

## **Issues of Poverty and Development in Bundelkhand Region of Uttar Pradesh: An Empirical Analysis**

### **Manish K. Verma**

Professor and Head, Department of Sociology,  
Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow  
**Email:** mkvbbau@gmail.com

### **Narendra Gupta**

Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology  
Bundelkhand P. G. College, Jhansi  
**Email:** narendragupt06@gmail.com

*Poverty in India has become a mounting issue in contemporary times. It refers to the inability of human beings to secure basic minimum needs for day-to-day sustenance and is reflected through lack of income, inadequate housing, polluted and unhygienic environment and eventually, discrimination and exclusion from the mainstream society. In India, most ironically, even after the passage of seven decades of independence, a large chunk of population is still living below poverty level and are unable to secure basic minimum needs including food. On a micro level, the paper is an empirical analysis of Bundelkhand region of Uttar Pradesh which is notoriously known for the existence of chronic poverty due to recurrence of drought, scanty rains, poor irrigation facilities and crop failure. The persisting situation has adversely affected the development of the region as inhabitants are getting trapped into vicious circle of poverty. Despite putting their best efforts, the programmes enacted by government related to poverty eradication are not able to effectively eradicate the chronic poverty from the region.*

*[Key Words: Poverty, Development, Drought, Erratic Rainfall, Agricultural Dependency]*

### **Introduction**

Poverty is a socio-economic phenomenon in which a section of society is unable to fulfil even their basic necessities of life. It deprives human beings from adequate food and nutrition, proper shelter, education, treatment during illness and similar essential material needs. In India, it is generally agreed that the people who fail to reach a certain minimum consumption standard are considered as poor (Kumari, 2013: 69). Today, poverty has become a major problem for all third world countries. In this regard, Adam Smith rightly said in 1776, “No society can surely be flourishing and happy, of which the far greater part of the members are poor and miserable”. Although persistence of poverty

has been a common phenomenon with most of the countries, the issue of scarceness in the third world countries acquires alarmingly high proportion. As a developing country and as one of the leading nations of the third world, India in no way is free from the scourge of poverty. It is estimated that one-third of the world's poor live in India. Although official estimates of Government of India says that only every fourth Indian is poor, however, according to the estimates of internationally recognized poverty line of dollar a day, 44 percent population in India are poor and 86% people earn less than 2 \$ a day (Saxena, 2012: 4).

Poverty is closely related to inequality which appears to have been on the rise worldwide in recent decades at both national and international levels. More than 80 percent of the world's population lives in such countries where income differentials are widening. The poorest 40 percent of the world's population account for only 5 percent of global income. On the other hand, the richest 20 percent account for 75 percent of world income<sup>1</sup> (UNDP, 2007: 25). Poverty is the principal cause of hunger and under nourishment. According to the most recent estimates of Food & Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO, 2009), statistically speaking, the number of hungry people worldwide has reached 963 million, or roughly 15 percent of the estimated world population (Kumari, 2013: 69-70). Every six seconds a child dies because of hunger and its related causes (FAO, 2004). Out of all hungry people of developing countries, fifty percent families are involved in farming activities. More than 60 percent of chronically hungry people are women (FAO, 2006). More than 70 percent (146 million) of world's underweight children aged below five years live in just 10 countries (FAO, 2006). Asia and Pacific region are the home to over two third of world's hungry people (FAO, 2008). Sixty five percent of the world's hungry people live in only seven countries, namely-India, China, The Democratic Republic of Congo, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Pakistan and Ethiopia (FAO, 2008). As per a study by the FAO (2009), 1.02 billion people do not have enough to eat and out of them, 907 million people are in developing countries<sup>2</sup> like India (Rani, 2011: 1).

Indian poverty is predominantly rural in nature where landless labourers and casual workers are the worst off economic group. Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, women, old aged people and female children are facing more deprivation than others<sup>3</sup>. Majority of the rural poor in India are engaged in agriculture and its allied activities. But regular occurrence of environmental catastrophes have vastly affected the production of agriculture due to which most of the people who are totally dependent on agriculture for subsistence of livelihood are bound to live in poverty. Land degradation and over-exploitation of groundwater has also seriously threatened the sustainability of food production and traditional irrigation systems. In a nutshell, these causes have adversely affected the living standard of rural poor. In India, nearly 300 million people live below poverty line in appalling conditions of extreme deprivation whose social status in the society is relegated to below the holy cow. Estimates

on poverty level suggest that 21.9 percent of population is below the poverty line in India out of which 25.7 percent are in rural areas (Mathew, 2003: 155-162).

