



International Journal of Research in Finance and Management

P-ISSN: 2617-5754
E-ISSN: 2617-5762
IJRFM 2024; 7(2): 47-53
www.allfinancejournal.com
Received: 25-05-2024
Accepted: 30-06-2024

Iqbal Kahn
Research Scholar, Department
of Commerce, Himachal
Pradesh University, Summer
Hill, Shimla, Himachal
Pradesh, India

Dr. Sarwan Kumar
Assistant Professors, Govt.
College Majheen, Kangra,
Himachal Pradesh, India

Transforming lives: The impact of integrated rural development program (IRDP) on poverty alleviation in Himachal Pradesh

Iqbal Kahn and Dr. Sarwan Kumar

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33545/26175754.2024.v7.i2a.345>

Abstract

In India's Himachal Pradesh, the Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP) has been significant for alleviating poverty. By giving them the opportunity to pursue self-employment alternatives, the program seeks to raise the living conditions of the impoverished in rural areas. Infrastructure support, skill development, and financial aid are important factors. The IRDP has had a major impact in raising income levels, improving agricultural production, and developing small-scale companies in Himachal Pradesh. The initiative has effectively promoted sustainable economic growth in the area, lessened income gaps, and increased neglected groups via targeted interventions. In spite of constraints like program execution and the distribution of resources, IRDP is still a crucial instrument in the battle versus rural poverty in Himachal Pradesh.

Keywords: Poverty alleviation, rural development, economic empowerment, self-employment, rural poverty, community upliftment, financial assistance

Introduction

Since its creation in 1978, India's approach to reducing poverty has been anchored on the Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP). IRDP, one of the biggest rural development programs in the nation, offers rural disadvantaged individuals options for asset creation and self-employment in an effort to improve their social and economic circumstances. With the purpose of supporting them with financial support and subsidies to engage in productive activities, the program primarily targets communities that are marginalized, such as small and marginal farmers, agricultural workers, and rural craftsmen. This study evaluates how the IRDP affects Himachal Pradesh's efforts to reduce poverty. Throughout the examination of data from several sources, such as case studies, government reports, and field surveys, this research aims to assess how well the program executes its objectives. The discoveries of this study will shed light on the achievements and inadequacies of the IRDP in the region, supplying crucial lessons for upcoming initiatives and strategies regarding rural development. The investigation will be separated into three sections: an introduction to the socioeconomic circumstances of Himachal Pradesh; an explanation of the IRDP and how it has been carried out in the state; and an in-depth analysis of its impact on reducing poverty. The research paper intends to add to the overall conversation on the development of agriculture and eliminating poverty in India through its investigation

Review of Literature

Raj (2007) ^[1] his article "Antodaya" (the programme in which the poor family is identified as a concrete human reality) has given four features of the Antodaya approach to rural development which deserve special emphasis i.e. under the approach poverty did not remain a statistical abstraction. The poor families were identified as a concrete human reality. Emphasis was given to the delivery of productive assets so that the poor family begins to get regular income from self employment. Third the administration should go out, identified and assists the poor people instead of waiting for people to come for assistance. The criterion of identification was strictly economic (whose income is below the poverty line) finally, he

Correspondence

Iqbal Kahn
Research Scholar, Department
of Commerce, Himachal
Pradesh University, Summer
Hill, Shimla, Himachal
Pradesh, India

