

# International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research

ISSN: 2393-8870

www.ijarm.com

DOI: 10.22192/ijamr

Volume 4, Issue 11 -2017

## Research Article

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22192/ijamr.2017.04.11.002>

## Welfare Policies and people's perceptions: With reference to Gender Classification

### Dr. C. Subramanian

Associate Professor & Wing Head, Political Science & Public Administration Wing, DDE, Annamalai University, Tamil Nadu, India

E-mail: [drcsubramanian@yahoo.com](mailto:drcsubramanian@yahoo.com)

### Introduction

All states are welfare states in the modern world society. Democratic institutions tend to unleash basic amenities by taking into the real causes of concern of poor people which is the main aim of all liberal democracies. Delivering positive goods need holistic aim and objectives in order to reduce the widening gap between the vested interests and marginalized section. The need of the hour is statesmanship and enlightened


self interests of either of the executives. India as a largest democracy on par with USA endeavors to be the solo champion for the cause of peace and welfare policies. It is in order to locate and investigate the implementation of welfare policies. Namakkal district has been taken as the sampling area. 300 respondents were chosen on the basis of random sampling method to draw precise and appropriate responses. The drawn responses were tabulated for analysing with simple percentage analysis along with fitting outcome.

### Gender wise - Respondents opinion

Variables	Male		Female		Total
	L	H	L	H	
Awareness	20 (6.66%)	130 (43.33%)	50 (16.66%)	100 (33.33%)	300 (100%)
Govt. Role	120 (40%)	30 (10%)	100 (33.33%)	50 (16.66%)	300 (100%)
Panchayat Involvement	25 (8.33%)	125 (41.66%)	40 (13.33%)	110 (36.33%)	300 (100%)
Political Intervention	20 (6.66%)	130 (43.33%)	30 (10%)	120 (40%)	300 (100%)
Caste-Play	20 (6.66%)	130 (43.33%)	30 (10%)	120 (40%)	300 (100%)
Red-Tapism	10 (3.33%)	140 (46.66%)	20 (6.66%)	130 (43.33%)	300 (100%)
Bureaucratic intervention	30 (10%)	120 (40%)	40 (13.33%)	110 (36.33%)	300 (100%)
Implementation	130 (43.33%)	20 (6.66%)	120 (40%)	30 (10%)	300 (100%)
Opinion	135 (45%)	15 (5%)	120 (40%)	30 (10%)	300 (100%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>150 (50%)</b>		<b>150 (50%)</b>		<b>300 (100%)</b>

L – Low level; H – High level


Variable	Male		Female		Total
	L	H	L	H	
Awareness	20 (6.66%)	130 (43.33%)	50 (16.66%)	100 (33.33%)	300 (100%)



For the question of awareness of schemes in the sampling area, among male respondents, 6.66% of the respondents are less aware, whereas 43.33% of them are highly aware of the welfare schemes.

Among respondents in the female category, it is 16.66% of them who opted for low level of awareness of schemes and 33.33% of them are highly aware.

Variable	Male		Female		Total
	L	H	L	H	
Govt. Role	120 (40%)	30 (10%)	100 (33.33%)	50 (16.66%)	300 (100%)




Related with the question of Govt. role in implementation of welfare schemes, in the Male category, 40% of the respondents opined for low level whereas 10% of them approached at high level of Govt. role in the implementation of welfare schemes.

Among the female category related with the question of gov't. role, 33.33% of them opted for low level and 16.66% of them suggested for high level of government role.

**Panchayat Involvement**

Variable	Male		Female		Total
	L	H	L	H	
Panchayat Involvement	25 (8.33%)	125 (41.66%)	40 (13.33%)	110 (36.33%)	300 (100%)




For the question of awareness of Panchayat involvement in implementation of schemes, among male respondents, 8.33% of them opted for low level of caste violence, whereas 41.66% opined at high level involvement of panchayat members and leaders without any hindrance.

Similarly in the female category, 13.33% of the respondents articulated at high level, whereas 36.33% of them expressed high level involvement of panchayat members.

**Political Intervention**

Variable	Male		Female		Total
	L	H	L	H	
Political Intervention	20 (6.66%)	130 (43.33%)	30 (10%)	120 (40%)	300 (100%)




With regard to the query of political intervention in the implementation of welfare schemes in the male category, 6.66% of the respondents approached at low level of intervention, whereas 43.33% of them articulated at high level of intervention in the implementation of welfare schemes.

Among the female category, 10% of the respondents approached for low level, whereas majority of the respondents opined for high level of political intervention in the implementation of welfare schemes.