The problem of poverty is more acute in several states of India like Maharashtra, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Jharkhand, Chhatisgarh etc. But focusing on micro level of the issue, Bundelkhand region is chronically poverty stricken and disreputably known since couple of decades due to farmers' committing suicides under pressure from famine and drought. The region is agriculture based and most of the people are engaged in agriculture activities for their subsistence and attainment of livelihood. Since last few years, Bundelkhand is struck by natural catastrophe in the form of occurrence of regular scarcity of water which has retarded overall development and growth of the region as well as locals residing there. The situation has adversely affected the livelihood of majority of the population and pushed them into the trap of vicious circle of chronic poverty (Singh, 2012: 2). Many government and non-government agencies (NGOs) are working in the area through implementation of various programmes like Integrated Child Development Services (ICDS), Mid-Day Meal Scheme (MDM), Public Distribution System (PDS), Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MNREGA) etc. for eradicating poverty. Ironically, these programs have not proved much beneficial and accessible to the aggrieved people.

In this background, the paper examines two districts of UP-Bundelkhand namely Banda and Mahoba and covers 400 samples to comprehend empirically the existing situation of poverty. The paper is divided into four segments. The first part discusses theoretical understanding of poverty. The second section focuses on the brief introduction of research area. Third segment of the paper highlights various causes which are responsible for the existence of poverty in the region. Analysis of implemented programmes and schemes has been done in the last section of the paper.

### **Poverty: A Theoretical Understanding**

As a matter of concern, several western and Indian scholars define the concept of poverty in different perspectives. *Harry Johnson* emphasizes that poverty exists only when the resources of families are inadequate to provide a socially acceptable standard of living. *Seebohm Rowntree (1899)* has used the concept of 'subsistence poverty' to define poverty. He draws a poverty line in terms of minimum weekly sum of money which is necessary to enable the poor families to secure the necessities of a healthy life which covers the fuel and electricity, food, clothing, household and personal sundries etc. *Harrington (1958)* defines poverty with reference to deprivation. According to him, poverty is the deprivation of those minimal levels of food, health, housing, education and recreation which are compatible with the contemporary technology, beliefs and values of a particular society. Further, *Becker (1966)* has conducted his study in United State and defined the concept of poverty in terms of materialistic possessions like TV set, telephone and washing machine by the

poor people. Likewise to define poverty, *Bernstein Henry (1992)* has underlined the following dimensions: (1) lack of livelihood strategies (2) inaccessibility to resources (money, land, credit) (3) feeling of insecurity and frustration (4) inability to maintain and develop social relation with others because of lack of resources (*Ahuja, 2009: 29-30*). In terms of minimum income required for subsistence, “poverty has been defined as an inability to gratify the psychological needs that is need for survival, safety and security. Here poverty is perceived in terms of poverty line which is determined by the prevailing standards of what is needed for health, efficiency, nutrition of children, social participation and maintenance of self respect” (*Becker, 1996: 436*).

In most of the Indian studies on poverty, the focus has been mainly on measuring the number of people living in absolute poverty as this problem looms large in vast parts of the country and affects majority of the population. In this respect, many Indian scholars have also studied the situation of poverty in India. *Dandekar and Rath (1971)* defined poverty line in terms of nutritional adequacy which was put at 250 calories per capita per day. The income equivalent of this calorie norm was Rs. 170 per capita per annum at 1960-61 prices. *Bardhan (1974)* used two alternative poverty norms for the same period. The first was a poverty line of Rs. 20 per capita per month at 1960-61 prices as recommended by a group of experts and accepted by Planning Commission. The second was a nutritional norm based on the formula drawn up by the commission. In this case, rural poverty line was worked out to be at Rs. 14 at 1960-61 prices and Rs. 28 at 1968-69 prices. *Dandekar and Rath* argued that states with a high proportion of wage labour in rural population were also with higher percentage of rural poor. In addition, the incidence of poverty among the agricultural labour households was much greater than rural population in general. The proportion of poor was higher among small cultivator households than large cultivator households. According to *Minhas*, the majority of the poor come from agricultural labour households while a large proportion of the remaining are smaller landowners with holdings of less than five acres (*Ahuja, 2009: 27*).