concluded that all these features are commendable and represent important departures from past practice. Chatterjee (2009) ^[2] studied the performance of Sampoorna Gramin Rozgar Yojna in his article he observed that SGSY is a massive self employment programme for poverty alleviation presently going on in rural India. The study further revealed that bank credit is an important component of SGSY. Credit disbursed in Uttar Pradesh and Jharkhand during 2006-07 were 81% & 49% respectively. On the other hand in Rajasthan and West Bengal, credit disbursed was 147% and 17% during the same period. Against this backdrop achievement in Andhra Pradesh was 316%. This was that the scheme playing a significant role for providing self employment and further more poverty alleviation in the area under study. Dev Basu (2009) ^[3] in his doctorate study titled "Impact of Rural Development Scheme in H.P." has revealed that the overall financial and physical performance of various rural development schemes such as SGSY, IAY, AAY, RGAY, IREP, SHG satisfactory but there is a lack of proper utilization of funds. He revealed that majority of illiterate and SC/ST as well as backward categories has got the benefit of the schemes. He said that Gram Sabha have played a vital role in the success of rural development schemes. He added that Rural Development Schemes have added positive impact on the annual income of the beneficiaries, type of housing and amenities near home. It further added to the economic development of the state. Jain (2011) ^[4] pointed out that the increasing injustice, inequalities and unemployment in the rural areas have serious ramification on India's socio-economic and political balance. The marginalization of rural areas which have been subservient to the urban system is reflected by simmering rebellion in much rural and tribal area in India. Srinivasan (2011) ^[7] states in his study "National Rural Livelihoods mission", A case study he stated that there has been a major shift in strategy too for training and capacity building of key stakeholders. Thus, it is proposed to develop community resource persons and community professionals as grassroots trainers, besides, it is also proposed to develop villages and blocks as resource centres which not are more effective but would also reduce the pressure on State/District level training centres. It is also proposed to develop the SGSY & NREGA programme in the development of the rural areas. Srinivasan (2011) ^[7] stated in his study "Rural Development the main focus" the integrated rural development programme covers the various programmes like Bharat Nirman representing Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojna (PMGSY) accelerated irrigation benefit programme (AIBP), Rajiv Gandhi Grameen Vidyutikaran Yojna, IAY, NRDW, Rural telephony etc. it covers the rural infrastructure development fund from Rs. 16000 crores to Rs. 18000 crores. Mahendran and Indrakant (2014) ^[5] noticed in their studies that the poorest are content and make use of resources for maintaining care of their homes. The state's social assistance initiatives, which provide free rice, color TV, fans, mixers, grinders, transportation, and other amenities to the impoverished, have improved and improved the lives of rural and coastal residents. Socioeconomic factors have a bearing on rural areas, particularly ones near coasts. Welfare systems have an influence on rural residents' standards of life. Chatterji (2016) ^[13] presented statistics on

the National Rural Livelihood Mission's (NRLM) most recent advancements in an article titled "Implementation of DAY-NRLM/Aajeevika: An Analysis." "The study makes use of secondary data. Pursuant to the research, DAY-NRLM has to be implemented fully since its coverage at the district, block, and gram panchayat levels is insufficient. Thus, it recommends that plenty of work be done in order to establish SHGs in rural India by 2020, engaging all BPL households and all angles of poverty. Diwan, Upadhyaya & Maheshwari (2017) ^[8] published a study titled "MGNREGA and Its Role in Rural Development" that detailed how the program contributed to rural development and the greater effort to combat poverty in India. The program's overall lack of social audit units and the lengthy approval and fund transfer protocols by the ministry are two of its flaws, according to the author. Furthermore, it is advised that governments take prompt action to guarantee the system will function as intended. Boro (2017) ^[9] "A Investigation on Rural Women Welfare Under the NRLM and its Impact to their Socio-Economic Development with Special Reference Development Block, Baksa district" is a comprehensive research study that had been finished. The study includes qualitative as well as quantitative methods in addition to primary and secondary data sources. As part of the National Rural Livelihood MISSION (NRLM), the author attempted to examine the socioeconomic development and means of subsistence for rural women. It was noted that there is still a growing need to improve women's economic standing and carry out NRLM programs. The researcher claims that the study region's NRLM is operating below par. Many women do not know about the NRLM or its programs. Second, the area lacks a marketplace and an adequate level of education, Sinha (2018) ^[10] presented numerous initiatives and funding for reducing poverty in an investigation called "Livelihood Development and Diversification. "Funding resources for enhancing livelihood diversification, rural infrastructure upgrades, and poverty reduction have expanded considerably over the past four years, as demonstrated by programmes like PMAY-G, PMGSY, MGNREGS, and DAY-NRLM. These are a few instances of livelihood development and infrastructure development initiatives that encourage the production of both direct and indirect employment. Das (2020) ^[11] has out an investigation on MGNAREGA titled "Empowerment of Rural Women Through MGNAREGA: A Study of MGNAREGA Implementation in Barpeta Development Block of Barpeta District of Assam." The author came to the conclusion that the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) is the biggest program for reducing poverty and that it has given rural households hope by improving livelihood security through the production of guaranteed wage jobs through village infrastructure. Still, it does positively impact women's earnings and level of involvement in rural areas. In order to maintain consistency with the minimum market pay rate, MGNREGA wage rates should be updated on a regular basis. Kamini and Sumit (2022) ^[12], explained in an article how empowering women in the Dhamtari district has been greatly enhanced by the National Rural Livelihood Mission (NRLM). It looks like this effort gave women who were unemployed or who relied only on labor and agriculture, alternatives to employment.

