Journal of Research Administration
Society of Research Administrators International

A STUDY ON ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF WOMEN WORKERS IN SELECTED BLOCKS OF NAMAKKAL REGION BASED ON UTILIZATION OF INFRASTRUCTURE

S. Vanitha
Ph.D. Research Scholar, Roll No:1904170015, Department of Economics, Annamalai University.

Dr. T. Sezhiyan
Associate Professor, (Research Supervisor), Department of Economics, Annamalai University, Email: Sezhiyan.yokesh@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The rural communities are deprived of opportunities, and a well-developed infrastructure could not be offered due to lack of funds and technology. However, in the recent years, the development of infrastructures in remote village areas is on the increasing, but, there is variation in the rate of development of social and economic infrastructure compartments across the districts of Tamil Nadu. It is seen that the several studies in the area of rural infrastructure have focused on social infrastructure components and economic infrastructure in isolation as well as their impact on economic growth. In remote villages of Tamil Nadu were meet the short fall of the infrastructure and technology services. The several villages in Tamil Nadu have not able to avail the basic amenities before past two decades. But it slowly gets all type of amenities and grows all type of developments. On the other hand working population in rural and remote villages are not having the all facilities from the administration Tamil Naduespecially, women workers from remote villages in backward region of Tamil Nadu. Therefore, a study is needed to how it should be eradicated from the stuituation and helps the women workers in the country side population.
Key Words: *infrastructure, utilisation, living condition*

Introduction and Background

The study is concerned with rural infrastructure and economic development in Tamil Nadu. It is pertinent to mention that the4capability of infrastructure helps determine a country's economic development in terms of diversifying manufacture, increasing do business, coping with inhabitant's enlargement, dropping shortage and improving environmental conditions. (Sebastian Morris 2003). Further, improving infrastructural services is the key to poverty alleviation leading to greater factor productivity and expands employment opportunity. They will also help the poor to have improved access to education, health, sanitation, drinking water, etc. (NCAER 2006). As infrastructural services contribute directly to welfare, its economic and social impacts cannot be viewed in isolation and have to be part of the broader development process. It may be revealed that productivity in economic and social spheres and in the fields of agricultural artisan activities, animal health, etc. Depends on how the infrastructural services are directly delivered to the poor

(Morris and Morris 2003). Further, infrastructural services act in many ways in different fields of economic and social activity viz., rural productivity, marketing network, water and sanitation health care, primary education and transport on the side and sustainable farm activity, employment generation on the other (Meenakshi Rajeev 2008).

Statement of the Problem

It is noticed that in the recent years the role of government and local governments is increasing in terms of general infrastructure development viz., power, roads, buildings, etc. and also in specific 6 schemes for surplus improvement (NABARD 2002). However due to institutional rigidity and imperfections, the infrastructure fund is underutilized, misutilized or becoming irrelevant to actual users (David Aschauer 1998). So infrastructure has a marking impact on rural economic development. It may be seen that in a country like India, the seven major infrastructure components are most significant in accelerating the pace of economic development viz., energy, transport, irrigation, finance, communication, education and health. (Randall 1991). The rural communities are deprived of opportunities, and a well-developed infrastructure could not be offered due to lack of funds (Edward Gram lich 1994). However, in the recent years, the development of infrastructures in non urban areas is on the increase, but, there is variation in the rate of development of social and economic infrastructure compartments across the districts of Tamil Nadu. It is seen that the several studies in the area of rural infrastructure have focused on social infrastructure components and economic infrastructure in isolation as well as their impact on economic growth. In this context, the present study deviates from the other studies by making an attempt to analyze the components of economic infrastructure and its contribution to rural development in Namakkal and Elachipalayam blocks of Namakkal District, Tamil Nadu.

Research Questions

- To what extent the infrastructural development leads to the promotion of rural livelihood assets in the study region?
- Whether the economic infrastructural development components really contribute towards the growth of living condition in the study region?
- Whether there exists any variation in utilizing infrastructural facilities among the rural households in the observed region?

Objectives

1. To explore the variation in the utilization of infrastructural components among the rural households in the study region.
2. To investigate the impact of infrastructural development on the livelihood assets in the study region.