**Caste-Play**

Variable	Male		Female		Total
	L	H	L	H	
Caste-Play	20 (6.66%)	130 (43.33%)	30 (10%)	120 (40%)	300 (100%)




In male category, In view of the caste play in the implementation of welfare schemes in the concerned district, 6.66% of the respondents opined about the low level of caste role, whereas, 43.33% of them articulated about the high level of caste role in the implementation of schemes in the sample area.

Among female category, 10% of them opined about the low level of caste role, whereas 40% of the respondents approached about high level of caste role.

**Red-Tapism**

Variable	Male		Female		Total
	L	H	L	H	
Red-Tapism	10 (3.33%)	140 (46.66%)	20 (6.66%)	130 (43.33%)	300 (100%)




With regard to the query of red-tapism or delaying of scheme implementation among the male category, 3.33% of the respondents opined at low level, whereas 46.66% of them expressed high level of red-tapism in implementation of schemes which is a negative development.

In female category, 6.66% of the respondents suggested for low level and 43.33% of them expressed high level of red-tapism in implementation of schemes.

**Bureaucratic intervention**

Variable	Male		Female		Total
	L	H	L	H	
Bureaucratic intervention	30 (10%)	120 (40%)	40 (13.33%)	110 (36.33%)	300 (100%)




Among the male category, for the query of bureaucratic intervention in negative aspect of implementing the schemes, 10% of them opined at low level whereas 40% of the respondents approached for high level.

In female category, 13.33% of the respondents suggested for low level, whereas 36.33% of the female respondents approached at high level

**Implementation**

Variable	Male		Female		Total
	L	H	L	H	
Implementation	130 (43.33%)	20 (6.66%)	120 (40%)	30 (10%)	300 (100%)




Regarding the query of proper implementation of schemes in the concerned District among the male respondents, 43.33% of the respondents approached at high level and 6.66% of them opined at high level of implementation of schemes

Among female respondents, for the query of proper implementation of schemes, 40% of the respondents approached at high level and 10% of them opined at high level of implementation of schemes

### Opinion

Variable	Male		Female		Total
	L	H	L	H	
Opinion	135 (45%)	15 (5%)	120 (40%)	30 (10%)	300 (100%)



With regard to the query of opinion of welfare scheme in implementation, among male respondents, 45% of them opined at low level and 10% of them opined for high level of opinion in the welfare schemes

In the female category, majority of the respondents articulated for low level, whereas only 10% of the respondents opined for high level of opinion in the welfare schemes.

### References

1. H.Bhushan Singh “District Administration in India”, *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi, Vol.32, July-Sept., 1986, pp. 349-53.
2. B.B. Mishra (1970), *The Administrative History of India 1834-1947: General Administration*, Oxford University Press, Bombay, p. 470.
3. HaridwarRai (1980) “The Changing Role of the District Collector”, *District Administration, Indian Journal of Public*

4. *Administration*, Indian institute of Public Administration, New Delhi, Vol. X No. 2, July-Sept., , p. 17.
5. S.R. Maheshwari (1979), *State Government in India*, Macmillan Company, New Delhi, p. 95.
6. Haridwar Rai, “Local Government, Local Administration and Development: Role Adaptation of the District Officer in India”, *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, Indian institute of Public Administration, New Delhi, Vol. XIV, No.1, Jan-March, 1968, pp. 89-93.
7. M.S. Mann (1992) “Establishment of British Government in India: Administration and Policies”, *History of India from 1526-1947 A.D.*, Bharat Prakashan, Jalandhar, pp. 488-517.
8. Ramesh K. Arora and RajiniGoyal (1995), *Indian Public Administration: Institutions anIssues*, Wishwa Prakashan, New Delhi, p. 243.

8. S.N. Mishra, "The District Collector: The Changing Role", *Development Policies and Administration in India*, Uppal Publishing House, New Delhi, 2000, pp. 287-288.
9. Sweta Mishra, *Changing Pattern of District Administration*, Mittal Publications, New Delhi, 1996, p. 29.
10. Abhijit Datta, "Dynamics of District Administration – A New Perspective," *Some Thoughts on the Proposed District Government*, Kanishka Publishers, New Delhi, 1996, p. 45.

<b>Access this Article in Online</b>	
	Website: <a href="http://www.ijarm.com">www.ijarm.com</a>
	Subject: <a href="#">Social Welfare</a>
<b>Quick Response Code</b>	
DOI: <a href="https://doi.org/10.22192/ijamr.2017.04.11.002">10.22192/ijamr.2017.04.11.002</a>	

**How to cite this article:**

C. Subramanian. (2017). Welfare Policies and people's perceptions: With reference to Gender Classification. *Int. J. Adv. Multidiscip. Res.* 4(11): 6-12.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22192/ijamr.2017.04.11.002>