The study's overall findings indicate that NRLM has made excellent success in the Dhamtari district, highlighting the initiative's significance in empowering rural women and enhancing their level of living.

Need of the Study

The geographical and socioeconomic conditions of Himachal Pradesh are diversified. Examining the implications of IRDP in this specific scenario helps to improve targeted interventions by providing an improved comprehension of how rural development programs operate throughout various settings. The investigation can offer accurate data about improvements in IRDP beneficiaries' overall well-being, educational attainment, income levels, and access to commodities. Evidence-based policymaking and evaluating programs depend on this particular type of evidence. In along with examining contemporary attempts, analyzing how the IRDP has reduced poverty in Himachal Pradesh will assist to shape more effective future plans to assist with rural poverty.

Objectives of the Study

- To examine how the Integrated Rural Development Program (IRDP) s efforts to alleviate poverty have affected the socioeconomic circumstances of the identified recipients.
- To identify the main obstacles to the Integrated Rural Development Program (IRDP) program for reducing poverty being implemented

Hypothesis Formulation

Hypothesis is simply a statement about the universe. It is a statement of the tentative solution of the problem. This statement may or may not be true; the research is designed to ascertain the truth. In view of above objective of the study, a number of research questions and review of related literature, the following hypotheses have been formulated:

- H₀₁ There is no significant impact of socio-economic conditions of beneficiaries under the IRDP in poverty alleviation scheme.
- H₀₂ there is no major constraint in the implementation of IRDP in poverty alleviation scheme.

Impact of Integrated Rural Development Programmes On Social Status of Beneficiaries

Integrated Rural Development Programme and Its Impact on Living Standard

Here, a sincere attempt has been made to analyze the impact of rural development programmes on the living standard of rural population on the basis of some selected variables.

Gender and Impact of IRDP on Living Standard

A brief glance at the table 1 reveals that 31% of beneficiaries—male and female—strongly believe that they may increase their level of life by participating in rural development programs, and 44.5 percent of respondents say they agree with this statement. Only 7% of respondents said they strongly disagreed with the claim that programs for rural development raise the level of living for rural households.

Table 1: Gender-wise Classification and IRDP effect

Gender	Nature of Responses					Total
	SA	A	N	D	SD	
Male	32 (31.2%)	44 (43.14%)	26 (25.49%)	18 (17.6%)	8 (7.84%)	102 (100.0%)
Female	28 (28.57%)	45 (45.91%)	9 (9.1%)	10 (10.2%)	6 (6.1%)	98 (100.0%)
Total	60 (30%)	89 (44.5%)	35 (17.5%)	28 (14%)	14 (7%)	200 100.0%

Source: Primary Data

Age and Impact of IRDP on Living Standard

In order to examine the correlation between respondents' ages and perspectives regarding the effect of IRDP on their standard of living. While 44% of beneficiaries stated they agreed upon 21% of beneficiaries acknowledged that they

greatly approve of the rural development program's contribution in raising the standard of living for the rural population. Beneficiaries who are neutral make up 21%. Of the recipients surveyed, 10.5% said they disagreed, and 3.4% said they strongly disagreed.