Adamu madu (2012), has analyzed the economic nexus between rural infrastructure and agricultural development in Nigeria. It is noticed from the study that the contribution of rural infrastructure plays a vital role the development of agriculture in Nigeria. Further the study reviewed that the provision of infrastructure to agriculture is central for enhancing productivity and improving access to market, reducing investment related risks among the farmers in the

country. Finally, it could be observed from the study that availability of infrastructure also reduces the information barriers and leads to development in livelihood opportunities in rural areas.

Estache, Speciale and Veredas (2006), have analyzed 5 the progress of basic amenities by using various infrastructural indicators. They conclude that roads, power and telecommunications infrastructure, except of water and sanitation, and contribute significantly to long-run economic growth in Africa. **Jahan and Mc Cleery, (2005)** have pointed out that the small-scale community based infrastructure efforts are complementary to large-scale infrastructure initiatives in many ways. However, they revealed that improvement of access to a high quality main road and a transportation system enables improvement of agricultural technology, a stable supply of input goods and improvement in productivity. **Olagunju** et' al, (2012) have examined the effect of rural road and marketing infrastructure on income of farming households. It may be observed from the study that the components of economic infrastructure such as electricity, bank, market stalls are lacking 2 in the investigating region.

The study has showed that economic infrastructure is poor in the study region and as a result the farming household income is not encouraging. **Prabha, et al, (2009)** have found that the infrastructural components electricity have a considerable strength on, HYVs, where as rural roads have an insignificant impact, However, the study brought out that the gross agricultural output and output per unit land has a positive and significant association with the density of roads and electricity consumption in rural areas.

Infrastructural Development at District Level

This section presents the description of infrastructural development in Namakkal and Elacipalayam blocks of Namakkal district.

Socio – economic uniqueness of the sample population

This section presents the socio – economic characteristics of the selected respondents in the infrastructural most developed block and least developed blocks viz., Namakkal and Elacipalayam blocks in the Namakkal district. Further, the socio – economic individuality of the sample populations are discussed in terms of age wise classification of the respondents, sex wise classification, Religion wise classification, community wise classification, educational qualification, income wise classification, family size wise classification, type of house and house hold saving wise classification of the answerer in the selected study region.

Table- 1, Variation in sources of income between most developed block and least developed block

Infrastructural Development	Agriculture	Wages	Business	Salaries	Others	Total
Most Developed Block	255462.42 (19.0)	184621.14 (13.7)	286245.42 (21.3)	355426.24 (26.4)	264246.21 (19.6)	1346001.4 (100)

Least Developed Block	163008.14 (19.2)	115324.42 (13.6)	140242.15 (16.5)	254622.53 (30.0)	176215.62 (20.7)	849412.9 (100)
Total	4184706 (50.2)	299945.6 (3.6)	426487.6 (5.1)	610048.8 (7.3)	2818661.8 (33.8)	8339849.8 (100)

Source: Computed

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage

Table 1 brings out the variation in sources of income between most developed block and least developed block. It could be inferred from the table that out of the total income 50.2 per cent of the income has derived from agriculture followed by 33.8 per cent which is derived from enterprise activities and other non farm activities in the rural areas. Further, 7.3 of the income is from salary, 5.1 per cent from business activities viz., cloth business, rice business, vegetable and fruit vending and edible oil sale and the least 3.6 per cent of the income has been derived from wages.

It is seen that in the developed block, 26 per cent of the income is derived from salaries which shows a major portion out of the total income is derived from salaries. It is followed by the income from business which is found at 21.3 per cent, 19.6 of the income from others viz., fruits and vegetable sales, cool drink making , food items and other non – farm activities in the rural areas. Further, 19.0 per cent of the income is found from agriculture and the remaining 13.7 per cent is from wages. However, in developed block a major portion of the income is derived from salaries. In regard to the least developed block, a major portion 30.0 per cent is derived from salaries followed by 20.7 per cent from others, 19.2 per cent from agriculture, 16.5 per cent from business and the least 13.6 per cent from wages. By and large, it could be inferred from the results that there is variation in the sources of income between the Most developed block and the least developed block.

Table – 2, Classification of respondents according to income distribution

(Rs.)

