficiary support services and convergence elements have gone into the new framework of PMAY-G, in order to make the outcome perceptible. So much so, the concept of ‘green development’ requires bearing in view when it comes to the choice of construction technologies, design typologies and material use. The e-Governance mechanism of the programme has been made robust through AwaasSoft, which is expected to respond to the newer requirements.

The guideline shows that transparency and accountability have significantly been improved, especially in the selection of beneficiaries and the construction of houses in PMAY-G. Another milestone in PMAY-G is geo-tagging to each and every house with photographs of beneficiaries. Furthermore, the convergence of other development programmes such as drinking water, sanitation, waste management, electricity, cooking gas and other amenities shall improve the quality of life of beneficiaries. Therefore, in the changing scenario, there is a need to study the impact of PMAY-G on the aspects such as social status, health improvement, rural livelihoods enhancement, perceived self-worth, satisfaction and improvement in other amenities, etc., for understanding the grassroots level realities, which in turn, can be shared with the PMAY-G Programme Division of the Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India. In order to put this study in proper perspective, a review of existing studies

with similar themes was made. [Ref: Chapter - 1 of this report]. Studies conducted have focused on ‘benefits of rural housing programme as a component in some other larger studies or social impact of housing with specific indicators. New PMAY-G the revised/revamped rural housing programme - has not been studied for its socio-economic impact on the rural poor. Moreover, none of the study reviewed has come out measuring the difference rural housing programme has made on the lives of the rural poor in terms of objective well-being and subjective feelings. Hence, this study is taken up.

Statement of the Problem

The PMAY-G is an improvement over the previous rural housing programme not only in terms of the criteria adopted for beneficiary selection but also in several other aspects, including the community participation and financing. The convergence elements are expected to make a greater impact on improving the quality of living of people with other amenities such as drinking water, sanitation, waste management, cooking fuel and other amenities. There are studies conducted on the impact of IAY programme, which was the earlier version of PMAY-G. However, there are hardly any studies carried out to understand the extent to which programme objectives of PMAY-G are being fulfilled to impact on rural social development. Therefore, this study is taken up with the following research questions and research objectives: (i) To what extent were the programme objectives met with regard to improving the socio-economic conditions of the target population?, and (ii) what are the changes brought about by PMAY-G in physical facilities or subjective well-being of people?

Objectives of the Study

1. To assess the overall socio-economic changes brought about on the lives of beneficiaries of PMAY-G at household and community levels
2. To study the extent of convergence of development programmes with PMAY-G and factors constraining effective convergence

Research Methods

Research Design: This study aims at bringing out ‘the socio-economic impact’ of PMAY-G programme on the target group in a real-life situation. Therefore, we have followed Experimental Research Design (using RCT) with a pragmatic research approach. We have worked with Treatment Groups and a Comparison Groups in each of the study States. Those who got their house constructed under PMAY-G have been taken as Treatment Group, and those who were on the ‘waiting-list’ were taken as Comparison Group. [Ten respondents on the waiting list of PMAY-G beneficiaries in every Gram Panchayat made the Comparison Group for this study]. These groups were very similar in socio-economic standing, and so there was almost no chance of any sampling bias to occur. These two were our groups for establishing the ‘difference or impact’. We have conducted interviews and FGDs as well. Mixed methods approach was followed in order to obtain statistically credible results. Experimental Research Design ensures internal validity, which is essentially used to determine cause-effect relationships. Pragmatism ensures external validity and maximises applicability and generalisability.

Source of Data: Gram Panchayat Offices and Block Development Office were the main source of secondary data – of people who were already living in houses constructed under PMAY-G (or almost ready to occupy) and those who were on the waiting list. List of beneficiaries that got their houses sanctioned after April 2016 and completed before February 2018 have been taken for Treatment Group. The list of beneficiaries of PMAY-G on the waiting list during the same period in the respective Gram Panchayats has been taken as Comparison Group for this study.

Sampling: The study covered 24 Gram Panchayats in three States covering six districts in 12 Blocks. Two Gram Panchayats in each selected Block were covered. Thus, there were four GPs studied in each selected district. The study States were selected covering regions that are plain, coastal and hilly – after ranking the States based on the coverage of beneficiaries under

PMAY-G after April, 2016. One State per region was selected, viz. (i) Madhya Pradesh [Plain], (ii) Odisha [Coastal] and (iii) West Bengal [hilly]. The list of Gram Panchayats selected based on these criteria is given as Annexure- 1. For the purpose of this study 1,383 PMAY-G beneficiaries and 250 waitlisted beneficiaries have been interviewed.

The respondents were selected based on the list of beneficiaries (Treatment Group); those on the waiting list to get benefited in the upcoming years (Comparison Group). This helped to avoid any selection bias, for their socio-economic background was very similar. Online Sample Size Calculator was used for determining sample size from each Gram Panchayats with a view to getting results with 95 per cent confidence level or with 5 per cent margin of error. Excel Random Number Generator was used for selecting respondents (sample fraction) for this study from the total list of PMAY-G beneficiaries (sampling frame) obtained from the respective Gram Panchayats. In order to ensure Statistical Power, we have gone for States, districts, blocks and Gram Panchayats where PMAY-G has made the highest coverage during the period under reference. This, in other words, means that we get the adequate number of samples, especially in our Treatment Group so that statistical treatment of data makes sense.

Data Collection: We prepared two different questionnaires – one for TG and the other for CG. They were almost similar but for a few differences that may not be applicable to CG. Mobile app-based ODK (Open Data Kit, which is an open-source software) was used for data collection. Use of mobile application brought down the time; otherwise, we would have spent entering data from the questionnaire into Excel sheets. Data were collected from respondents using a mobile app and was saved in the mobile phone for which no internet connectivity was required. Every evening, data from the mobile phone were uploaded into the server at NIRDPR when we got access to internet connectivity (in a hotel room in the field). Data sent from ODK mobile app to the server at NIRDPR opens as Excel sheets, completely saving

the time required for data entry and data cleaning. The data were ready for analysis and statistical treatment straight after ‘data collection stage’. ‘Data collection’ itself served the purpose of ‘data entry’ as well.

Period Covered: PMAY-G is an improvised programme over IAY. Studies are required to determine the impact in terms of ‘socio-economic and quality of living indicators’ on the target beneficiaries of PMAY-G. Thus, this study covered beneficiaries of PMAY-G reported on the PMAY-G website of the MoRD as of 2017-18 (December) 2017. At the Block and Gram Panchayat level, we have made sure that we take into account those beneficiaries who got their houses sanctioned after April, 2016 and completed before February, 2018.

Scope of the Study

This study has covered PMAY-G houses sanctioned and completed between April, 2016 and December, 2018. It does not cover houses constructed under IAY nor under any of the State government programmes or through NGO/CSR funding. It covers only beneficiaries of PMAY-G houses. It focuses on socio-economic impact, which is operationally defined below.

Operational Definitions

Impact: The difference PMAY-G has made in the lives of beneficiaries of the programme was measured in terms of objective well-being and subjective well-being.

Objective Well-being: This is about the changes brought about in the physical conditions of dwelling objectively verifiable through indicators such as:

- Type of materials used in construction and roofing
- Number of rooms
- Electricity connection

- Availability of toilet
- Separate kitchen for cooking
- Type of fuel used for cooking
- Natural lighting and ventilation
- Drinking water supply
- Drainage, etc.

Subjective Well-being: This is about the changes that have come about at the ‘gut feeling’ subjectively stated/expressed.

- Satisfaction about having a house
- Feeling of ‘Ownership’
- A Sense of Improved ‘Social Status’
- Self-perceived improvement in ‘Self-Worth’
- Self-perceived improvement in ‘Confidence level’
- Self-perceived improvement in ‘Health’
- Feeling of ‘Safety and Security’
- Improvement in Overall Standard of Living

Economic Indicators:

- Extra money spent
- Source of borrowing, if borrowed
- Money spent on Repair and Maintenance
- Space for taking up livelihood activities
- Type of fuel used for cooking

Analytical Framework

As mentioned in the design of the study, this is a study using Experimental Design

where we had Treatment Groups and Comparison Groups from six districts of three States. After controlling for extraneous/confounding variables, any improvement (difference) made by the Treatment Group over the Comparison Group has been construed as the impact of the programme. Besides Descriptive Statistics such as mean, mean difference, median, range, Standard Deviation and graphic presentations, appropriate inferential statistical tools such as variances, T-test, Cohen's D, and ANOVA have been used for data analysis. Pragmatic trials bring out maximal heterogeneity in all aspects. This helps policymakers to have an active interest in pragmatic trials since these are designed to answer the question most relevant to a decision maker's agenda: effectiveness of an intervention in the routine practice.