Table 2: Age-wise Distribution: Impact of IRDP on Living Standard

Age	Nature of Responses					Total
	SA	A	N	D	SD	
Below 30	8 (15.4%)	24 (46.2%)	11 (21.2%)	7 (13.5%)	2 (3.8%)	52 (100.0%)
30-45	14 (23.34%)	23 (38.33%)	15 (25%)	7 (11.67%)	1 (1.67%)	60 (100.0%)
45-60	11 (20%)	26 (47.27%)	11 (20%)	4 (7.27%)	3 (5.45%)	55 (100.0%)
Above 60	9 (17.28%)	15 (45.45%)	5 (15.15%)	3 (9.09%)	1 (3.03%)	33 (100.0%)
Total	42 (21%)	88 (44%)	42 (21%)	21 (10.5%)	7 (3.5%)	200 (100.0%)

Source: Primary Data

Income and Impact of IRDP on Living Standard

The relationship between income and perception of the rural population's standards of living is examined in Table 3. A large percentage of respondents (41%), expressed opinion that programs for rural development contribute to an

improvement in their standard of living.

Twenty-one percent of those surveyed are unsure. Just 5.5% of respondents, or a small portion of the sample, indicated that they strongly disagreed with the statement above.

Table 3: Income-wise Bifurcation: Impact of IRDP on Living Standard

Income	Nature of Responses					Total
	SA	A	N	D	SD	
Below 40,000	18 (37.5%)	15 (31.2%)	12 (25.0%)	2 (4.2%)	1 (2.1%)	48 (100.0%)
40,000-80,000	20 (21.06%)	39 (41.05%)	19 (20%)	13 (13.68%)	4 (4.21%)	95 (100.0%)
80,000-1,20,000	4 (13.3%)	13 (43.3%)	8 (26.68%)	3 (10%)	2 (6.67%)	30 (100.0%)
Above 1,20,000	6 (22.23%)	15 (55.55%)	3 (3.40%)	2 (7.40%)	1 (3.70%)	27 (100.0%)
Total	48 (24%)	82 (41%)	42 (21%)	20 (10%)	8 (5.5%)	200 (100.0%)

Integrated Rural Development Programme and Its Impact on Poverty Alleviation

Sincere as analysis has been done in the paragraph that follows to examine how rural development initiatives affect reducing poverty based on respondents' age, gender, and yearly income.

Gender and Impact of IRDP on Poverty Alleviation

Table 4 indicates that 35% of beneficiaries, both male and female, strongly agree that rural development programs are contributing to the reduction of poverty. Twenty-five percent of respondents say they agree, and fifteen percent are neutral. Beneficiaries who indicated that they had no opinion were 12.5% and 8%, respectively.

Table 4: Impact of IRDP on Poverty Alleviation: Gender-wise Responses

Gender	Nature of Responses					Total
	SA	A	N	D	SD	
Male	44 (43.13%)	32 (31.37%)	10 (9.80%)	10 (9.81%)	6 (5.5%)	102 (100.0%)
Female	26 (26.53%)	27 (27.55%)	20 (20.41%)	15 (15.31%)	10 (10.21%)	98 (100.0%)
Total	70 (35%)	58 (29.5%)	30 (15%)	25 (12.5%)	16 (8%)	200 (100.0%)

Source: Primary Data

Age and Impact of IRDP on Poverty Alleviation

The breakup of the beneficiaries in Table 5 evaluates the association between respondent age and the eradication of poverty. A majority of respondents, or 37.5%, across a range of age categories, said that they agreed. Only 4% of

the respondents said that they strongly disagreed with the statement. Therefore, it can be said that the majority of respondents agree that integrated rural development programs have a significant role in reducing poverty.

Table 5: Age-wise Distribution: Impact of IRDP on Poverty Alleviation

Age	Nature of Responses					Total
	SA	A	N	D	SD	
Below 30	16 (30.8%)	25 (48.1%)	4 (7.7%)	7 (13.5%)	0 (0.0%)	52 (100.0%)
30-45	25 (41.67%)	15 (25%)	10 (16.67%)	6 (10%)	4 (6.67%)	60 (100.0%)
45-60	17 (30.91%)	17 (30.91%)	12 (21.82%)	6 (10.91%)	3 (5.45%)	55 (100%)
Above 60	7 (21.21%)	18 (54.54%)	5 (15.15%)	2 (6.07%)	1 (3.03%)	33 (100.0%)
Total	65 (32.5%)	75 (37.5%)	31 (15.5%)	21 (10.5%)	8 (4%)	200 (100.0%)

Source: Primary Data.