Infrastructural Development	**Up to 50.000**	**50,000 to 1,00,000**	**1,00,000 to 2,00,000**	**2,00,000 to 3,00,000**	**Above 3,00,000**	**Total**
Most Developed	10 (6.7)	7 (4.7)	39 (26.0)	41 (27.3)	53 (35.3)	150 (100)
Least Developed	75 (50.0)	37 (24.7)	17 (11.3)	15 (10.0)	6 (4.0)	150 (100)
Total	**85 (28.3)**	**44 (14.7)**	**56 (18.7)**	**56 (18.7)**	**59 (19.7)**	**300 (100)**

Source: Computed

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage

Table 2 discussed the variation in the degree of income distribution between infrastructural Most developed block and least developed block in Namakkal district. It could be observed that out of the total 300 respondents, 28.3 per cent of the respondents have come under the category of income up to Rs. 50.000, followed by 19.7 per cent who have recorded their income above Rs. 3,00,000, 18.7 per cent of them have acquired income from Rs.1,00,000 to 2,00,000, and the same trend has been observed in the income category between Rs.2,00,000 and 3,00,000. Further, the least 14.7 per cent of them have come under the income category between 50,000 to 1,00,000. However, it could be observed from the results that out of the total respondents a major portion of the respondents have acquired income only the category up to 50,000. In regard to the Most developed block, it may be observed that a higher magnitude that is 35.3 per cent of the respondents have acquired income above Rs. 3,00,000, followed by 27.3 per cent who have recorded the income level between 2,00,000 to 3,00,000, 26.0 per cent of them have come under the income category between 1,00,000 to 2,00,000, 6.7 per cent of them are under the income category up to 50,000 and the lowest 4.7 per cent of them have recorded the income level between 50,000 to 1,00,000.

As far as the least developed block is concerned, out of the total respondents in the block, 50.0 per cent of them are under income category up to 50,000 followed by 24.7 per cent who have recorded the level of income between 50,000 to 1,00,000, 11.3 per cent of them are under the income category between 1,00,000 and 2,00,000, 10 per cent of them acquired income between 2,00,000 and 3,00,000 and the remaining 4 per cent of them are under the income level above 3,00,000.

In this context, it could be inferred from the results that while making a comparison between infrastructural most developed block viz., Namakkal block and infrastructural least developed block viz., Elachipalayam, a major portion of the respondents in the developed block have acquired the income level above 3,00,000. It showed that access to facilities, the level of education, access to health care services and variation in occupation have led to a higher amount of income in the developed block. As regards the developed block, the major socio and economic infrastructural development is relatively low which impede the development of the block resultant low level of income has been noticed in the infrastructurally less developed block.

Results and Discussion

The results of multiple Regression model are employed for socio – economic development of this study. It could be observed from the results that all the five independent variable viz., access to market, access to financial service, contact with fitness services, access to educational service and farm and non – farm income have jointly explained, the 94 8 per cent of the variations in the household income of the selected respondents in the rural. It means that out of 100% variation in the rural household income, about 94 per cent is attributed to the given five independent variables. Further, the overall ‘F ‘ratio is also found to be statistically significant, which are based on R2. Therefore, all the five independent variables selected for the model irrespective of the

infrastructurally most developed block, infrastructurally least developed block infrastructural developed and least developed villages are found to be appropriate. It is pertinent to brought out from the results that all the five independent variables are statistically significant at 5 per cent level. It is noticed from the value of co – efficient that even one percent increase in access the market, could lead to 42.61 % in the household income of the rural households. Similarly, the same one unit increase in access to financial services, contact with fitness facilities, farm and non – farm income will lead to increase in rural household income at 10.14per cent, 3.44 per cent, 18.33 per cent,11.44 per cent in the most developed block, least developed block, most developed village and the least developed village in Namakkal region. It could be attributed to the information that the economic expansion of pastoral areas are highly dependent on the provision of socio – economic infrastructural components like access to market through well equipped road facilities along with Transport facilities, provision of credit and facilities for saving with formal financial institutions, better health care facilities and access to educational. When all these basic services are adequately provided in the nonurban place, there is an amble scope for increasing rural household income irrespective of areas. More specifically, when there is adequate provision of credit for farm and non – farm services, the farm and non – farm income increase among the rural household. The people in the hinterland are dependent on non – institutional credit for their farm and non – farm activities and this inhibits the house hold development in the bucolic place. Similarly, education is a vital social infrastructural component which plays a crucial role in creating human capital in the rural areas and it has contributed much to the rural household income. By and large, it could be understood as of the study region that both farm and non – farm incomes are dependent on the foresaid socio - economic infrastructural components and as a result the household income is determined.