Chapter Scheme

Chapter – 1: Introduction

Chapter – 2: Design of the Study

Chapter – 3: Profile of the Study States

Chapter - 4: Analysis and Discussion

Chapter - 5: Findings and Conclusion

CHAPTER – 3

PROFILE OF THE STUDY AREA

This section describes the demographic profile of the respondents under this study. It starts with profile such as the age of the respondents, gender, education, marital status, family type, family size, livelihood details, involvement in MGNREGS, bank account details, etc., and also provides the State-wise number of respondents included in this study. All these together put across the contributions of PMAY-G to the socio-economic and subjective well-being of the PMAY-G beneficiaries.

States under Study

State	Madhya Pradesh		Total	Odisha		Total	West Bengal		Total
District	Sagar	Rajgarh		Baleshwar	Ganjam		Bankura	Purulia	
No. of Respondents	191	216	407	182	211	393	301	281	582
Per cent within State	46.9 per cent	53.1 per cent	100.0 per cent	46.3 per cent	53.7 per cent	100.0 per cent	51.7 per cent	48.3 per cent	100.0 per cent

Note: Total Number of respondents: $407 + 393 + 582 = 1382$

Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Table 1 shows the number of respondents (male and female) interviewed State-wise with break-up details on districts. In Madhya Pradesh, Sagar (191) and Rajgarh (216) districts were selected for this study. From these districts, we had 407 respondents proportionate to the total that was in the list of PMAY-G beneficiaries, who got their houses constructed (Treatment Group) during the period under reference. Among them, 92 were women and others were men. In Odisha, at Baleshwar (182) and Ganjam (211) districts, we had 393 respondents. Among them, there were 144 women and the rest were men.

In West Bengal, at Bankura (301) and Purulia (281) districts, we had 582 respondents. Among them, 290 were women, and the rest were men. In total, we had 1,382 respondents; among them 62 per cent were men and 38 per cent were women.

Table 1
State and District-wise Distribution of Respondents

State	District	Total		Total Number of Respondents
		Male	Female	
Madhya Pradesh	Sagar	150 (78.5 per cent)	41 (21.5 per cent)	191 (13.8 per cent)
	Rajgarh	165 (76.4 per cent)	51 (23.6 per cent)	216 (15.6 per cent)
Odisha	Baleshwar	110 (60.4 per cent)	72 (39.6 per cent)	182 (13.2 per cent)
	Ganjam	139 (65.9 per cent)	72 (34.1 per cent)	211 (15.3 per cent)
West Bengal	Bankura	55 (18.3 per cent)	246 (81.7 per cent)	301 (21.3 per cent)
	Purulia	237 (84.3 per cent)	44 (15.7 per cent)	281 (20.3 per cent)
Total		856 (61.9 per cent)	526 (38.1 per cent)	1382 (100 per cent)

Source: Primary Data (Figures in brackets are percentage to the total).

Table 2 shows the age of the respondents who got houses sanctioned under PMAY-G. The table shows that most of the heads of the households (900/1382) in this study are in the age bracket of 30-53 years. If we split this group further and analyse, we find that most of them (500/900) are within the age group of 30-41 years, which is nearly the appropriate age when one needs to own a good house to live in, so as to be able to focus on livelihoods-related search. This is to say that the age at which the houseless poor people get house is appropriate. Thus, it can be stated that in terms of the ‘age of the beneficiaries selected under the PMAY-G’, it is found they are at an appropriate age to own a house.

Table 2
Distribution of the Respondents by Age of the Head of the Household

State	District	Age-Group						District Total	State Total
		under 18	18-29	30-41	42-53	54-65	66 and above		
Madhya Pradesh	Sagar	0	14 (7.3 per cent)	72 (37.7 per cent)	61 (31.9 per cent)	28 (14.7 per cent)	16 (8.4 per cent)	191 (100 per cent)	407
	Rajgarh	0	21 (9.7 per cent)	98 (45.4 per cent)	62 (28.7 per cent)	25 (11.6 per cent)	10 (4.6 per cent)	216 (100 per cent)	
Odisha	Baleshwar	0	11 (6.0 per cent)	53 (29.1 per cent)	60 (33.0 per cent)	43 (23.6 per cent)	15 (8.2 per cent)	182 (100 per cent)	393
	Ganjam	0	14 (6.6 per cent)	77 (36.5 per cent)	53 (25.1 per cent)	49 (23.2 per cent)	18 (8.5 per cent)	211 (100 per cent)	
West Bengal	Bankura	0	40 (16.0 per cent)	134 (44.5 per cent)	69 (22.9 per cent)	47 (15.6 per cent)	11 (3.7 per cent)	301 (100 per cent)	582
	Purulia	0	2 (7.0 per cent)	66 (23.5 per cent)	95 (33.8 per cent)	95 (33.8 per cent)	23 (8.2 per cent)	281 (100 per cent)	
Total		0 (0)	102 (10.3 per cent)	500 (36.2 per cent)	400 (28.9 per cent)	287 (20.8 per cent)	93 (6.7 per cent)	1382 (100 per cent)	1382

Source: Primary Data.

Table 3 shows the caste-wise distribution of respondents' families. We find there is a fair distribution among various caste categories, which means a fair share of sanction is found among the SC/STs and among the OBCs and General Category people. The SC/ST put together on one side, and the OBC and the General Category put together on the other side weighed almost equal. Going by population proportion of SC/ST in India or in the States under reference, it might look inequity in distribution. But, going by the inclusive policy

of the government, the distribution is justifiable that a good number of SC/ST households (695) along with an equal number of OBCs and General Category households (687) have got houses sanctioned under PMAY-G.

Table 3
Caste-wise Distribution of Respondents

State	District	Caste				Total
		SC	ST	OBC	General	
Madhya Pradesh	Sagar	30 (15.7 per cent)	29 (15.2 per cent)	115 (60.2 per cent)	17 (8.9 per cent)	191 (100 per cent)
	Rajgarh	28 (13.0 per cent)	0	158 (73.1 per cent)	30 (13.9 per cent)	216 (100 per cent)
Odisha	Baleshwar	76 (41.8 per cent)	50 (27.5 per cent)	41 (22.5 per cent)	15 (8.2 per cent)	182 (100 per cent)
	Ganjam	153 (72.5 per cent)	2 (9.0 per cent)	34 (16.1 per cent)	22 (10.4 per cent)	211 (100 per cent)
West Bengal	Bankura	180 (59.8 per cent)	13 (4.3 per cent)	101 (33.6 per cent)	7 (2.3 per cent)	301 (100 per cent)
	Purulia	89 (31.7 per cent)	45 (16.0 per cent)	128 (45.6 per cent)	19 (6.8 per cent)	281 (100 per cent)
Total		556	139	577	110	1382
	40.2 per cent	10.1 per cent	41.8 per cent	8.0 per cent	100.0 per cent	

Source: Primary Data.

Table 4 shows the distribution of respondents by religion. Obviously for India, we find among the beneficiaries most of them are Hindus (87 per cent), some are Muslims (11 per cent) and a few belong to Christianity.

Table 4
Distribution of Respondents by Religion

State	District	Religion			Total
		Hindu	Muslim	Christian	
Madhya Pradesh	Sagar	187 (97.9 per cent)	4 (2.1 per cent)	0	191 (100 per cent)
	Rajgarh	191 (88.4 per cent)	25 (11.6 per cent)	0	216 (100 per cent)
Odisha	Baleshwar	179 (98.4 per cent)	0	3 (1.6 per cent)	182 (100 per cent)
	Ganjam	191 (90.5 per cent)	0	20 (9.5 per cent)	211 (100 per cent)
West Bengal	Bankura	198 (65.8 per cent)	103 (34.2 per cent)	0	301 (100 per cent)
	Purulia	260 (92.5 per cent)	21 (7.5 per cent)	0	281 (100 per cent)
Total		1206 (87.3 per cent)	153 (11.1 per cent)	23 (1.7 per cent)	1382 (100 per cent)

Source: Primary Data.

Table 5 shows that most of the beneficiaries (87 per cent) are married and are living with their families while others are either widowed or divorced, living with or without other family members.

Table 5
Marital Status of the Respondents

State	District	Marital Status				Total
		Single	Married	Divorced	Widow	
Madhya Pradesh	Sagar	2 (1.0 per cent)	166 (86.9 per cent)	0	23 (12.0 per cent)	191 (100 per cent)
	Rajgarh	3 (1.4 per cent)	195 (90.3 per cent)	0	18 (8.3 per cent)	216 (100 per cent)
Odisha	Baleshwar	8 (4.4 per cent)	153 (84.1 per cent)	3 (1.6 per cent)	18 (9.9 per cent)	182 (100 per cent)
	Ganjam	11 (5.2 per cent)	171 (81.0 per cent)	1 (0.5 per cent)	28 (13.3 per cent)	211 (100 per cent)
West Bengal	Bankura	7 (2.3 per cent)	269 (89.4 per cent)	3 (1.0 per cent)	22 (7.3 per cent)	301 (100 per cent)
	Purulia	7 (2.5 per cent)	254 (90.4 per cent)	0	20 (7.1 per cent)	281 (100 per cent)
Total		38 (2.7 per cent)	1208 (87.4 per cent)	7 (0.5 per cent)	129 (9.3 per cent)	1382 (100 per cent)

Source: Primary Data.

