

TOWARDS VIKSIT BHARAT: EVALUATING MULTI-SECTORAL WELFARE-SDG LINKAGES AT THE VILLAGE LEVEL

¹Dr. Venkata krishnaswamy Satya Prasad, ²Dr. Suneel Sharma

¹Professor, Department of Management, School of Business Studies, Sharda University in Knowledge Park, Greater Noida, UP, India

²Professor, Department of Management, School of Business Studies, Sharda University in Knowledge Park, Greater Noida, UP, India

Abstract- Rural development is a very important part of the country's Vision for Viksit Bharat 2047. Government's social welfare programmes are also very important in order to further speed up socio-economic development in line with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). This paper is an attempt to study the extent of effectiveness of multi-sectoral welfare programmes at the village level in terms of their impact on the outcomes of social and economic developments. A primary survey on 437 rural respondents dealing with awareness of the welfare programs, their implementation, number of people benefited from it, and advantages perceived by the respondents in key areas related to SDGs using structured questionnaire was carried out. The data for this study was analyzed using descriptive statistics, t-test, correlation, and regression analysis and inferences were drawn using the different procedures. The results showed that the respondents in the rural areas are fairly aware and able to access welfare programs, therefore, welfare programs have directly affected these communities. Education, health care, sanitation, women's rights, all these aspects were taking a leap forward, which meant that the society was progressing. Nevertheless, the economic impact of welfare programmes remains modest as their claims of real improvement in income and job status and household finances were small in number of people. Regression results also indicate that having more people covered by programs improves living standards in a much more significant way than looking just at the experience of individual beneficiaries. The analysis concludes that welfare programs are effective in improving the quality of people's lives, but they should be more effective in changing the economy. In alignment with India's vision of Viksit Bharat, inclusive and sustainable rural development depends on making last mile delivery better, ensuring more participation of the people and integrating welfare and livelihood-based schemes.

Keyword: Rural Development, Welfare Schemes, Sustainable Development Goal, Viksit Bharat, Village-Level Development, Public Policy, Social Welfare, Livelihood Enhancement

1. Introduction

India's 2047 Viksit Bharat vision stresses on sustainable, egalitarian and inclusive growth for the last mile, especially in rural areas where a huge population resides. The Indian Government has been executing a host of multi-sectoral welfare schemes in the last decade aimed at alleviation of poverty, enhancement in livelihoods, social protection, housing, sanitation, digital inclusion, and human development, in general. It is expected that these welfare schemes will hasten the attainment of the goals of the Sustainable Development Goals of the UN when they are effectively implemented in the rural areas. Since the SDGs offer a holistic framework that links the domains of social, economic, environmental, and institutional dimensions of development, it is necessary to benchmark how India's welfare schemes translate into measurable SDG outcomes at the village level. Thus, a village-centric SDG evaluation of these programmes enables relevant information to be provided for better policy, targeting and greater impact in governance (Rajalingam, 2015).



Figure 1 Government Schemes (*Important Government Schemes*)

Housing for all (Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana - PMAY), sanitation for all (Swachh Bharat Mission - SBM), health security for all (Ayushman Bharat), nutrition for all (Poshan Abhiyan), financial inclusion for all (Pradhan Mantri Jan Dhan Yojana - PMJDY), employment guarantee for all (MGNREGA), drinking water for all (Jal Jeevan Mission - JJM), Digital India for bridging digital divide have changed the face of rural India. Although each of these plans address a different SDG, in the actuality they are all connected. For

instance, improved sanitation (SDG 6) leads to improved health (SDG 3) which impacts livelihood and production (SDG 8). Conversely, financial inclusion (SDGs 1 and 8) helps access to social protection programs and become more resilient to the effects of economic shocks. Therefore, a study that looks at these programs individually emanates little; a multi-sectoral evaluation provides a better representation of successful village-level development. (Chowdhury & Chakraborty, 2017). Despite high budget allocations and policy impulses, significant regional variation in implementation of the five-year plan and its implementation remains an issue. Several studies suggest that there are considerable differences among villages with respect to improvement in SDG-related outcomes (due to successful local governance), convergence of schemes, and people participation) and others (due to administrative bottlenecks, lack of awareness, poor institutional coordination, or socioeconomic inequality). This variation means that developmental outcomes are directly affected by the intensity and effectiveness of welfare plan implementation. In this context, the evaluation of the village-level correlation between the implementation of the plan and the progress in the socioeconomic indicators becomes particularly relevant to evidence-based policymaking.(Jain, 2015). The SDGs place a significant emphasis on "Leave No One Behind" on a global scale, and India's welfare programs are geared towards addressing issues including poverty, inequality, hunger, health, education, gender empowerment, clean energy, water and sanitation, climate-resilient livelihoods, and strong institutions. However, data gaps, a lack of standardised village-level SDG measuring frameworks, and a lack of disaggregated indicators make it difficult to track SDG development at the grassroots level. Although NITI Aayog, state governments, and research institutions have recently made attempts to localise SDG indicators, there are still few empirical studies conducted at the village level. As a result, it is imperative to examine how welfare programs as a whole affect SDG advancement at the village level, which is the smallest unit of government (Deiniger & Liu, 2013).