Income and Impact of IRDP on Poverty Alleviation

The breakup of the beneficiaries in Table 6 makes it evident that the researcher evaluated at how respondents' incomes affected the impact of integrated rural development programs on reducing poverty. In accordance with the data,

31.5% of respondents strongly agree and 44% say they agree that programs for rural development are lowering poverty in rural areas. 17.5% are still indifferent. Just 1.5% of respondents, or just over one fifth, strongly disagree with the aforementioned assertion.

Table 6: Income-wise Classification: Impact of IRDP on Poverty Alleviation

Income	Nature of Responses					Total
	SA	A	N	D	SD	
Below 40,000	18 (37.5%)	18 (37.5%)	9 (18.8%)	3 (6.2%)	0 (0.0%)	48 (100.0%)
40,001-80,000	28 (29.45%)	45 (47.37%)	16 (16.84%)	3 (3.15%)	3 (3.15%)	95 (100.0%)
80,001-1,20,000	9 (30%)	10 (33.3%)	7 (23.3%)	4 (13.4%)	0 (0.0%)	30 (100.0%)
Above 1,20,001	8 (29.63%)	15 (55.56%)	3 (11.1%)	1 (3.7%)	0 (0.0%)	27 (100.0%)
Total	63 (31.5%)	88 (44%)	35 (17.5%)	11 (5.5%)	3 (1.5%)	200 (100.0%)

Source: Primary Data

Intregeted Rural Development Programme and Its Impact on Migration

An attempt has been made to investigate the effects of implementing Integrated Rural Development Program (IRDP) rural development programs on population shifts in rural areas based on a few selected features, ranging

including gender, age, and income level, in the paragraph that follows.

Gender and Impact of IRDP on Migration

The relation between respondents' responses considering the influence of IRDP on migration and their gender is

displayed in the contingency table. Of the beneficiaries, 25% of men and 32.5 percent of women say they strongly agree, and the remaining percentage says they agree. Only

10% of those interviewed said they strongly disagree. Thus, based on gender-specific responses, the majority appears to concur with the claim mentioned earlier.

Table 7: Impact of IRDP on Migration: Gender-wise Bifurcation

Gender	Nature of Responses					Total
	SA	A	N	D	SD	
Male	25 (24.5%)	25 (24.5%)	28 (27.4%)	12 (11.76%)	12 (11.76%)	102 (100.0%)
Female	25 (25.5%)	40 (40.81%)	12 (12.24%)	13 (13.26%)	8 (8.17%)	92 (100.0%)
Total	50 (25%)	65 (32.5%)	40 (20%)	25 (11.25%)	20 (10%)	200 (100.0%)

Source: Primary Data

Age and Impact of IRDP on Migration

To figure out how respondents' age group and impact of integrated rural development programs on migration are related. The breakup of the beneficiaries in table 8 shows that most respondents across all age groups agree, with an

exception of a small minority who appear to strongly disagree with the claim that integrated rural development programs are having a significant impact on lowering the rate of migration from rural regions.

Table 8: Age-wise Distribution: Impact of IRDP on Migration

Age	Nature of Responses					Total
	SA	A	N	D	SD	
Below 30	4 (7.7%)	25 (48.1%)	13 (25.0%)	8 (15.4%)	2 (3.8%)	52 (100.0%)
30-45	21 (35%)	23 (38.8%)	8 (13.33%)	4 (6.7%)	4 (6.67%)	60 (100.0%)
45-60	12 (21.81%)	20 (36.36%)	10 (18.18%)	8 (14.54%)	5 (9.09%)	55 (100.0%)
Above 60	3 (9.10%)	11 (33.33%)	7 (21.21%)	8 (24.24%)	4 (12.12%)	33 (100.0%)
Total	40 (20%)	79 (39.5%)	38 (19%)	28 (14%)	15 (7.5%)	200 (100.0%)

Source: Primary Data

Income and Impact of IRDP on Migration

The relationship between income and the effect of measures for Integrated Rural Development Program (IRDP) on migration is displayed in the table. Only a small portion of respondents, or 8%, strongly disagreed with the statement that rural development initiatives are reducing rural

population migration to urban and semi-urban areas in search of employment. Table also suggests that the majority of respondents from various income groups agree with the statement that rural development programs are pragmatically reducing migration to urban and semi-urban areas.