Table 6 shows that everyone has a bank account, and reportedly all the accounts are active.

Table 6
Bank Account Holding Particulars of Respondents

State	District	Bank Account		Total
		Yes	Active	
Madhya Pradesh	Sagar	191 (100 per cent)	191 (100 per cent)	191 (100 per cent)
	Rajgarh	216 (100 per cent)	216 (100 per cent)	216 (100 per cent)
Odisha	Baleshwar	182 (100 per cent)	182 (100 per cent)	182 (100 per cent)
	Ganjam	211 (100 per cent)	211 (100 per cent)	211 (100 per cent)
West Bengal	Bankura	301 (100 per cent)	301 (100 per cent)	301 (100 per cent)
	Purulia	281 (100 per cent)	281 (100 per cent)	281 (100 per cent)
Total		1382 (100)	1382 (100)	1382 (100)

Source: Primary Data.

Table 7 shows that surprisingly, most respondents either never went to school (53 per cent) or have had only primary level of education (42 per cent), [despite the fact that most of them are in the age group of 30 – 53 years (read along with Table -2)]. This data support the thesis that there is a direct correlation between educational attainments and poverty levels. All the beneficiaries selected are poor and almost all of them are illiterates or have had primary level education. This proves the thesis that illiterates tend to get mired in the poverty sludge. This, to some extent, validates that right beneficiaries have been selected.

Table 7
Educational Status of the Respondents

State	District	Education					Total
		Illiterate	Primary	Secondary	Inter-mediate	Graduate	
Madhya Pradesh	Sagar	114 (59.7 per cent)	73 (38.2 per cent)	1 (0.5 per cent)	2 (1.0 per cent)	1 (0.5 per cent)	191 (100)
	Rajgarh	94 (43.5 per cent)	113 (52.3 per cent)	6 (2.8 per cent)	1 (0.5 per cent)	2 (0.9 per cent)	216 (100 per cent)
Odisha	Baleshwar	69 (37.9 per cent)	87 (47.8 per cent)	22 (12.1 per cent)	4 (2.2 per cent)	0	182 (100 per cent)
	Ganjam	74 (35.1 per cent)	130 (61.6 per cent)	7 (3.3 per cent)	0	0	211 (100 per cent)
West Bengal	Bankura	265 (88.0 per cent)	34 (11.3 per cent)	2 (0.7 per cent)	0	0	301 (100 per cent)
	Purulia	113 (40.2 per cent)	144 (51.2 per cent)	23 (8.2 per cent)	1 (0.4 per cent)	0	281 (100 per cent)
Total		729 (52.7 per cent)	581 (42.0 per cent)	61 (4.4 per cent)	8 (0.6 per cent)	3 (0.2 per cent)	1382 (100 per cent)

Source: Primary Data.

Table 9
Distribution of Respondent by Family-type

State	District	Family Type		Total
		Nuclear	Joint	
Madhya Pradesh	Sagar	136 (71.2 per cent)	55 (28.8 per cent)	191 (100 per cent)
	Rajgarh	145 (67.1 per cent)	71 (32.9 per cent)	216 (100 per cent)
Odisha	Baleshwar	154 (84.6 per cent)	28 (15.4 per cent)	182 (100 per cent)
	Ganjam	173 (82.0 per cent)	38 (18.0 per cent)	211 (100 per cent)
West Bengal	Bankura	218 (72.4 per cent)	83 (27.6 per cent)	301 (100 per cent)
	Purulia	96 (34.2 per cent)	185 (65.8 per cent)	281 (100 per cent)
Total		922 (66.7 per cent)	460 (33.3 per cent)	1382 (100 per cent)

Source: Primary Data.

Table 10 shows the 'family size'. We found 55 per cent of the families have had more than five members in the family. In terms of families being nuclear or joint, we find about 67 per cent are nuclear families and 33 per cent belong to joint-families (See Table 9).

Table 10
Size of Family (Treatment)

State	District	Family Size			Total
		Less than 5	5 -8	8 <	
Madhya Pradesh	Sagar	55	123	13	191 (100)
	Rajgarh	68	134	14	216 (100)
Odisha	Baleshwar	118	61	3	182 (100)
	Ganjam	114	94	3	211 (100)
West Bengal	Bankura	149	142	10	301 (100)
	Purulia	117	150	14	281 (100)
Total		621	704	57	1382 (100)

Source: Primary Data.

Table 11 shows that many families (nearly 67 per cent) have children too, of less than 14 years old. The number of families having children is more in Madhya Pradesh and West Bengal and it is slightly less in Odisha. Table 12 shows that the number of children at school-going age is more in all the States under study.

Table 11
Distribution of Respondents' Families having Children (0-14 Years)

State	District	Families Having Children		Total
		Yes	No	
Madhya Pradesh	Sagar	139 (72.80 per cent)	52 (27.2 per cent)	191 (100 per cent)
	Rajgarh	165 (76.40 per cent)	51 (23.6 per cent)	216 (100 per cent)
Odisha	Baleshwar	93 (50.90 per cent)	89 (48.9 per cent)	182 (100 per cent)
	Ganjam	123 (58.30 per cent)	88 (41.7 per cent)	211 (100 per cent)
West Bengal	Bankura	212 (70.40 per cent)	89 (29.6 per cent)	301 (100 per cent)
	Purulia	191 (68.00 per cent)	90 (32.0 per cent)	281 (100 per cent)
Total		929 (66.70 per cent)	459 (33.20 per cent)	1382 (100 per cent)

Source: Primary Data.

Table 12
Distribution of Children at School-going Age

State	District	If children all are going school			Total
		No Children in Family	Yes	No	
Madhya Pradesh	Sagar	52 (27.2 per cent)	44 (23.0 per cent)	95 (49.7 per cent)	191 (100 per cent)
	Rajgarh	51 (23.6 per cent)	76 (35.2 per cent)	89 (41.2 per cent)	216 (100 per cent)
Odisha	Baleshwar	90 (49.5 per cent)	72 (39.6 per cent)	20 (11.0 per cent)	182 (100 per cent)
	Ganjam	88 (41.7 per cent)	111 (52.6 per cent)	12 (5.7 per cent)	211 (100 per cent)
West Bengal	Bankura	88 (29.2 per cent)	173 (57.5 per cent)	40 (13.3 per cent)	301 (100 per cent)
	Purulia	90 (32.0 per cent)	137 (48.8 per cent)	54 (19.2 per cent)	281 (100 per cent)
Total		459 (33.2 per cent)	613 (44.4 per cent)	310 (22.4 per cent)	1382 (100 per cent)

Source: Primary data

Table 15 shows the number of PMAY-G beneficiaries, who are NREGS job card holders. We find that nearly 95 per cent of them are NREGA job card holders. This is almost uniform in all the three States under study. This goes to confirm that the selection of beneficiaries has been properly done in all the three States under study.

Table 15
Distribution of Respondents by their MGNREGA Job Card

State	District	MGNREGA Job card		Total
		Yes	No	
Madhya Pradesh	Sagar	172 (90.1 per cent)	19 (9.9 per cent)	191 (100 per cent)
	Rajgarh	202 (93.5 per cent)	14 (6.5 per cent)	216 (100 per cent)
Odisha	Baleshwar	164 (90.1 per cent)	18 (9.9 per cent)	182 (100 per cent)
	Ganjam	203 (96.2 per cent)	8 (3.8 per cent)	211 (100 per cent)
West Bengal	Bankura	285 (94.7 per cent)	16 (5.3 per cent)	301 (100 per cent)
	Purulia	281 (100 per cent)	0	281 (100 per cent)
Total		1307 (94.6 per cent)	75 (5.4 per cent)	1382 (100 per cent)

Source: Primary Data.

Table 16 shows the number of PMAY-G beneficiaries who also got benefited under NREGS, while their house was under construction. Nearly 88 per cent of the PMAY-G beneficiaries have got wages for 90 days of employment under MGNREGS for involving themselves in constructing their own houses. The remaining 12 per cent have not benefited under NREGS convergence, the reasons for which are unknown. It requires exploring.