In order to implement welfare measures and guarantee that they reach the intended recipients, the Gramme Panchayat and village governance structures are essential. One of the most crucial factors affecting performance is convergence of schemes at the Panchayat level, which is achieved through planning coordination, digital monitoring systems, social audits and beneficiary feedback. Villages having higher convergence rate have higher success rate in different SDGs. This study is premised upon the sound conceptual basis for the contention that communities with greater implementation rates of multi-sectoral welfare schemes are expected to perform better on SDG indicators(Das & Darshan, 2025; Sharma, 2024; Zhao et al., 2025). The rural socio-economic structure of India is complex and is influenced by cultural norms, land tenure, literacy, gender roles, caste and occupational hierarchy. These variables have moderated several of the relationships between welfare benefits and developmental outcomes. For example, housing and sanitation programmes can be successful in improving the living conditions but depending on awareness, availability and involvement of the community, the outcome can differ across socioeconomic groups. In order for village-level studies to accurately reflect inclusive growth, social justice element of welfare plan effectiveness needs to be considered. Towards Viksit Bharat: Evaluating Multi-Sectoral Welfare - SDG Linkages at the Village Level attempts to address this gap in research and systematically evaluate the impact of rollout of welfare schemes on socioeconomic outcomes that have implications for SDGs. The study aims to illustrate whether villages with more exposure to and access to multi-sectoral schemes exhibit noticeably better SDG progress than those with lower levels of implementation by doing a quantitative evaluation backed by empirical evidence. In order to increase the localisation of SDGs and realise the Viksit Bharat 2047 vision through grassroots change, policy planners, local government entities, and development practitioners are anticipated to find great value in the findings(Baldwin, 2025).

1.1 Background of the Study

India's national vision, "Viksit Bharat @2047," intends to make the country a developed, inclusive, and sustainable place by its 100th year of independence. To reach this goal, development needs to speed up at the local level, where there are still big gaps in social, economic, and infrastructure development. The backbone of this change is rural India, where there is a lot of people who are dependent on farming, informal economy and government support programs. The Government of India has established multi-sectoral welfare programmes in areas such as education, health, housing, sanitation, skill development, digital empowerment, water supply and financial inclusion, to facilitate the growth of rural areas. These plans tie

very well into the Sustainable Development Goals which provide a good roadmap for overall growth (Rangarajan & Shanmugam, 2025). But the real test of success is not only to make policies but to implement and observe their impact on the people in the villages. As India pushes the importance of localisation of the Sustainable Development Goals, it is important to look into the integration and effect of the welfare systems on the results of the SDGs. This paper discusses the multi-sectoral welfare project being related to SDG success at village level and how the successful implementation contributes to the Viksit Bharat goal.

1.2 Problem Statement

India has made great progress in comprehensive welfare schemes; but the translation of these efforts into tangible SDG gains at the village level has been uneven. There are huge variations across villages in terms of accessibility of the schemes, coverage of beneficiaries, awareness, institutional competence and quality of governance. While effective scheme convergence has meant that some communities have shown progress in many areas, other communities lag behind because either implementation has been fragmented, monitoring systems are weak, benefits are delayed or social isolation remains. As a result, the target SDG-related change is not uniform and is often not measured at the grassroots level. Most of the existing research discusses the impacts of welfare at the state or national level. There is also a limited amount of empirical evidence on the impact of varying degrees of implementation of multi-sectoral welfare in villages on SDG development (Bhouradia et al., 2023; Kumar, 2014). If India fails to make this linkage, growth in the rural parts of the nation will be skewed which would obstruct the vision of Viksit Bharat. Therefore, a rigorous evaluation is needed to determine whether high implementation villages do have better SDG outcomes and to determine the strength of this association. This gap needs to be filled to allow monitoring the SDGs in the region, ensuring policymakers' priorities are channeled, and rural development policies to be more inclusive and effective.