### **Bundelkhand Region of Uttar Pradesh: A Brief Introduction Geographical Profile**

Bundelkhand is known for its cultural-geographic region in India which is surrounded by Vindhyan Hill in south, Yamuna River in north, Ken River in east and Betwa and Pahuj rivers in west. Bundelkhand region of central India is a semi-arid plateau that encompasses seven districts of Uttar Pradesh (Jhansi, Jalaun, Hamirpur, Lalitpur, Banda, Chitrakut and Mahoba) with total area of 29418 Sq. KM, which is 12.21% of the total geographical area of Uttar Pradesh. The region experiences the extremes of temperature, reaching 48°C during summer months and dropping as low as 1°C in winter. It suffers from acute ecological degradation due to deforestation and consequent top soil erosion which degrades the fertility and productivity of land. The rainfall distribution pattern in the region is irregular. Over the last decade, the rainfall pattern has

become very erratic which has caused adverse effects on growth and production of crops (Verma and Pal, 2014: 103).

### Demography Profile

According to Census 2011<sup>4</sup>, Bundelkhand region has total population of around 18.2 million out of which Uttar Pradesh part of the region consists of the population of around 9.6 million. The total population of seven districts of UP-Bundelkhand is 96,59,718 of which male and female are 51,49,243 and 45,10,475 respectively. Rural population is 79,54,680 and urban population is 21,95,078 of which male and female population in rural areas are 39,81,236 and 39,73,444 and male and female population in urban areas are 11,63,849 and 10,31,229 respectively. Correspondingly, the literacy rate is 4.98% of which male and female literacy is 61.55% and 38.45%. The sex ratio is 877 females for every 1000 males which is lower than the national average of 942 for India, showing a bias against the girl child in the region. The average density of population in UP-Bundelkhand is 277 persons/sq. km. which is much lower than the state average of 830 persons/sq. km.

### Situation of Poverty in the Study Region

The region is a landscape of drought and starvation and its inhabitants live in chronic poverty. In recent decades, Bundelkhand has become synonymous to drought, unemployment, perennial water stress<sup>5</sup>, hunger and starvation. Since last few decades, intellectuals, planners and politicians have been stating the causes like deforestation, drought and crop failure etc. for the existence of poverty. Further, it can be said that the malacies like unequal land holding and landlessness etc., are the causes of poverty in the study region. A first order approximation of the extent of existing inequality can be made in terms of the proportion of land operated by various sections of society and the size of destitute class composed of agricultural labourers and marginal and small cultivators. In the region, majority of the population has to rely upon to sale their labour and various archaic forms of human bondage have emerged.

**Table: 1 District-wise Percentage and Number of Population below Poverty Line, 2011-2012**

S. No.	Districts	Rural		Urban		Total	
		%	Persons (in lakh)	%	Persons (in lakh)	%	Persons (in lakh)
1	Hamirpur	11.0	61.8	5.8	17.0	9.2	78.8
2	Jalaun	38.9	4.2	20.3	0.7	34.7	4.9
3	Chitrakoot	33.9	92.1	2.5	9.2	32.0	101.3
4	Banda	34.1	320.4	31.2	37.8	33.7	358.2
5	Mahoba	44.6	88.9	24.8	15.2	39.9	104.1
6	Jhansi	12.9	0.5	9.8	16.5	9.9	17.0
7	Lalitpur	6.8	0.4	4.1	0.4	5.1	0.8
<b>UP-Bundelkhand</b>		<b>30.4</b>	<b>479.4</b>	<b>26.1</b>	<b>118.8</b>	<b>29.4</b>	<b>598.2</b>
<b>Uttar Pradesh</b>		<b>30.4</b>	<b>479.4</b>	<b>26.1</b>	<b>118.8</b>	<b>29.4</b>	<b>598.2</b>
<b>India</b>		<b>25.7</b>	<b>2166.6</b>	<b>13.7</b>	<b>531.2</b>	<b>21.9</b>	<b>2697.8</b>