Table 16
MGNREGA Convergence

State	District	MGNREGA Convergence		Total
		Yes	No	
Madhya Pradesh	Sagar	178 (93.2 per cent)	13 (6.8 per cent)	191 (100 per cent)
	Rajgarh	205 (94.9 per cent)	11 (5.1 per cent)	216 (100 per cent)
Odisha	Baleshwar	162 (89.0 per cent)	20 (11.0 per cent)	182 (100 per cent)
	Ganjam	206 (97.6 per cent)	5 (2.4 per cent)	211 (100 per cent)
West Bengal	Bankura	254 (84.4 per cent)	47 (15.6 per cent)	301 (100 per cent)
	Purulia	205 (73.0 per cent)	76 (27.0 per cent)	281 (100 per cent)
Total		1210 (87.6 per cent)	172 (12.4 per cent)	1382 (100 per cent)

Source: Primary Data.

Table 17 shows the involvement of the beneficiaries of PMAY-G in any other additional livelihood activities to have secondary/subsidiary source of income – in addition to their primary source of income. It was found that 37 per cent of the families have an additional member (other than the head of the household), involved in adding to the income of the family by involving themselves in goat/sheep rearing, maintaining a cow for milking or involved in some kind of handcrafts making, etc.

Table 17
Distribution of Respondents by their Family Members' Livelihood Status

State	District	Family members' involvement in other livelihood activities		Total
		Yes	No	
Madhya Pradesh	Sagar	10 (5.2 per cent)	181 (94.8 per cent)	191 (100 per cent)
	Rajgarh	25 (11.6 per cent)	191 (88.4 per cent)	216 (100 per cent)
Odisha	Baleshwar	61 (33.5 per cent)	121 (66.5 per cent)	182 (100 per cent)
	Ganjam	103 (48.8 per cent)	108 (51.2 per cent)	211 (100 per cent)
West Bengal	Bankura	150 (49.8 per cent)	151 (50.2 per cent)	301 (100 per cent)
	Purulia	162 (57.7 per cent)	119 (42.3 per cent)	281 (100 per cent)
Total		511 (37.0 per cent)	871 (63.0 per cent)	1382 (100 per cent)

Source: Primary Data.

CHAPTER – 4

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter discusses the focal point of this research study that is the impact of PMAY-G on the beneficiaries of the programme. As put across in the research design part of this report, we have taken Control Groups (waitlisted beneficiaries) from each study village to be able to compare the difference the programme has made on the lives of the PMAY-G beneficiaries (Treatment Group). This is presented in two parts. Part-I deals with the objective well-being and economic benefits and Part-II, deals with subjective well-being that the beneficiaries report. In order to make it easy to comprehend, an attempt has been made to make a graphic presentation, as far as possible.

Housing Condition: Condition of housing (in terms of materials used for constructing and the type of roof) is one important indicator one can take up for measuring the change brought about in the condition of housing.




Figure 4.1: Housing Condition (Control Group)






Figure 4.1a: Housing Condition (Treatment Group)

Figures 4.1 & 4.1a show the housing condition of the PMAY-G beneficiaries who are already living in the house constructed with the assistance of the PMAY-G, in comparison to the housing condition of those waiting to get a house sanctioned. We found (in Figure 4.1a) that 58 per cent of the beneficiaries (TG) have got houses that are pucca concrete, about 25 per cent have concrete houses with asbestos roofs and the remaining 17 per cent have a partial concrete roof and partial asbestos. Most of the houses are made of brickwork or cement block work. A look at the Comparison Group (Fig: 4.1) shows that most of them live in mud houses that have a paddy straw roof (62 per cent) or thatch roof (23 per cent). There were mud wall houses with tiled roof (14 per cent) as well. About a one per cent of the houses have been constructed with a variety of materials that are indescribable – too abysmal for words. PMAY-G has offered better housing condition to the beneficiaries by providing pucca houses. To what extent it has improved their level of well-being compared to those who are yet to get a house shall be taken up for analysis, later in this section.

Houses Electrified: Electrification of houses is an important indicator in the rural housing programme. The PMAY-G framework of implementation states that houses should be electrified under rural electrification programme or under MNRE's (Ministry of New and Renewable Energy) solar electrification scheme.



**Figure 4.2: Electrification
(Control Group)**



**Figure 4.2a: Electrification
(Treatment Group)**

A comparison of Figure 4.2 against Figure 4.2a reveals that 34 per cent of the households in the Control Group do not have electricity facility, whereas in the Treatment Group only about 19 per cent of the households do not have electricity connection. Thus, the houses electrified have gone up from 66 per cent to 81 per cent. Among the 19 per cent of the households, who do not have electricity, many of them reported that they have applied for power connections, but they are yet to get connected to a power grid. People are unaware of electrification through solar unless implementing officers explain the possibilities with solar and educate the people. We found solar lights in only one village in Odisha.

Family Size and Congestion: Number of occupants in a house is an indicator of any housing programme. It must help reduce the congestion in occupancy.




Figure 4.3: Family Size and Congestion

The number of members occupying a house is an important indicator of any rural housing programme. The box and whisker plot above shows the occupancy status of

the Control Group on the right side and the occupancy status of Treatment Group on the left side. It indicates that PMAY-G has slightly reduced the congestion in occupancy by bringing the median occupancy from 5 to 4.5.

Availability and Use of Kitchen: General measure of housing as a facility shall include kitchen and toilet. PMAY-G is no exception to that rule. The researchers studied the availability and use of kitchen in PMAY-G houses in comparison to the Control Group houses. The data are presented in the following pie-diagram (See Figure: 4.4).




Figure 4.4: Availability and Use of Kitchen

Figure 4.4 shows that 48 percent of the houses in the Control Group (left) have kitchen and 52 per cent did not have a kitchen that means they cook outside. Even among the 48 per cent who have a kitchen about 11 per cent do not use the kitchen and they also cook outside. Among the Treatment Group, 63 per cent of the households have kitchen, and 37 per cent do not have kitchen, which means that they have opted to have one additional room in place of a kitchen. Even among the 63 per cent who

have kitchen, 2 per cent of the families cook outside, and have started using the space meant for kitchen as another room for use. This shows the tendency to have additional room for occupancy rather than having a kitchen for cooking. Perhaps, the kitchen is used hardly one or two hours a day, whereas a room can be used for more than 10 hours a day.

Cooking Fuel: The PMAY-G suggests the beneficiaries to avail LPG under PMUY (Pradhan Mantri Ujjwala Yojana). This is suggested as part of the possible convergence under PMAY-G. Figure 4.5 shows a comparative picture of what type of cooking fuel is used by Treatment Group vis-à-vis the Control Group.




Figure 4.5: Cooking Fuel Used (Control Group)




Figure 4.5a: Cooking Fuel Used (Treatment Group)

Figures 4.5 and 4.5a show that traditional *chulah* and firewood still remain the main cooking fuel even in PMAY-G houses. Over 92 per cent of the households in Control Group use traditional chulah with firewood and there is no noticeable difference in the Treatment Group except in the case of Odisha where nearly 20 per cent of the people report to be using LPG. LPG is used only in 14 per cent PMAY-G houses in MP (which is 4 per cent in CG), 20 per cent in Odisha (which is 5 per cent in CG) and 8 per cent in WB (which is 6 per cent in CG).

Availability and Use of Toilet: Availability and use of Toilet is another indicator in PMAY-G convergence, which must happen through Swachh Bharat Mission (SBM-G) or through MGNREGS. Figure 4.6 shows the availability and toilet use in amongst Control Group and Treatment Group.




Figure 4.6: Availability and Use of Toilets

Figure 4.6 shows that among the Control Group, 30 per cent has toilets and 70 per cent does not have toilets. Among the 30 per cent in CG who have toilet, 6 per cent does not use it. Among the Treatment Group, 65 per cent of the households have toilets and 35 per cent don't have toilets. Out of the 65 per cent of the households in Treatment Group who have toilets, on an average (all the 3 States put together) 10 per cent of them are not using. It shows new houses constructed under PMAY-G have provided people with toilets but still, a good number of them do not use toilets. Most of these non-use cases are reported from Odisha, West Bengal and very less from Madhya Pradesh. This is surprising and it requires probing in order to ascertain if the non-use/disuse is due to behaviour-related reasons or because of poor installations.

Drinking Water: Domestic water supply facility, especially house service connection for the houses constructed under PMAY-G, is another measure of convergence that can improve the quality of living of PMAY-G beneficiaries. Figures 4.7 and 4.7a show the status of drinking water provision to the Control Group and Treatment Group in the study States.




Figure 4.7: Drinking Water Supply Facility (Control Group)




Figure 4.7a: Drinking Water Supply Facility (Treatment Group)

In providing access to piped water supply, there is no much headway made. Most beneficiaries of PMAY-G houses get water through common water collection points only. We find that there is no much difference between CG and TG when it comes to drinking water facility. The dependence is still on common water collection points. The same holds good for other common facilities like waste collection, drainage and street lights too confirming once again poor convergence of PMAY-G with other programmes.

Space Available for Livelihoods: It often happens that houses provided under government programmes ignore the livelihood requirements of the beneficiaries (Palanithurai, 2008).