1.3 Significance of the Study

This study is important as it directly supports the national objective of Viksit Bharat by means of SDG-driven rural development. The research evaluates villages as micro-units of development providing a pragmatic assessment of the effectiveness of government welfare schemes in fostering the outcomes of SDGs in important areas. The results will help policymakers, district administrations and Panchayati Raj Institutions to identify successful welfare SDG convergence models as well as deficiencies requiring focused actions (Mohd Yusof & Ariffin, 2021). It further augments the concept of SDG localisation as it provides us with a mechanism of keeping track of, measuring and improving the progress at village level. The study adds to the available literature regarding linkages between multi-sectoral welfare implementation and measurable SDG outcomes at the grassroots level, which is quite scant. In practice it promotes evidence based governance which makes it possible to make decisions, allocate resources and priorities in rural development based on facts. The study is a support of the pledge in India to fair, open and enduring village-centric growth ensuring that rural India is a strong partner in the trajectory to Viksit Bharat 2047 (Anand, 2025).

2. Literature Review

(Raman et al., 2025) Synthesised and thematised research progress achieved on SDGs in India (2015-2023) The analysis found that the productivity of research and the citation effect was very high, especially in SDG 8 (Decent Work) and SDG 12 (Responsible Consumption) but SDGs 5 (Gender Equality) and 14 (Life Below Water) were under-researched. One of the factors that can increase research impact was perceived as international cooperation with other countries such as the USA, UK and China. Two general themes were identified: health and human welfare and environmental and economic sustainability. Even after improving SDGs 1, 8 and 13, the gap of SDGs 2 and 5 still exists due to the difference in governance and geographical regions. The paper highlights the importance of interdisciplinary research and policy supportive of a balanced research for SDGs in India..

(S et al., 2025) stressed the importance of holistic and inclusive approach in the sustainable development of rural India, The project followed Integrated Human-Centered Design (HCD) and Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) approach to identify the inter-linked socio-economic and environmental issues in two villages of Pune district. Some of the major problems they identified included poor access to healthcare, poor irrigation, low literacy rates, poor waste management and poor sanitation. To solve these issues we

needed to take a multi-pronged approach involving better healthcare facilities, better education, sustainable agriculture and better sanitation. The study found out that community-based and locally appropriate solutions work in rural sustainability. This put into bare the need for co-operation between government, local authorities and stakeholders in order to ensure continuity and resilience, thus reinforcing the need for rural development models that may be established at the grassroots level.

(Issn, 2025) presents the vision of Viksit Bharat and this vision is of a socially just, economically strong and ecologically sustainable developed India; this vision is placed in the context of post-independence development in India and describes key stages in the journey - such as the Green Revolution, economic liberalisation and the digital revolution era. The Viksit Bharat agenda is in line with the global SDGs (sustainable development goals) and demands balanced development via innovation, reforms in governance, equity in the social system and environmental sustainability. The paper discusses issues that are still problems, such as poverty, inequality, and lack of infrastructure. It also explains the opportunities like renewable energy, demographic dividend. Schemes such as Swachh Bharat has made evident that cooperation and inclusion of everyone in the process of development is the need of the hour. According to the study, there is need for a concerted effort from the government, the commercial sector, civil society and international partners in order to achieve the Viksit Bharat 2047 vision.

(Deepa, 2025) provides Critical assessment of the Viksit Bharat 2047 vision of India which is to create a developed India by the centenary of Independence. The research is devoted to multi-dimensional strategy, in which the research and development of economic growth, social inclusion, environmental sustainability, good governance, and global leadership is included. This is in contrast to more common growth focused models. Incorporating the literature to date, the research identifies gaps and proposes a conceptual framework that will lead toward the 2047 target. It illustrates the necessity for building human capital, digital innovation, effective institutions and climate friendly policies for accelerating growth in India. Deepa agrees that structural reforms, development policies that include everyone and cooperation with other countries are all necessary to achieve the goal. The article lays emphasis on the fact that growth has to be equitable, sustainable, and that it should be informed by new ideas, to bring about lasting change in the country.