Conclusion and Policy Implications

This part brings together the outcome received from the analysis and integrates them. Further, it provides policies for the infrastructural development and offers scope for further research. It may be observed that in any country the provision of infrastructure acting as very important position in its economic development. In addition, a developing country like India requires greater focus on rural infrastructural development in terms of energy, transport, irrigation, finance, communication, education and health. If there is socio – economic infrastructural services are adequate, the rate of economic developmentand development would be quite encouraging. More specifically, the provision these infrastructural amenities in the rural region are pivotal, since a major portion of India's population live in rural areas. In view of these facts, the present empirical study has made an attempt to explore the impact of infrastructural development on the rural economic development by taking two blocks viz., Elachipalayam block and Namakkal block representing one block viz., Elachipalayam block as infrastructural least developed block and Namakkal as infrastructurally most developed block based on the secondary sources.

Policy Implications

The following suggestions will be of immense use to academic experts, policy makers and planners to develop the infrastructural provision in the hinterland region. Yet, the following suggestions directly flow from the result of the current research.

Regarding provision of credit by the formal financial institutions, it may be suggested that the institutional credit provision should be increased to the farm and non-farm activities should be increased to the farm and non-farm activities in the most developed block viz., Namakkal block.

As far as access the market and road facilities are concerned, such facilities are low in the least developed blocks as compared to the most developed block. In this context, it may be suggested that access to market and access to main road should be well developed in the Elachipalayam blocks.

Regard to wellbeing concern activities, it may be suggested that the provision of health care services through primary health centres in Elachipalayam blocks should be improved.

There should be a provision for storage facilities and warehousing facilities for preserving agricultural commodities in the infrastructurally less developed block viz., Elachipalayam block.

By and large, infrastructural less developed block lacks both the development of social and infrastructural components. In this context, there should be proper plan and also people's participation to the increasing the basic amenities.

References

Aschauer, David Alan, (1998), "Public Capital and Economic Growth: Issues of Quantity, Cultural Change, University of Chicago Press, Vol: 48(2), Pp. 391-406

Ayozie Daniel Ogechukwu (2010),Entrepreneurial developments and small scale industry contribution to Nigerian national development- A marketing interface, Information Management and Business Review, 2010, vol. 1, issue 2, 51-68

Estache, A., Speciale, B. and Veredas, D. (2005), How Much Does Infrastructure Matter to Growth in Sub-Saharan Africa, European Center for Advanced Research in Economics. Working Paper, Universite Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium.

Ganapathy S. Natarajan and David A. Wyrick (2011),Role of Small Scale Business in Poverty alleviation in Assam with Special Reference to Barpeta District, Assam (India), International Journal of Scientific Research in Science and Technology Volume 9 | Issue 5 Print ISSN: 2395-6011 | Online ISSN: 2395-602X

Hessels J, A. van Stel (2011), Entrepreneurship, export orientation, and economic growth, Small business economics, 2011

Jahan, S. and McCleery, R. (2005). *Making Infrastructure Work for the Poor: Synthesis Report of Four Country Studies – Bangladesh, Senegal, Thailand and Zambia*. New York: UNDP.

Meenakshi Rajeev, (2008)*, Ensuring Rural Infrastructure in India: Role of Rural Infrastructure Development fund'*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 43, No. 7 (Feb. 16 - 22, 2008), pp. 27-31.

Morris. S, and A. Morris, (2003), The Rural Infrastructure Development Fund: A Review, India Infrastructure Report 2003 - Public Expenditure Allocation and Accountability, 3inetwork, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2003.

Obayelu.AE, TO. Olarewaju (2012), Journal of Agricultural Effect of rural infrastructure on profitability and productivity of cassava-based farms in Odogbolu local government area, Ogun state, Nigeria

Olagunju, FI, Ayinde, OE, Adewumi, MO, Adesiji, GB (2012): Effect of rural roads and marketing infrastructure on income of farming households in Osun state: Implications for Infrastructure Investment: A Review Essay, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 1994, vol. 32, issue 3, 1176-96

Prabha, (2009), Impact of Infrastructure and Technology on Agricultural Productivity in Uttar Pradesh, Agricultural Economics Research Review, Vol. 22 January-June 2009 pp 61-70.

Randall. S, (1991),The demographic consequences of conflict, exile and repatriation: A case study of Malian Tuareg European journal of population/Revue Europeans de, Springer

Umar Adamu Madu and John Phoa Cl, (2012), Evaluation of Fadama II Road Infrastructure among Rural Communities in Adamawa State, Nigeria, Asian Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development, *2012, vol. 2, issue 2, 294-301*