Figure 4.8 analyses this fact in the case of PMAY-G beneficiaries in comparison with Control Group.




Figure 4.8: Space Available for Livelihoods

Figure 4.8 shows that only 33 per cent of the houses under Control Group have had space for livelihoods, whereas in Treatment Group 68 per cent of the households have mentioned about having got additional space for livelihood activities in-door. PMAY-G houses have become facilitative of livelihood activities in rural areas.

Extra Expenditure Incurred: The Government of India provides Rs.1,20,000 for constructing house under PMAY-G. It often happens that the beneficiaries tend to invest additional funds from their own sources with a view to constructing a house to their liking. Figure 4.9 shows the additional investment made by beneficiary households.




Figure 4.9: Additional Investment Made by PMAY-G Beneficiaries

It was found that about 80 per cent of the beneficiaries have invested additional funds for constructing their PMAY-G assisted houses. The median amount spent was Rs. 60,000 and most people have spent an amount ranging from Rs. 50,000 to Rs.80,000 as we find in the box plot above, there are some outliers ranging from Rs. 2,00,000 to Rs. 6,00,000 but the number of such beneficiaries do not go beyond 10 at the maximum. Therefore, such extreme cases need not be taken as the programme driving the beneficiaries to become indebted - as some studies argue. The PMAY-G guidelines clearly say that beneficiaries can borrow (at a differential rate of interest) up to Rs.70,000 from banks if they need additional funds for construction. If the beneficiaries made huge investments beyond their means, it should be within their sanction and sanity.

Figure 4.10 shows the source from where the PMAY-G beneficiaries arranged additional funds to be able to meet the extra investment, they thought they needed.




Figure 4.10: Sources of Additional Funds for Investment

Figure 4.10 shows that only 20 per cent of the PMAY-G beneficiaries have constructed the house within the amount sanctioned from the Programme. About 80 per cent of the beneficiaries have borrowed funds from various sources. The main sources reported are: 37 per cent from private moneylenders, 18 from friends and relatives and 17 from materials suppliers. Five per cent of them have reported to have used up savings/sold out assets or pledged assets, etc. Hardly, 3 per cent have gone for SHG/MFI loans and less than one per cent of them have gone for nationalised banks. The predominant source has been non-institutional sources such as private moneylenders, building material suppliers, relatives and friends. Why is it that many have not approached banks, remains unexplained, although some report of having very little hope about convincing a banker to lend for the purpose of investing in a house being constructed under a government programme?

House Maintenance Expenditure




Figure 4.11: House Maintenance Expenditure (CG)




Figure 4.12: House Maintenance Expenditure (CG)

Figure 4.11 shows the house maintenance expenditure that the Control Group reported incurring. It shows they incur median Rs. 2000 in Madhya Pradesh and West Bengal, Rs. 3000 in Odisha. The range goes up to Rs. 5000-Rs.6000 per annum. There is a need for people living in old, thatched and dilapidated house to keep attending to repairs constantly. Thus, they incur this expenditure. Figure 4.12 shows the house maintenance expenditure incurred by the Treatment Group (beneficiaries of PMAY-G). We find most of them have reported zero maintenance. The reason, possibly, could be because of the new houses require not much maintenance. Some beneficiaries have reported to have spent Rs. 2000-6000 and their number is too small, although.

Part – I

Results – Objective Well-being

Taking into account physical facilities such as type of house, electricity connection, kitchen, toilet, bathroom, natural ventilation, natural light and space for livelihood activities, etc., we measure the overall objective well-being of the Treatment Group and Control Group. Figure 4.13 shows a comparison of these facilities in percentage terms. Figure 4.14 shows the mean difference of the same facilities in the study States.




Figure 4.13: Physical Facilities (Treatment – Control)




Figure 4.14: Mean Difference in Facilities

Figures 4.13 and 4.14 show the mean difference in facilities. We have Treatment Group on the left and Control Group on the Right. The mean positive difference is 31.9 per cent in Madhya Pradesh, 26.9 per cent in Odisha and 39 per cent in West Bengal. The same is plotted in a line graph in Figure 4.15 below, which clearly put across the difference PMAY-G has made in terms of providing house as a physical facility.




Figure 4.15: The Difference PMAY-G has made

Results of T-Test

Moving beyond descriptive statistics, an attempt was made to use T-test from inferential statistics in order to find out if inferential statistics also supports the internal validity of our inference.

T-Test

Paired Samples Test					
		Paired Differences			
					95 per cent Confidence Interval of the Difference
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower
Pair 1	Madhya Pradesh Treatment & Madhya Pradesh Control	32.22222	38.47330	12.82443	2.64903
Pair 2	Odisha Treatment & Odisha Control	25.33333	25.70506	8.56835	5.57468
Pair 3	West Bengal Treatment & West Bengal Control	38.66667	20.67607	6.89202	22.77363

Paired Samples Test					
		Paired Differences	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		95 per cent Confidence Interval of the Difference			
		Upper			
Pair 1	Madhya Pradesh Treatment and Madhya Pradesh Control	61.79541	2.513	8	.036
Pair 2	Odisha Treatment and Odisha Control	45.09199	2.957	8	.018
Pair 3	West Bengal Treatment and West Bengal Control	54.55970	5.610	8	.001

We find the ‘significance’ / P-value to be less than 0.05 in all the States, which indicates that there is a significant difference. Hence, we accept H_1 i.e., there is a difference due to intervention.

Effect Size

We wanted to move beyond ‘P-value’ in order to find out the ‘Effect Size’. These effect sizes estimate the amount of the variance within an experiment that is “explained” or “accounted for” by the experiment’s model. We used Cohen’s d and Sawilowsky (2009) method of finding out the effect size. We calculated the effect size and fixed our values into Sawilowsky (2009) chart.

Table 4.1: Effect Size

EFFECT SIZE	d	Our Values	Reference
Very Small Effect	0.01		Sawilowsky, 2009
Small Effect	0.20		Cohen, 1988
Medium Effect	0.50		Cohen, 1988
Large Effect	0.80		Cohen, 1988
Very Large Effect	1.20	0.83 (MP), 0.98 (Odisha)	Sawilowsky, 2009
Huge Effect	2.0	1.80 (WB)	Sawilowsky, 2009

Note: The table above contains descriptors for the magnitude of $d=0.01$ to 2.0, as initially suggested by Cohen (1988) and expanded by Sawilowsky (2009).

We find that as far as Madhya Pradesh and Odisha are concerned the effect size is ‘Very Large’ and in West Bengal, the programme has made a ‘Huge Effect’.

Part – II

Subjective Well-being (Socio-Psychological)

There are certain subjective well-being elements we included in the study. They are analysed separately. They include: Social Status, Self-worth, Confidence Level, Feeling of Ownership, Feeling of Safety & Security, Self-perceived Improvement in Health, Overall Quality of Life, and Satisfaction about the New House. Figure 4.16 shows the subjective well-being measured for the Treatment Group in comparison to the Control Group.




Figure 4.16: Subjective Well-being of PMAY-G beneficiaries' vis-à-vis Control Group

Figure 4.16 shows all the parameters of subjective well-being, and we find the Treatment Group feels much better when compared to the Control Group. Subjective well-being goes to say that a housing programme provides not only a safe and secure house to live in. The agency value of the person, who is becoming a new house

owner goes up, his social status steps up, self-worth expands, his confidence level raises and his voice in the society becomes audible. That way, the contribution of PMAY-G to poor families is very much perceptible in the study States.

CHAPTER – 5

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

This study on the impact of PMAY-G set out answering some specific research questions. They are: (i) To what extent were the programme objectives met with regard to improving the physical conditions of living of the target population (ii) socio-economic improvements experienced by the target population, as a result of owning a new house? These precisely mean the changes brought about by PMAY-G in physical facilities or subjective well-being of the people, who availed house under the PMAY-G. Studying the extent of convergence of development programmes with PMAY-G and factors constraining effective convergence was also part of the study.

The study was conducted in three States (covering 24 Gram Panchayats in six districts), viz. Madhya Pradesh, Odisha, and West Bengal. The methodology used is RCT (Randomised Control Trial), where the beneficiaries who availed house already and are living in the past six months to one year are taken as Treatment Group, and those who were selected and have been put in the waiting list to avail house in the upcoming years are taken as Comparison Group. The following are the results of the study.

General Findings

Most (900/1382) of the head of the beneficiaries, who got houses sanctioned under PMAY-G, are in the age bracket of 30-53 years. If we split this group further and analyse, we find that most of them (500/900) are within the age group of 30-41 years, which is nearly the appropriate age when one needs to own a good house to live in, so as to be able to focus on livelihoods-related search. This is to say that the age at which the houseless poor people get house is appropriate. Thus, it can be stated that in terms of the ‘age of the beneficiaries selected under the PMAY-G’, it is found they are at an appropriate age to own a house.