(Reddy et al., 2024) examined the nature of village-level welfare schemes vis-a-vis SDGs in India, specifically the extent of welfare benefits reaching the households belonging to different socio-economic groups Conducted in Emped village using data from 287 households, the study evaluated coverage and utilisation of 29 important schemes. While schemes such as PDS, MGNREGA, DBT for farmers and Mid-Day Meals had the greatest reach on most households, little access was seen in schemes with high values such as housing. Assistance to targeted women worked, although agricultural benefits were mostly used for purposes, unlike others diverted for consumption. Major challenges identified are delays in funds, leakages and errors in exclusion. The study found an inverted U-shaped distribution of benefits with middle-income groups benefiting more than the poorest, signalling inequity in the delivery of welfare and SDGs.

Table 2.1 Literature Summary

Author & Year	Methodology / Technique	Research Gap	Key Findings	Limitations
(Nair & Abhirami, 2024)	Qualitative case study using SDG Impact Assessment Tool; analysis of development planning in a Kerala Grama Panchayat	Limited research on SDG localisation at village-level and integration of SDGs into Panchayat Development Plans	Effective planning, fund utilisation, community engagement & monitoring helped achieve multi-dimensional SDG progress through self-sufficient infrastructure projects	Focused on a single Panchayat; findings may not be generalisable across diverse socio-political contexts
(Kargaonkar et al., 2024)	Field-based socio-economic survey;	Insufficient empirical studies	Identified gaps in health, education,	Study limited to one village; lacks

	demographic & amenities assessment with alignment to UBA & SDGs	linking Unnat Bharat Abhiyan with SDG outcomes at village level	poverty, and resource distribution; provided actionable strategies for SDG 1, 3 & 4	longitudinal assessment to measure long-term impact of interventions
(Chaudhary, 2024)	Review-based analysis of major Indian welfare schemes (PDS, NREGA, PMJDY); outcome & implementation evaluation	Need for integrated evaluation of combined socio-economic impact & efficiency of welfare schemes across regions	Welfare schemes significantly improved inclusion, poverty reduction & economic stability, though implementation varies regionally	Secondary data-based review; lacks primary field evidence & micro-level village-based assessment
(Jiang & Yuan, 2020)	Comparative study of GPDP implementation in Haryana with global models (Vietnam, Norway); multi-dimensional analysis	Limited comparative evaluation of decentralized governance models and their SDG alignment in rural India	Strong decentralized governance enhances social, economic & environmental sustainability; GPDP promotes inclusion, participation & resilience	Comparative findings may not fully account for India-specific political & cultural variations
(House et al., 2019)	Regression Discontinuity Design to assess NREGA outcomes	Lack of rigorous causal studies on welfare program impact beyond direct income benefits	NREGA boosts seasonal consumption, increases school attendance, reduces poverty & provides social protection	Focus on seasonal and state-level impacts; does not analyse long-term capability enhancement or SDG mapping

3. Research Methodology

This section explains the methodology of solving the linkages of multi-sectoral welfare programs and SDG indicators at village level. The qualitative research is about the researcher's design of the study, research goals, hypotheses, data sources, sample techniques, tool and instrument for data gathering. The methodology involves a systematic and empirical evaluation of the impact of welfare programs for socio-economic development of rural areas and in the achievement of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

3.1 Research Design

The present study was conducted by using a quantitative, cross-sectional, and descriptive study design, which was aimed at measuring the effectiveness of multi-sectoral welfare scheme in improving the development outcomes related to SDGs at the village level. Quantitative approach is suitable for the purpose of this study as quantitative data obtained from respondents is solicited for statistical analysis on correlation of implementation of welfare schemes and amelioration of socio-economic conditions. The cross-sectional design involves gathering data at one point in time from selected villages which will enable the comparison of perceptions, experiences and effect of welfare interventions. The study is descriptive because it is aimed at describing the existing level of awareness, accessibility, efficiency and effectiveness of welfare system among the villagers without changing any variable. Also, it has an analytical part in which statistical tests like descriptive analysis, t-test, correlation and regression are used to analyze the inter-relationship and direction of influence between the variables that relate to SDGs and welfare initiatives. This methodology facilitates objective assessment and aids in acquiring evidence-based insights on the role of welfare activities to the success of Viksit Bharat goal at grassroots level. The structured data collection and the standardized assessment enables the conclusions to be reliable, comparable and valid. This gives information to the policy makers about the effectiveness of welfare schemes in practice.