**Source:** NSSO, various volumes, www.indiastat.com/table

There are incidences of high malnutrition in Banda and Mahoba Districts. This shows that poverty still continues to be a serious issue in the districts. The rate of rural poverty in these districts is higher than Uttar Pradesh and India. In 2011-12 the percentage of families below poverty line in selected districts was 34.1% and 44.6% respectively as against 30.4% for Uttar Pradesh and 25.7% for India (table 1).

### **Causes of Poverty**

There are many factors positively contributing to the perpetuation of poverty in study area. The most important among them are agricultural dependency, erratic rainfall, and unequal distribution of land, drought and poor irrigation facilities.

### **Agricultural Dependency and Labour Force**

Agriculture being the main occupation in the region, the effect of drought is observed in the form of decrease in production and consequent fall in employment of agricultural labourers. Drought has intensified poverty of chronically poor and made non-poor transiently poor. Acute vulnerability to drought is observed amongst landless agricultural labourers and daily wage labourers. Table 2 shows that the maximum number of population is cultivator and agricultural labourer which are higher in both the selected districts than state and national average. Around 60 percent of the workers in total belong to the category of agricultural labourers which is more than the figure of 21 percent of the state as a whole in comparison.

**Table: 2 Percentage-wise break-up of workers, Census 2001 & 2011**

District	Cultivator		Agricultural Labour		Household industry		Other work	
	2001	2011	2001	2011	2001	2011	2001	2011
Mahoba	54.4	40.4	17.7	27.9	3.0	3.4	23.5	28.2
Banda	54.6	41.8	20.4	32.1	3.0	2.3	21.4	23.7
UP average	47.0	34.9	15.1	21.8	5.3	5.4	32.6	37.9
India average	33.9	-	20.3	-	3.9	-	42.7	-

**Source:** Statistical Handbook of 2001 and 2011

The percentage of workers engaged in other work is very less than other workers of state. It reveals that there is less employment opportunities in other sector due to which locals is highly dependent on agriculture and allied activities. Therefore, the more dependency on agriculture and adverse affect of low productivity due to regular drought has led residents into trap of vicious circle of poverty.

### **Erratic Rainfall**

The rainfall pattern in Bundelkhand is typically monsoonic. The region gets around 600 to 1350 mm of rainfall annually while Uttar Pradesh part of Bundelkhand gets around 600 to 900 mm of normal rainfall annually (UPWSRP, 2013: 10). The fluctuation of rainfall pattern in UP-Bundelkhand is depicted in table 3. Data shows that rainfall deficit is high in 2005, 2006 and

2007 which is certainly far below than normal annual rainfall of UP-Bundelkhand. In 2008 and 2009, the average rainfall in the region was 670 mm and 619 mm respectively. After the year 2010 when we look at the rainfall trends, it suggests that in 2011, there was much rainfall in comparison to other years. Moreover, the rainfall was much less in 2012 and 2013.

**Table: 3 District-wise Annual Rainfall Pattern in UP-Bundelkhand Area (mm)**

<i>Districts</i>	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Chitrakoot	793	789	540	306	425	600	-	425	-	1053
Hamirpur	559	784	439	466	889	794	539	905	644	621
Jalaun	629	542	92	271	493	586	700	687	675	572
Banda	837	704	411	303	661	511	669	1008	784	673
Mahoba	743	448	444	366	679	488	700	869	-	-
Jhansi	693	545	328	360	717	571	602	883	649	1204
Lalitpur	742	952	542	443	824	752	754	1321	872	945
UP-Bundelkhand	<b>713</b>	<b>680</b>	<b>399</b>	<b>359</b>	<b>670</b>	<b>619</b>	<b>566</b>	<b>867</b>	<b>517</b>	<b>724</b>

**Source:** Statistical Hand Book of Various Years.

Hence, it can be said that the rainfall is quite erratic and uneven in the region. The phenomenon has been incessantly happening for many years having adverse impacts on water resources. It indicates that rainfall deficiency has reduced water availability and further affected the agricultural production.