We found that there is a fair distribution among various caste categories, meaning a fair share of sanction is found among the SC/STs and among the OBCs and General Category of people. The SC/ST put together on one side and the OBC and the General Category put together on another weighed almost equal. Going by population proportion of SC/ST in India or in the States under reference, it might look inequity in distribution. But, going by the inclusive policy of the government, the distribution is justifiable that a good number of SC/ST households (695) along with an equal number of OBCs and General Category households (687) have got houses sanctioned under PMAY-G.

In terms of families being nuclear or joint, we found that about 67 per cent are nuclear families and 33 per cent belong to joint-families. With regard to the 'family size', we found that 55 per cent of the PMAY-G beneficiaries' families have more than five members in the family. There are families with eight or more than eight members too. We analysed if there were any members of the beneficiaries' family involved in livelihoods that add to the family kit (adding to the overall household income). It was found that 37 per cent of the families have an additional member (other than the head of the household), involved in adding to the income of the family by involving themselves in goat/sheep rearing, maintaining a cow for milking, or involved in some kind of handcrafts making, etc.

Specific Findings

Type of House: The poor who were living in thatched houses, mud houses and houses with paddy straw roof have got concrete roofed houses (58 per cent), Concrete + asbestos roofs (25 per cent), and fully asbestos (17 per cent). Most of the houses are made of brickwork or cement block-work. PMAY-G has provided better housing condition to the beneficiaries by providing pucca houses. In the comparison group, we found only 66 per cent of the houses electrified, whereas in PMAY-G houses, we found 81 per cent electrified.

Congestion in Occupancy: PMAY-G has slightly reduced congestion in houses by

providing two or more rooms. It has slightly reduced the congestion in occupancy by bringing the median occupancy from 5 to 4.5.

Kitchen: PMAY-G has provided cooking space (kitchen) inside the house. This has changed the practice of cooking outside, but not to the extent it could have changed. PMAY-G beneficiaries seem to prefer having one more room to kitchen. Some have designed their houses to be all rooms and no kitchen. A few of them who have constructed kitchen also prefer cooking outside so as to use the kitchen space as another living room. This explains why PMUY (LPG gas) has not picked up amongst the PMAY-G houses to the extent it could have.

Fuel for Cooking: Traditional *chulah* and firewood still remain the main cooking fuel even in PMAY-G houses. The LPG is used only in 14 per cent PMAY-G houses in MP (which is 4 per cent in CG), 20 per cent in Odisha (which is 5 per cent in CG) and 8 per cent in West Bengal (which is 6 per cent in CG). The PMUY (LPG for cooking) is not a big success under PMAY-G convergence. The price of LPG and voluntarily placing oneself under the pressure of having to find money to replace empty cylinders every time it runs empty are reportedly the reasons that prevent PMAY-G beneficiaries from applying for LPG connections. The awareness level with regard to PMUY convergence is also poor, even among the Awaas Bandu (Local Motivators of PMAY-G).

Toilets: With regard to the availability and use of toilets, among the Control Group 30 per cent have toilets and 70 per cent don't have toilets. Among the 30 per cent CG who have toilet 6 per cent of them do not use. Among the Treatment Group, 65 per cent of the households have toilets and 35 per cent do not have toilets. Out of the 65 per cent of the households in Treatment Group who have toilets, on an average (all the 3 States put together) 10 per cent of them are not using. It shows new houses constructed under PMAY-G have provided with toilets to every household but still, a good number of them do not use. Most of these non-use cases are reported from Odisha, West Bengal and very less from Madhya Pradesh. This is surprising and it requires

probing in order to ascertain if the non-use/disuse is due to behaviour-related reasons or because of poor installations.

Drinking Water: In providing access to piped water supply through convergence with NRDWP, there has been no much headway made amongst PMAY-G beneficiaries. Most beneficiaries of PMAY-G houses get water through common water collection points only. We find that there is no much difference between CG and TG when it comes to drinking water facility. The dependence is still on common water collection points. The same holds good for other common facilities like waste collection, drainage and street lights too confirming once again poor convergence of PMAY-G with other programmes.

Space for Livelihoods: Under Control Group only 33 per cent of the houses has had space for livelihoods, whereas in Treatment Group 68 per cent of the households have mentioned about having got additional space for livelihood activities in-door. PMAY-G houses contribute to livelihood activities by providing additional space for livelihoods.

Additional Expenditure Incurred: It was found that about 80 per cent of the beneficiaries have invested additional funds for constructing their PMAY-G assisted houses. The median amount spent was Rs. 60,000 in most cases, the amount spent ranges from Rs.50, 000 to Rs.80, 000 a few beneficiaries reported to have spent additional funds ranging from Rs.2,00,000 to Rs.6,00,000 but the number of such beneficiaries does not go beyond 10 at the maximum (out of 1,380 beneficiaries interviewed). Therefore, such outliers (extreme cases) need not be taken as, the programme driving the beneficiaries to become indebted - as some studies argue (cite). The PMAY-G guidelines clearly say that beneficiaries can borrow (at a differential rate of interest) up to Rs.70,000 from banks if they need additional funds for construction. If the beneficiaries made huge investments beyond their means, it should be within their ability and sanity.

Source of funds for Additional Investment: It was found that only 20 per cent of the PMAY-G beneficiaries have constructed the house within the amount sanctioned

from the Programme. About 80 per cent of the beneficiaries have arranged additional funds from various sources. The main sources reported are private money lenders and building material suppliers (54 per cent), friends and relatives (18 per cent). Five per cent of them have reported to have used up savings/sold out assets or pledged assets etc. Hardly, three per cent have gone for SHG/MFI loans and less than one per cent of them have gone for nationalised banks. The predominant source has been non-institutional sources such as private money lenders, building material suppliers, relatives and friends. During informal interviews, it was found that they were aware that they could approach banks for availing a loan up to Rs.70,000. Some report of having very little hope about convincing a banker to lend for the purpose of investing in a house being constructed under a government programme.

House Maintenance Expenditure: The median expenditure incurred by those in the Comparison group was Rs.2000 in Madhya Pradesh and West Bengal, Rs.3000 in Odisha. The range goes up to Rs.5000- 6000 annual. There is a need for people living in old, thatched houses and dilapidated houses to keep attending to repairs almost every year. Thus, they incur this expenditure. With regard to the house maintenance expenditure incurred by the Treatment Group (beneficiaries of PMAY-G), most of them have reported 'zero maintenance'. The reason, possibly, could be because a new house does not require much maintenance. Some beneficiaries have reported to have spent Rs.2000-6000 and their number is too few. New PMAY-G house has lightened the house maintenance burden.

Conclusion

Taking into account physical facilities such as type of house, electricity connection, kitchen, toilet, bathroom, natural ventilation, natural light and space for livelihood activities, etc., when we measure the overall objective well-being of the PMAY-G beneficiaries in comparison to those on the waiting list, we can conclude that PMAY-G beneficiaries have the mean positive difference is 31.9 per cent in Madhya Pradesh, 26.9 per cent in Odisha and 39 per cent in West Bengal. The T-test conducted also shows a significant difference between the

Treatment Group and Comparison Group. In terms of effect size, we find that as far as Madhya Pradesh and Odisha are concerned the effect size is ‘Very Large’ and in West Bengal, the programme has made a ‘Huge Effect’.

In terms of subjective well-being (socio-psychological well-being), on indicators such as Social Status, Self-worth, Confidence Level, Feeling of Ownership, Feeling of Safety & Security, Self-perceived Improvement in Health, Overall Quality of Life, and Satisfaction about the New House, we find the Treatment Group feels much better, compared to the Control Group. It can be concluded that the new PMAY-G has made a significant impact on the lives of beneficiaries.

Policy Issues

1. **Kitchen:** PMAY-G has provided cooking space (kitchen) inside the house. Although this has changed the practice of cooking outside, not to the extent it could have changed. PMAY-G beneficiaries seem to prefer having one more room in place of a kitchen. Some have designed their houses to be all rooms and no kitchen. A few of them who have constructed kitchen also prefer cooking outside, so as to use the kitchen space as another living room. This explains, in a way, why PMUY, (LPG gas) has not picked up amongst the PMAY-G houses, to the extent it could have.
2. **Cooking Fuel:** With the convergence of PMUY, LPG cylinders could have made way into PMAY-G houses. But, it has not happened to the extent, it could have. Besides their usual practice of cooking outside the house, the money required for replacing empty cylinders is also reported as a factor preventing the PMAY-G beneficiaries from applying for LPG for cooking. This stands in the way of PMAY and PMUY convergence.
3. **Toilet Use:** It was found that 10 per cent of the toilets constructed along with PMAY-G houses remain unused. Is it to do with the behaviour-related factors of the community in question, or poor installation rendering the toilet not usable? This requires probing.