Table 9: Income-wise Classification: Impact of IRDP on Migration

Income	Nature of Responses					Total
	SA	A	N	D	SD	
Below 40,000	2 (4.2%)	19 (39.6%)	14(29.2%)	13 (27.1%)	0 (0.0%)	48 (100.0%)
40000-80000	16 (16.84%)	34 (35.79%)	20 (21.75%)	10 (10.52%)	15 (15.75%)	95 (100.0%)
80,000-1,20,000	8 (26.67%)	12 (40%)	8 (26.67%)	2 (6.67%)	0 (0.0%)	30 (100.0%)
Above 1,20,000	8 (29.63%)	10 (37.04%)	6 (22.22%)	2 (7.41%)	1 (3.7%)	27 (100.0%)
Total	34 (17.5%)	75 (37.5%)	48 (24%)	27 (13.5%)	16 (8%)	200 (100.0%)

Source: Primary Data

The main obstacles to the IRDP program for reducing poverty being implemented

- Plenty of challenges might make it difficult for efforts to reduce poverty to be carried effectively and effectively. The points that follow are a few of the main constraints:

1. Fiscal Restrictions

- **Inadequate Funding:** The variety and efficacy of many programs aimed at eliminating poverty have been limited by a lack of funding.
- **Inconvenient Resource Allocation:** Ineffectual resource allocation may end up in waste and poor efficacy.

2. Aspects of Governance and Administration

- **Bureaucratic Red Tape:** Sophisticated processes and

an abundance of paperwork can cause delays in benefit implementation and distribution.

- **Corruption:** Whenever resources are mismanaged or compromised,

3. Not Enough Facilities

- **Inadequate Physical Infrastructure:** Defective roads, transportation, and communication systems can make it more challenging to supply services and goods.
- **Digital Divide:** Poor access to internet connectivity and technology could affect the impact of digital-based

4. Difficulties with Classification and Localization

- **Accurate Targeting:** Errors in inclusion (ineligible persons receiving benefits) and exclusion (needy people being left out) might result from having difficulty in effectively identifying and reaching the intended

beneficiaries.

- **Dynamical Nature of Poverty:** It can be hard to keep the beneficiary lists current due to the continually shifting nature of poverty.

5. Constraints from Sociopolitics

- **Government disruptions:** The primary goal of measures aimed at reducing poverty can be altered by political agendas and interests, which may result in the neglect or supporting some specific groups.
- **Social Barriers:** marginalized populations may find it difficult to obtain benefits due to difficulties which include caste, gender discrimination, and social exclusion among others.

6. Skill and Capacity Defects

- **Lack of Professional Personnel:** It's conceivable that there is an acute shortage of skilled individuals to devise, execute, and oversee activities intended for lessening poverty.
- Limited Organisational with a capacity of Frail organizations could run into difficulties

7. Challenges in Monitoring and Reviewing

- **Inadequate Monitoring:** Improper ways of tracking may leave you without timely and accurate data when assessing the performance of the program in question.
- **Evaluation Challenges:** Establishing the long-term effects of programs to reduce poverty is an involved procedure that need for accurate approaches.

8. Property and Participation in Community Life

- **Lack of Community Involvement:** Schemes may be less profitable and environmentally friendly if local communities aren't properly involved in their the preparation and performance.
- **A absence of Trust:** Customers may have worries about initiatives by the government because of perceived inefficiencies or prior setbacks.

9. Economic Restraints

- **Economic Instability:** Funding and resources for organizations aimed at reducing poverty can grow scarcer throughout periods of economic downturns and fluctuation.
- **Market Inefficiencies:** Poorer individuals may have less opportunity for collecting revenue due to not sufficient market access and failures.

10. Physical and Ecological Constraints

- **Geographical Barriers:** It could be hard to deliver service in isolated and difficult to reach regions.
- **Environmental calamities:** The achievement and implementation of measures aimed at eliminating poverty may be impacted by disasters of nature and environmental degradation.