### **Unequal Land Holdings**

Land is primordial source of wealth and power in an agricultural society and as in the rest of India, ownership of land is highly skewed across social groups in Bundelkhand. Theoretically, a larger holding should enable greater capital formation and greater investment in production-enhancing use of fertilizers, improved seeds and modern agriculture equipment. However, due to inherently unfavorable conditions of monsoon for agriculture in major part of the region, it is not seen in Bundelkhand. The distribution of land holding by size is quite uneven among the farmers.

**Table: 4 Agricultural Land and Caste of the Respondents**

<b>Total Land in Bigha</b>	<b>Caste of the Respondent</b>			
	<b>General</b>	<b>OBC</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>Total</b>
1-5	45 (11.3%)	49 (12.3%)	61 (15.2%)	155 (38.8%)
6-15	30 (7.5%)	16 (4.0%)	10 (2.5%)	56 (14.0%)
16-25	8 (2.0%)	20 (5.0%)	4 (1.0%)	32 (8.0%)
26 and Above	8 (2.0%)	8 (2.0%)	0 (0.0%)	16 (4.0%)
Don't have land	13 (3.2%)	33 (8.2%)	95 (23.8%)	141 (35.2%)
<b>Total</b>	104 (26.0%)	126 (31.5%)	170 (42.5%)	400 (100.0%)

From the study region, it is observed that the acquisition of land holding is closely related to caste. The dominant castes like Thakur, Lodhi and Yadav have grabbed bigger patches of agricultural land thus excluded the marginalized caste groups. **Table 4** clears that among Scheduled Castes, the number of large

farmers is very less while the number of small farmers is more. Thus, such meager land holdings by majority of marginal farmers are neither viable nor sustainable for the region with million plus mouths to feed.

### **Agriculture and Poor Irrigation Facilities**

Adequate rainfall or irrigation is the crucial need for agricultural production. Unfortunately, if one analyses the rainfall, it seems to be satisfactory but in reality, it is not. Because of uneven and irregular rainfall, the region is continuously drought-affected. The alternative water resources for saving crop during scanty rainfall are quite frustrating. Generally, in past, irrigation was done from tanks, ponds, dug wells and other sources but due to the negligence of traditional water management systems and in absence of their maintenance, most of them are not in such a condition to provide irrigation.

**Table: 5 Source of Irrigation for Agricultural Land**

<b>Source of Irrigation</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Pumping Set	46	11.5
Tube well	51	12.8
Well	33	8.2
Canal	129	32.3
No agricultural land	141	35.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>100.0</b>

In present time, residents are using pumping sets, tube wells, wells and canals for irrigation of land. About 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the households are dependent on canal which remains dry for most of the time due to occurrence of drought. It adversely affects the agriculture production and leads to chronic poverty (table 5).

### **The Chronic Saga of Drought**

In Bundelkhand, recurrence of drought is palpably devastating all the course of development. For most of the years, residents of Bundelkhand experience acute scarcity of water for agricultural and domestic use. The region has a long standing history of droughts and famines. It witnessed “The Panic Famine” of 1873-74 (Loveday, 1914: 138). The Indian famine of 1896–1897 began in Bundelkhand early in 1895 and spread across many parts of the country. According to the report on drought mitigation strategies for UP-Bundelkhand by the Inter-ministerial Central Team headed by Dr. J. S. Samra, the region experienced a major drought in every 16 years during the 18th and 19th centuries, which increased by three times during the period 1968 to 1992 (Sharma, 2008). In recent years, Inter-ministerial Central Team reported for erratic rainfall in most part of the region since last ten years. Drought became evident in 2004-05 with 25% short fall in monsoon rains. The rainfall deficit increased further to 43% in 2006-07, 56% in 2007-08 leading to severe drought conditions. In the last nine to ten years, there has been news of crop failure, mass migration, starvation deaths, farmer suicides and even the ‘mortgaging’ of women in Bundelkhand area (Gupta, 2014: 2).