4. **Drinking Water:** The NRDWP has a target of providing piped water supply as yard connections to most rural households by 2022. In providing access to piped water supply to PMAY-G houses, there is no much headway made in this regard. Most PMAY-G houses get water through common water collection points only. The same holds good for other common facilities like waste collection, drainage, and street lights too confirming once again poor convergence of PMAY-G with other programmes.
5. **Source of Borrowing:** 80 per cent of the PMAY-G beneficiaries have availed loan to be able to meet the additional expenditure in house construction. Nearly 72 per cent of them have borrowed from private moneylenders and from other private sources such as material suppliers or from friends and relatives. It shows that banks are of little use to PMAY-G beneficiaries. Hardly three per cent of the beneficiaries borrow from banks or SHGs and MFIs in order to meet the additional expenditure required for construction. Many of them are aware of the PMAY-G guidelines which suggest that beneficiaries can avail up to Rs.70,000 bank loan from any commercial bank. Yet, we find most of the PMAY-G beneficiaries choose to remain away from the banks. It is a policy matter to look into. Being a member of SHG and their linkage with banks could facilitate availing bank loan for house construction under PMAY-G. Those SHG members who are part of Bandhan bank in the study area have availed such loans - their number is not big, though.
6. **Awas Bandhu:** We find that Awas Bandhus (PMAY-G Local Motivators) in many places (e.g. West Bengal, Odisha) are doing commendable work in local coordination. They, in fact, seem to help speed up progress. But, they are unaware of the convergence possibilities. They can be trained in various schemes that a PMAY-G beneficiary can avail. Possibly, this can help convergence to take momentum.

References

Ninth Five-Year Plan (1997-2002), Vol. II, Planning Commission, Government of India, New Delhi, p.5.

G. Sudharshnam and M. Ajantha Kumar, “Rural Housing for Weaker Sections- A Study of Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY)”, Indian Journal of Public Administration, Vol. Liv, No.1 2005.

K.Venkataiah and R.Nageswara Ra, Kurukshetra, July, 1984.

K. D. Gaur, “Housing for the Rural Poor”, Kurukshetra, May-June, 1996, p.90.

Chandra Dutt, Kurukshetra, October, 2002.

G.C. Mathur, Kurukshetra February, 1991.

K.S. Srinivasan Kurukshetra October, 1988.

Working Group on Rural Housing for the 12th Five-Year Plan, Ministry of Rural Development, Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi, 2011.

Abhiroop Mukhopadhyay and Indira Rajaraman, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol XLVII, No.12, 2012.

Anand. P (2017), Housing for Poor and the Impact of IAY in Rural India: Present Context, International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Research.

RESEARCH REPORTS SERIES

- I. Role of PRIs in Management of Rural Health Care and Family Welfare Services: An Exploratory Study
2. The State-Sponsored Innovative Rural Development Programmes - The VDB of Nagaland
3. Management of Public Distribution in Two States - Gujarat and Karnataka
4. Viability of Service Area Approach to Small Farmers
5. Social Security to the Poor : Efficacy of PDS and WEPs in Karnataka
6. Participatory Planning : A Study of the Planning Process in Kerala
7. Micro Credit for Micro Enterprises
8. Planning for Kohir Mandal
9. Demography of Crimes in Rural Areas : Causes and Remedies
10. Impact Assessment of Wage Employment (JRY and EAS) Programmes in Selected Areas of Uttar Pradesh
11. Working of Tribal Panchayats in Bilaspur District, Madhya Pradesh
12. Functional and Financial Devolution on Panchayats (A Study in Daman & Diu and Dadra & Nagar Haveli)
13. People's Perception of Panchayati Raj in Kerala
14. Nyaya Panchayats in India : A Study
15. Emerging Leadership among SCs/STs under New Panchayati Raj Act in Karnataka
16. The Role of Panchayati Raj in Natural Resource Management: A Study of Two Village Panchayats in Tamil Nadu
17. Community Polytechnics and Rural Development

18. Role of Melas in Marketing of Rural Industries Products
19. Impact of Committee System in Promoting Devolution of Panchayats : A Study in West Bengal
20. Planning for Sustainable Rural Environment through Watersheds and Water Harvesting Structures : A Process Study
21. Impact Assessment of Wage Employment (JRY & EAS) Programmes in Selected Areas of Bihar
22. Decentralisation of Power in Schedule V Areas : Interface Between Panchayati Raj Institutions and Line Departments
23. Participatory Micro Level Planning : A Study of the 11th Janmabhoomi Programme of Andhra Pradesh
24. Management of Panchayati Raj Finances in Andhra Pradesh : A Study in Medak District
25. A Study on Wage Employment Programme in Kurnool (Andhra Pradesh) and Surat (Gujarat) Districts
26. Self-employment Projects-Group Approaches
27. Management of Public Distribution System in Two States (Kerala and Orissa)
28. Capacity Building of SHGs to take up Micro-Enterprises under SGSY : A Quick Study in Jalna District, Maharashtra
29. Rural Infrastructure and Welfare of the Poor
30. Organisational and Institutional Arrangements across the Watershed Programmes: A Study of Kerala Model
31. Rural Road Links : A Study of Sagar District in Madhya Pradesh
32. Micro Credit Interventions in Promoting Micro Enterprises
33. Impact of Integrated Wasteland Development Programme (Phase-II) (IIWDP) : A Study in Uttar Pradesh

34. Entrepreneurship Development among Rural Women
35. Employment, Earnings and Environment among Diamond Cutting Workers in Gujarat
36. Direct Funding to Watershed Community : Process and Impact
37. Employment and Levels of Living Among Cane and Bamboo Artisans in Tripura
38. Strategies for Marketing of Rural Industries Products
39. Activities for Women under Cluster Approach and their Capacity-Building under SGSY - A Study in Five States
40. Management of Rural Development Programmes with Special Reference to JGSY: A Study
41. Changing Pattern of District Administration with Particular Reference to the Role of the Collector in Panchayati Raj
42. Panchayati Raj Finances in Maharashtra : A Quick Study
43. Institutional and Infrastructural Impediments in Rural Industrialisation in Dindigul District, Tamil Nadu
44. Gram Sabha : A Study in Two States
45. Social Mobilisation for Elimination of Child Labour : A Study of MVF
46. Participatory Management of Land Resources with Special Reference to JFM : Impact on Andhra Pradesh
47. Functioning; Performance and Leakage in Public Distribution System : A Study in Three States
48. Impact Assessment of JRY and EAS Programmes in Tripura
49. A Case Study of Savings and Investments of Rural Households in Sagar District of Madhya Pradesh
50. Emerging Leadership in the Tribal Area

51. Partnership in Community-initiated Forest Management System : Conflicts and Prospects
52. Training Towards Capability-Building among Various Clientele Groups In Watershed
53. Muga/Eri Silk Production and Constraints : A Process Study in Assam and Mizoram
54. Community Interventions in Traditional Rain Water Harvesting-Drinking Water
55. Capacity Building of Community-Based Organisations : A Study
56. Empowerment of Weaker Sections - The Barefoot College, SWRC, Tilonia
57. Positive and Inhibiting Factors in Cluster Approaches and Group Functioning of Micro Enterprises under SGSY
58. Post-Literacy and Continuing Education : A Study in Yamunanagar District of Haryana
59. Infrastructure for Rural Poor
60. Functioning of PDS in North-Eastern States
61. Assessment of Targeted PDS in Rural India
62. Rural Road Connectivity : A Process Study of PMGSY
63. Marketing Channels for Select Products of SGSY
64. Farmers' Suicides in Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka
65. Working of Women's Thrift Cooperatives under MACS Act in A.P. - A Study
66. Decentralised Planning and Management of Primary Health Care Services under Panchayati Raj Institutions
67. Implementation of SGRY in Chhattisgarh
68. Quick Study on Performance of SHGs and DWCRA Implemented by Government and Non-Government Organisations

69. Poverty, Gender and Reproductive Choice - An Analysis of Linkages
70. Empowerment of Women in PRIs : A Study in Six Select States
71. Flood Disaster Management: A Study
72. Risk, Vulnerability and Coping Mechanisms in Rainfed Agriculture : A Study in Three States
73. Gramsat: Utility and Effectiveness
74. Micro-Level Experiments in Food Security - A Study across States
75. Community Based Resource Management - A Study of Forest Panchayats of Uttaranchal
76. Agrarian Relations and Rural Poverty in Post-Reforms Period : A Study of Bihar and Orissa
77. Implementation of IAY : Issues and Achievements : A Nation-wide Study
78. Interventions of Livelihood Options for HIV and AIDS Affected People in the Rural Areas
79. Effectiveness of Watershed Development on Environment Conservation : A Case Study in Jharkhand and Madhya Pradesh
80. Gender and MGNREGS
81. Stakeholders' Participation and Equity Aspects of Watershed Development: A Study in Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan
82. Stress Audit : For Rural Development Institutions At District and Block Level
83. Marketing Strategies for Traditional Fishery Products
84. Approaches to Forest Management : A Comparative Study of JFM and Self - Initiated Forest Management
85. Crisis in Handloom Industry: A Study in Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu
86. Competency Mapping : For Rural Development Officials