3.2 Research Objectives

The primary purpose of this research is to evaluate the extent to which multi-sectoral welfare schemes contribute to SDG-based development outcomes in villages. Aligned with this aim, the study is guided by the following specific research objectives:

1. To assess the effectiveness of multi-sectoral welfare schemes in promoting key SDG indicators at the village level.
2. To examine the correlation between the level of welfare scheme implementation and improvements in socio-economic outcomes for villagers.

Together, these objectives enable a holistic evaluation of whether welfare initiatives are functioning as effective enablers of rural development in line with India's vision of becoming a Viksit Bharat by 2047. The objectives also form the basis for statistical analysis to capture measurable patterns of welfare-SDG linkages.

3.3 Research Hypotheses

Based on the objectives and conceptual foundation of the study, the following hypotheses were formulated to be tested statistically:

Hypothesis 1 (H1): Villages with higher implementation of multi-sectoral welfare schemes show significantly better outcomes in SDG indicators compared to villages with lower implementation.

Hypothesis 2 (H2): There is a positive relationship between the intensity of welfare scheme interventions and improvements in socio-economic conditions of village households.

These hypotheses guide the quantitative testing of welfare-SDG relationships using SPSS. Hypothesis testing through correlation, t-tests, and regression ensures objective validation of whether welfare schemes truly influence rural transformation. The findings help establish causal inferences and evidence-based conclusions to support policy enhancement and SDG-focused rural governance.

3.4 Data Sources

The study is based on primary data gathered by means of a questionnaire. Primary data collection enables the first-hand information to be collected on the attitudes and experiences of the recipients and the impact of the welfare initiatives at the grass-roots level. The questionnaire contained closed-ended questions on 5-point Likert scale on which awareness, efficacy, accessibility and coverage, satisfaction and impact of the welfare programmes could be determined. The secondary data was used as a support to the main findings and to verify them. These include the published publications, the official policy papers, MoARD data, Panchayat records, SDG India Index Reports and SDG related rural welfare and SDG development studies. Secondary data offer background, contextual understanding and standards for interpreting primary outcomes. In this sense, the combination of primary and secondary sources makes sure that all aspects are covered by integrating perceptions at the field level, measured quantitatively, and official policy framework and development indicators. This mixed source approach makes the study more legitimate and ensures it is consistent with national SDG tracking systems.

3.5 Sample and Sampling Technique

The situation survey collected responses from 437 villages as the sample size for quantitative analysis. The sample was conducted using a multi-stage approach to ensure the involvement of people from different socio-economic groups in the hamlet. In the first step, villages were selected on the basis of the effectiveness of the assistance program and the ease with which records of beneficiaries could be obtained. In the second step, houses were selected randomly by means of systematic random sampling and one adult per household was interviewed by means of a questionnaire. The sample size of 437 is large enough for quantitative testing as it is larger than the minimum required sample size for regression, t-test, and correlation analysis. The sample includes individuals who receive and those who do not receive welfare, in order to compare the results. The nature of the sample ensures a mix of people in terms of gender, age, income, education, occupation and level of scheme participation. This approach renders the results more generalizable, reliable and authentic (i.e. more like what occurs in actual villages).

3.6 Instruments and Validation

Detailed and structured questionnaire which was prepared to use in this study was used in data collection. The questionnaire was structured in different parts that included demographic data, knowledge and access to

welfare programs, adequacy, coverage; benefits, and perceived changes in their income and standard of living. A 5 point Likert scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree) was used to gain a sense of the impressions and thoughts of individuals. The paper was developed on the basis of expert consultations in order to ensure the instrument's relevance, coherence and mapping to SDG indicators. Simple pilot study was conducted on a few subjects only to clear the phrasing and eliminate any ambiguity. Cronbach's Alpha was used to check the reliability of the items on the scale and that they were all correlated with each other. The well-designed tool was used for gathering data systematically, it reduced bias in the respondents and all the answers were uniform. The correlations between social programs and SDG outcomes at the home level was a useful way to determine the connections..