**Table: 6 Reasons of Crop loss**

<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Drought	223	55.8
Animals	14	3.5
Hailstorm	22	5.5
Not applicable	141	35.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The residents have given some reasons of crop loss which are depicted in the table 6. The data reveals that 223 (55.8%) households report for crop loss due to drought and 22 (5.5%) due to hailstorms. Only 14 (3.5%) households confirm that animals have destroyed their crops. Here, it is observed that continuous appearance of drought along with erratic rainfall has resulted in crop failure and thus people of the region have become poorer to poorer.

#### **Level of Development in Bundelkhand Region**

Government has come forth with numerous programmes to improve the living condition of the poor and the villagers. These programmes are running for infrastructure, sanitation, women, children, employment, eradicating poverty etc. so that the living conditions of aggrieved people may steadily improve. The various programmes are operated by both the central and state government which target the different aspects like providing food free of cost or at subsidized rate to the marginalized sections of society, assistance in developing houses as it is one of the key parameter to judge the socio-economic status of family, sanitation facilities to ensure healthy life for all, education for all and employment so that the people can have opportunities to prideful earning and living. A detailed mapping of programmes implications in the study area have been carried out and given as following.

Table 7 shows that PDS has gainfully penetrated in the area and large number of people is getting benefits from this scheme. Around 137 (34.2%) households get wheat, rice and kerosene etc. from PDS outlets. The second mostly availed scheme is MNREGA which guarantees 100 days employment to bestow the poor earning capacities. There are about one fourth of the households who are getting benefit of this programme. About 86 (21%) households are getting benefits from the Mid-Day-Meal Programme and only 8 (2%) households are availing the benefits of Health Card Yojna which helps them to avail free health treatment up to the Rs. 30000. The people have availed almost equal benefit from Maha Maya Garib Anudan Yojna and Pension Yojna (widow/old aged pension). These programmes include 12 (3%) and 13 (3.2%) benefited households respectively.

**Table: 7 Benefits Drawn from Government Implemented Programmes**

<b>Programmes</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
MNREGA	95	23.8
Indira Awas Yojna	23	5.8
Mahamaya Gareeb Anudaan Yojna	12	3.0

Mid Day Meal	86	21.5
P.D.S. Yojna	137	34.2
Health Card Yojna	8	2.0
Pension Yojna (Widow/Old Aged)	13	3.2
No Benefit	26	6.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>100.0</b>

It is well known that in rural areas mostly the dominant persons interfere in identification of beneficiaries under the various development programmes. They play an important role in decision-making and in implementation of development programmes neglecting the legitimacy of Panchayat Raj Institutions (Bhatt, 1994: 10). It is noted that about 45.5% respondents admit the presence of interference of dominant persons while 30% neglects this. Alarming, the data reveals that about one fourth of the population don't know whether there is any interference of local dominant people or not (table 8). Therefore, data largely shows that dominant persons manipulate the list of beneficiaries for availing the benefits of various welfare programmes.

**Table: 8 Interference of Dominant Persons in Implementation of Programmes**

<b>Interference of Dominant People</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	182	45.5
No	120	30.0
Don't know	98	24.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Furthermore, it is observed that due to irregularity in getting benefits of programmes, majority of the locals are unsatisfied with welfare schemes. Table 9 shows that 175 (43.8%) households get the benefits of programmes sometimes and around 72 (18.2%) households have mostly availed the benefits. Only 42 (10.5%) respondents confirm about full benefits of all implemented programmes while 84 (21%) reports that they are getting no benefits of any programmes for which they are entitled.

**Table: 9 Level of Benefits of Development Programmes**

<b>Level of Benefits</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Fully Obtained	42	10.5
Mostly Obtained	73	18.2
Sometimes	175	43.8
No benefits	84	21.0
Not Applicable	26	6.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The respondents further have given many reasons due to which they are not completely getting benefits of programmes. They report that due to corruption, inefficiency prevalent in the system and interference of local

dominant persons, the benefits of existing government implemented programmes are not fully benefited to the people of the region.