87. Status of Land Allotted to Poor under Land Distribution Programmes - An Evaluation in Selected States
88. Behavioural Competencies Requirement for MGNREGS Administration
89. Pro-Poor Strategy for Micro-Credit Delivery System
90. Comparative Study of Institutional Arrangements and Farming Systems : Viable Options for Small and Marginal Farmers
91. A Study on Marketing Infrastructure for Fruits and Vegetables in India
92. Impact of Antyodaya Anna Yojana (AAY) on the Food Security of the Poorest of the Poor in Rural Areas
93. Impact of Federations in Economic Improvement of SHG Members : A Study Across Two States of India
94. Inclusion Of Persons With Disabilities Under MGNREGS : A Study Across Three States
95. Role of Exclusive Credit Linkage Programme for Occupational Dynamics Among Fisherwomen – A Study in Andhra Pradesh & Tamil Nadu States
96. Land and Water Use Practices for Sustainable Smallholders' Livelihoods : A Study in Four States
97. e-Connectivity of Panchayats
98. Factors Facilitating Participation of Women in Mahatma Gandhi NREGS
99. Empowerment of Landless: An Analysis of Land Distribution and Land Purchase Programmes of Andhra Pradesh
100. Factors Affecting Participation of Tribals in MGNREGS: A Comparative Study
101. Watershed and its Impact on Poverty Alleviation and Sustainable Livelihoods: A Comparative Study in Six States
102. Study of Marketing of SGSY Products in Pune District of Maharashtra: Case of Public Private Partnership

103. Traditional Irrigation System in Bihar
104. Effectiveness of Watershed Management : A Study of Some Successful Watershed Projects in Five States
105. Role of Technology in Entrepreneurship Development and Emerging Gender Relations in Poor Women
106. Agrarian Distress, Coping Mechanisms and Ramifications of Debt Waiver Scheme (A Study in Telangana State)
107. Research Study on Nutrition Security and Equity in its Access in Watershed Development Programmes

CURRENT NIRDPR PUBLICATIONS

S.No.	TITLE	Price ₹
1.	Action Research-Enhancing SHG Movement Livelihood Promotion in Anantapur District, Andhra Pradesh (Discounted Price) by Gyanmudra & Team	830-00
2.	Agrarian Crisis in India – The Way out (Discounted Price) - K. Suman Chandra, V. Suresh Babu, P.K. Nath - 2013	1,295-00
3.	Blending the Traditional with the Modern... (Discounted Price)	450-00
	a) Cost effective rural housing technologies (paperback)	500-00
	b) Cost effective rural housing technologies (bound)	
4.	Course Modules for Entrepreneurship Development Training Programmes – RSETI Directory 2011 (Discounted Price)	200-00
5.	Democratisation of Water B K Thapliyal, SSP Sharma, P. ShivRam, U. Hemanth Kumar	1,650.00
6.	Devolution of Functions and Finances on Panchayats in Andhra Pradesh by K. Sivasubrahmanyam	430-00
7.	Devolution of Functions and Finances on Panchayats in Orissa by A. C. Jena	250-00
8.	Directory of Rural Technology	
	a) PART - I (Discounted Price)	200-00
	b) PART – II	550-00
	c) PART – III	540-00
	d) PART – IV (Discounted Price)	230-00
	Edited by Mathew C. Kunnumkal and Bharat R Sant	
9.	Disaster Management – Orissa Cyclones, Floods and Tidal Waves Disaster (2001) by R.C. Choudhury & K. Prasad Rao, et. al.	490-00
10.	Emerging Institutions for Decentralised Rural Development Edited by S.P.Jain	
	Volume – I (2001)	575-00
	Volume – II (2001)	575-00
11.	Gender Issues in Education Edited by Arvind Yadappanavar & Gyanmudra	210.00
12.	Guaranteed Employment for the Rural Poor	
	a) Volume – I	340-00
	b) Volume - II	220-00
13.	Impact of SGSY & IAY Programmes on Minorities 2011	475-00
14.	India Panchayati Raj Report (2001)	
	a) Volume - I	450-00
	b) Volume - II Edited by R.C.Choudhury and S.P.Jain	450-00
15.	India Rural Development Report – 1999	500-00
16.	India Rural Development Report – 2005 (Discounted Price)	1000-00
17.	Indigenous and Traditional Knowledge for Promotion of Sustainable Agriculture V. Suresh Babu, K. Suman Chandra and S.M. Iliyas (August 2013)	850 - 00
18.	Issues Related to Planning Sustainable Livelihood Settlement for HIV/AIDS Affected People in Rural Areas S K Bhanj and R. Chinnadurai	350-00
19.	Research Methods for Rural Development Professionals (Discounted Price) by Gyanmudra	500-00
20.	Right to Education - Challenges and Strategies (Discounted Price) by M. Sarumathy and Gyanmudra	420-00
21.	Social Audit : A Peoples Manual (2007) (Discounted Price)	100-00
22.	Rural Development Statistics- 2016-17	700-00
23.	Rural Development Statistics- 2017-18	700-00

Note : 20% discount to all individuals, organisations and participants of training programmes ; 50% discount to the Institutional Members of NIRDPR)

For Orders Contact :

Centre for Development Documentation and Communication (CDC)

National Institute of Rural Development and Panchayati Raj

Rajendranagar, Hyderabad - 500 030. India.

Tel & Fax : 24008473, Website: <http://www.nirdpr.org.in>

About NIRDPR

National Institute of Rural Development and Panchayati Raj (NIRDPR) continuously strives to serve the nation through research, training, action research and consultancy activities for development of the rural poor and enhance their quality of life. It aims to:

1. Organise training programmes, conferences, seminars and workshops for senior-level development managers, elected representatives, bankers, NGOs and other stakeholders;
2. Undertake, aid, promote and coordinate research on its own and/or collaborate with State, national and international development agencies;
3. Analyse and offer solutions to problems encountered in the planning and implementation of the programmes for rural development, decentralised governance, panchayati raj and related programmes;
4. Study the functioning of the Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) and rural development programmes across the States;
5. Analyse and propose solutions to problems in planning and implementation of the programmes for rural development; and
6. Develop content and disseminate information and transfer technology through periodicals, reports, e-modules and other publications.

Considering the challenges faced by the government in the development of a large section of rural poor across the country through its various policies and programmes, NIRDPR as an apex training institute in the field of rural development, has to cater to the training and capacity development needs of a larger clientele. To achieve these objectives, a nationwide network of training infrastructure has to play its rightful role. The clientele includes a large number of elected PRI representatives at different levels, rural development functionaries, NGOs, bankers and other stakeholders. Capacity building of rural development personnel and elected representatives is an intrinsic part of the entire rural development process. It helps to improve their managerial skills while keeping them abreast with the latest changes in strategies, government policies and programmes to augment their knowledge and working efficiency, resulting in strengthening of the delivery mechanism for the benefit of all the stakeholders. The challenge is huge and NIRDPR has been able to play its role in the country's rural development initiatives by facilitating qualitative changes in the implementation of programmes through a process of training, research, action research, consultancy, information dissemination and information building on a continual basis. This has enabled the Institute to emerge as the National Apex Institute for capacity development in the area of rural development.

In its continuous effort to develop managerial skills of functionaries in the rural development process, the Institute offers two regular fully residential diploma programmes – one-year Post Graduate Diploma in Rural Development Management (PGDRDM) and two-year Post Graduate Diploma in Management (Rural Development). Further, it offers M.Tech Programme on Appropriate Technology & Entrepreneurship (ATE) and three distance mode programmes - Post Graduate Diploma in Sustainable Rural Development (PGDSRD), Post Graduate Diploma in Tribal Development Management (PGDTDM) and Post Graduate Diploma in Geo-Spatial and Technological Applications in Rural Development (PGDGARD). The Institute is also offering one-year Diploma Programme on Panchayati Raj Governance & Rural Development (DP-PRGRD) in association with the University of Hyderabad through distance mode.

For further details, write to:

Director General
National Institute of Rural Development and Panchayati Raj
Rajendranagar, Hyderabad - 500 030, India

Telefax: 040-24008473, Email: cdc.nird@gov.in

Website: <http://www.nirdpr.org.in>



TRAINING
& CAPACITY
BUILDING



RESEARCH
& CONSULTANCY



POLICY
FORMULATION
& ADVOCACY



TECHNOLOGY
TRANSFER



ACADEMIC
PROGRAMMES



INNOVATIVE
SKILLING
& LIVELIHOOD