11. Dimensions of Heritage and Behavior

- **Cultural refusing:** The adoption of new techniques and technology may be inhibited by cultural norms and resistance to change.

- **Behavioral limitations:** Clients might not be aware of or motivated to take part in actions intended for alleviating poverty.

The diversified policy aimed at encouraging engagement with the community, infrastructure development, governance enhancement, and sustainable economic growth must be implemented to overcome these barriers. Along with constant surveillance, innovative tactics, or tactics, and coordination between many stakeholders—government businesses, non-governmental organizations, and the financial sector—effective reduction in poverty additionally needs those components.

Conclusion and Suggestions

The study analyses each of the initiatives that the government of Himachal Pradesh is carrying out in an effort to reduce poverty. The socioeconomic status of the participants is discussed in the paper's conclusion. Table also shows that 31% of beneficiaries, both male and female, strongly believe that taking part in rural development programs may raise their condition of life, and 44.5 percent of respondents agree with this statement. The assertion that programs for integrated rural development improve the standard of living for rural households was strongly disputed by just 7% of respondents. Table also looks at the relationship between income and how people perceive the standard of living in rural areas. A significant portion of participants (41%), stated that they believed programs aimed at rural development improved their quality of life. A total of 21% of those polled expressed uncertainty. Only 5.5% of respondents, or a tiny percentage of the sample, said they strongly disagreed with the aforementioned statement. Table also revealed the decomposition of beneficiaries assesses the relationship between respondent age and the elimination of poverty. Across a variety of age categories, the majority of respondents 37.5% said they agreed with the statement, while only 4% strongly disagreed. These results suggest that the majority of respondents agree that integrated rural development programs play a significant role in reducing poverty. The table additionally indicates the relationship between income and the effect of measures for rural development on migration. The suggestion that rural development initiatives are lessening rural population migration to urban and semi-urban areas in quest of jobs was strongly disagreed with by just 8% of respondents. According to Table the majority of respondents across a range of income brackets seem to concur that rural development initiatives are effectively lowering migration to urban and semi-urban areas.

References

1. Raj K. Antyodya Yojna. 2007 Jan;51:63.
2. Chatterjee S. "SGSY: Developing Banking Habits Among Rural Poor." Kurukshetra. 2009 Feb.
3. Basu D. Impact of Rural Development Scheme in H.P. [Ph.D. Thesis]. Shimla: Deptt of Commerce, H.P.U.
4. Jain AK. An unemployment in rural areas. A Journal on Rural Development. 2011 Oct;59:19-21. Kurukshetra.
5. Mahendran A, Indrakant S. Public distribution system in Tamil Nadu, India: Rice supply scheme of prosperous, problems and policy. International Journal

- of Academic Research in Public Policy and Governance. 2014 Jan;1(1).
6. Ganyaih C, Nagrja B. Impact of self help groups on income and employment: A case study. Kurukshetra. 2006 Mar;54(5).
 7. Srinivasan G. Rural development: The main focus. A Journal on Rural Development. 2011 Oct;59:19-21. Kurukshetra.
 8. Diwan P, Upadhyaya R, Maheshwari S. Knowledge of national rural livelihood mission among rural women of Udaipur district. International Journal of Home Science. 2017;631-634.
 9. Boro N. A study on rural women livelihood under the NRLM and its contribution to their socio-economic development with special reference to Goreswar development block, Baksa District [doctoral dissertation]. Assam: Assam Don Bosco University; 2017. p. 1-98.
 10. Sinha A. Livelihood development and diversification. Yojana. 2018;25-29.
 11. Das D. Empowerment of rural women through MGNREGA: A study of MGNREGA implementation in Barpeta Development Block of Barpeta District of Assam. Journal of Critical Reviews. 2020;7(7):334-339.
 12. Kamini, Sumit. National Rural Livelihood Mission and rural woman empowerment with special reference to Dhamtari District of Chhattisgarh. International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts. 2022; ISSN 2320-2882.
 13. Chatterji AK, Durand R, Levine DI, Touboul S. Do ratings of firms converge? Implications for managers, investors and strategy researchers. Strategic management journal. 2016 Aug;37(8):1597-1614.