**Table: 10 Reasons for not Getting Benefits of Development Programmes**

Reasons	Frequency	Percentage
Corruption	112	28.0
Casteism	31	7.8
Nepotism	117	29.2
Political Dominance	42	10.5
Biasness in making B.P.L. list	40	10.0
Don't know	32	8.0
Not Applicable	26	6.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 10 shows that 117 (29.2%) households accept that nepotism is the main reason for not availing the benefits while around 112 (28%) mention corruption as the second largest reason. The study region is highly caste ridden and thus 31 (7.8%) households confirm casteism as the reason for not availing complete benefits of programmes. Overall data shows the failure of social and economic welfare programmes in the study area.

Apart from state and central government, Non Government Organizations are also working in the region for welfare of people and society. NGOs play an important role in the development of the area. They provide various supports to the people of the area. Generally, they work for children, women, poverty eradication, healthy environment, education, business and employment opportunities etc. They help in improving health status by raising health camps, distributing centres for medicines at low cost etc. They facilitates employment opportunities for the people either by providing them training, imparting professional knowledge and creating employment opportunities to carry out various functions of the area.

**Table: 11 In What Ways NGO's Policies are Helpful**

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Education	4	1.0
Health	1	0.2
Employment	3	0.8
Business	4	1.0
Any Other	5	1.2
Not Applicable	383	95.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>100.0</b>

But in the study area, only 17 (4.2%) households confirm about the presence of NGOs which are working in various fields of development for the betterment of mankind. Data shows that about 4 (1%) households accept that NGOs are working for promoting the education of children; 3 (0.8%) respondents state that they get employment opportunities with the help of NGOs. Around 4 (1%) households favour NGOs to get help in their business

activities and only 1 (0.2%) household get assistance in health care facilities by NGOs (Table 11).

The next query is about the perception of people to know the satisfactory level of NGOs' development programmes. Table 12 explains the extent of benefits provided by NGOs whether it is satisfactory or not. Only 1 (0.2) respondent confirms that NGOs are really helpful. They are giving better services and creating awareness about various development programmes implemented in the area. Around 3 (0.8%) households report confirms about the satisfactory work of NGOs and with the view of 5 (1.2%) respondents, NGOs are normally helpful in their efforts. Further, most of households 8 (2%) record their concerns that the work of NGOs are entirely unsatisfactory.

**Table: 12 Satisfactory Level of NGO's Development Programmes**

Satisfactory Level	Frequency	Percentage
Most Satisfactory	1	0.2
Satisfactory	3	0.8
Normal	5	1.2
Unsatisfied	8	2.0
Not Applicable	383	95.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Thus, overall data illustrates that non-government organizations are not playing active role for the social development and economic welfare activities. The role of NGOs in promoting development of the area is unsatisfactory and locals are not at all beneficial in their welfare and development by any means.

### **Conclusion**

On the basis of above, it can safely be concluded that most noteworthy factors through which poverty is deeply embedded in the Bundelkhand region are: agricultural dependency, unequal land holding pattern, regular drought, lack of irrigation facilities, unemployment etc., to name a few. The region is agriculture based wherein most of the population is dependent on agricultural activities for the subsistence of their livelihood. But draught as a major cause of poverty has lessened the ecological dependence of locals. More than half of the populations have faced the problem of crop loss due to the recurrence of environmental catastrophes like drought and hailstorm. Land holding is highly caste based wherein the dominant castes have grabbed the bigger patches of agricultural land. It has excluded the marginal farmers to the level of hand to mouth existence leading many health related problems. Irrigation facilities are very poor in the region. Majority of the people are dependent on canal for irrigation which remains dry for most of the time. Thus, these causes have pushed the locals into the vicious circle of poverty.

Furthermore, an examination of the implication of government and non-government programmes divulges that most of the households have access to Public Distribution System (PDS) which provides subsidized food grains to the poor people. The other most beneficial programme is MGNREGA through

which locals are getting employment for the sustenance of their livelihood. The third highly beneficial scheme is found to be mid-day meal. But as a whole, these programmes have benefited only one third of the population of the area. The findings suggest that benefits of the existing government implemented programmes of social and economic welfare have not fully benefited to the people of the region. Residents confirm that the issues of corruption, inefficiency in the existing system and interference of the local dominant persons are the main attributable reasons for such a dismay condition. By and large, non-government organizations are not playing active role for the social development and economic welfare activities. Their role as facilitator to access various services such as healthcare, employment and training, education and self employment etc. in general has been very ordinary. The services rendered by NGOs in promoting development of the area are found unsatisfactory since they are not at all beneficial in welfare and development activities by any means. This suggests that the non-government organizations have largely been unsuccessful in assisting the needy people and promoting the welfare and inclusive development of the area. Therefore, in a nutshell, it can be said that in the absence of well planned development programs and efficient delivery systems, needy people do not get proper access to the social welfare schemes. As a result, the pace of progress in the region has remained stunted and the poor continue to suffer.

### Notes:

<sup>1</sup>[http://www.finance.gov.pk/survey/chapter\\_10/09\\_Poverty.pdf](http://www.finance.gov.pk/survey/chapter_10/09_Poverty.pdf) /25-07-2016/10:25AM.

<sup>2</sup><http://www.wfp.org/hunger/stats>, United Nations World Food Programme- Fighting Hunger Worldwide.

<sup>3</sup><https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/1892.pdf>.

<sup>4</sup>[www.bundelkhand.in](http://www.bundelkhand.in).

<sup>5</sup><http://www.downtoearth.org.in/blog/bundelkhand-drought-miseries-and-hope-44680>.

<sup>6</sup>[www.bundelkhand.in/portal/info/land-holdings-in-bundelkhand/](http://www.bundelkhand.in/portal/info/land-holdings-in-bundelkhand/)10:30AM/06-04-2016.

### References

- Ahuja, R. (2009). Social Problems in India. Jaipur: Rawat Publications, 27-32.
- Arya, Y. B. (2010). Overcoming Poverty and Hunger in Bundelkhand. Centre for Contemporary Studies and Research, 10-21.
- Becker, H. (1966). Social Problems: A Modern Approach. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc., 436.
- Bhatt, G. D. (1994). Emerging Leadership Pattern in Rural India: An Empirical Study, New Delhi: M D Publication Pvt. Ltd., 10.
- Gupta, A. K. (2014). Bundelkhand Drought Retrospective Analysis and Way Ahead. New Delhi: National Institute of Disaster Management, 2.
- Kumari, L. (2013). Poverty Eradication in India: A Study of National Policies, Plans and Programmes. Research World- Journal of Art, Science and Commerce, IV (2), 2-3, 69.
- Loveday, A. (1914). The History and Economics of Indian Famines. London: G.Bells and Sons Limited, 138.
- Mathew, G. (2003, January 11). Panchayati Raj Institutions and Human Rights in India. Economic and Political Weekly, 155-162.
- Rani, A. (2011). Poverty in Punjab: A District Level Study. Panjab, 1, [http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/10225/8/08\\_chapter%201.pdf](http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/10225/8/08_chapter%201.pdf).

- Samra, J. S. (2008). Report on Drought Mitigation Strategy for Bundelkhand Region of Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh. New Delhi: Inter-ministerial Team.
- Saxena, N.C. (2012). Food Assistance Programmes and Their Role in Alleviating Poverty & Hunger in India, 4, <http://www.sccommissioners.org/Starvation/Articles/foodassistanceprogrammessayena.pdf>.
- Shakeel, A. (2012). A regional analysis of food security in Bundelkhand Region, *Journal of Geography and Regional Planning*, 253.
- UNDP. (2007). Human Development Report. New York: Oxford University Press, 25.
- UPWSRP, P. (2013). Social & Environmental Assessment Framework for Entire Area of Uttar Pradesh 'Final Report for Bundelkhand'. Lucknow, 10, [www.irrigation.up.nic.in/Final\\_Report\\_...](http://www.irrigation.up.nic.in/Final_Report_...)
- Verma, M. K. and Pal A. (2014). Exploration of ethno-botanical uses of major plants species by the local tribal communities of Bundelkhand region of Uttar Pradesh, India, *Journal of Biodiversity and Environmental Sciences (JBES)*, Volume 4 (3), 103, <http://www.innspub.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/JBES-Vol4No3-p101-120.pdf>.

[The final revised version of this paper was received on 29 April 2017]