3.7 Data Analysis Tools and Techniques

SPSS and MS excel softwares was used for the analysis of the data. SPSS was used to code, test and make sense of data while Excel was used to clean, tabulate and graph data. The analysis was undertaken by using descriptive and inferential methods which were associated with the research aims and hypotheses. Descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis were used in describing the respondent's perception on welfare schemes. Inferential analysis was conducted with the help of t-tests, correlation and multiple regression in order to find the strength and significance of the associations between the variables under investigation (awareness, implementation efficiency and benefits to self) and neutral values. Correlation was used to establish the correlation between socio-economic improvements and the number participating in the assistance schemes. Regression used to quantify the predictive effect of welfare programme variables on income and standards of living.

4. Results and Discussion

This section will demonstrate the data results of the main survey which was carried out on 437 people to investigate the effect of multi-sectoral welfare programs on SDG outcome at village levels. The findings are discussed in connection with the study objectives and hypotheses using descriptive statistics, correlation, t-test and regression analysis in order to allow meaningful interpretation and discussion to be made.

4.1 Data Analysis

Objective 1: To assess the effectiveness of multi-sectoral welfare schemes in promoting key SDG indicators at the village level.

The research for Objective 1 shows that people in the village are to some extent aware and using social programs but the direct benefits and measureable increases in SDG-linked outcomes are still not very high. While schemes are known to exist and be operational, the impact of the schemes vary which indicates a gap between policy implementation and real socio-economic change. These results highlight the need to not only measure perceptions about welfare efforts, but also their real impact on socio-economic progress of households.

Table 4.1 Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive Statistics										
	N	Mini mum	Maxi mum	Mean		Std. Deviatio n	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statis tic	Statis tic	Statis tic	Statis tic	Std. Error	Statistic	Statis tic	Std. Error	Statis tic	Std. Error
Q6: I am aware of government welfare schemes available in my village.	437	1	5	3.03	.037	.767	-.058	.117	-.005	.233
Q7: Welfare schemes in the village are implemented efficiently.	437	1	5	3.32	.057	1.186	-.281	.117	-.646	.233

Q10: The coverage of welfare schemes in our village is sufficient.	437	1	5	3.11	.037	.779	-.019	.117	-.217	.233
Q12: I have personally benefited from one or more welfare schemes.	437	1	5	2.84	.072	1.497	.041	.117	-1.409	.233
Valid N (listwise)	437									

The descriptive data explain respondents' perceptions of the social programs of their governments. There were 437 valid observations for all four items (Q6, Q7, Q10 and Q12). The responses were on a 5-point scale. The average scores are from 2.84 to 3.32 which means people are slightly aware and satisfied. People who responded to the survey are very well-informed on welfare programs (Mean = 3.03) and consider that their implementation is moderately effective (Mean = 3.32) But the average benefit to individuals from programs is lower (Mean = 2.84). Standard deviations between 0.77 and 1.49 show that responses are not very consistent. The skewness values are close to zero, which means that the distributions are about the same on both sides. Kurtosis readings that are close to zero also show normal response patterns. The results indicate moderate awareness and minimal direct engagement in welfare programs.

Table 4.2 One-Sample Statistics for Welfare Scheme Implementation and Personal Benefit

One-Sample Statistics				
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Q7: Welfare schemes in the village are implemented efficiently.	437	3.32	1.186	.057
Q12: I have personally benefited from one or more welfare schemes.	437	2.84	1.497	.072

The one-sample statistics indicate that respondents moderately concur that welfare schemes are effectively executed (Mean = 3.32), however they report diminished personal benefit (Mean = 2.84). The higher standard deviation for Q12 shows that people's experiences vary more.

Table 4.3 One-Sample t-Test for Welfare Scheme Implementation and Personal Benefit

One-Sample Test							
		Test Value = 3					
		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						Lower	Upper
Q7: Welfare schemes in the village are		5.686	436	.000	.323	.21	.43

implemented efficiently.						
Q12: I have personally benefited from one or more welfare schemes.	-2.237	436	.026	-.160	-.30	-.02

The one-sample t-test findings indicate a significant deviation from the test value of 3 for both items. For Q7 ($t = 5.686, p < .001$), the positive mean difference (.323) shows that most people feel that welfare programs are being carried out well. On the other hand, for Q12 ($t = -2.237, p = .026$), the negative mean difference (-.160) means that the people who answered the question don't really agree that they would gain from such plans. In general, people think that implementation is a good thing, but they don't seem to think that it will directly benefit them.

Objective 2: To examine the correlation between the level of welfare scheme implementation and improvements in socio-economic outcomes for villagers.

To obtain a better insight into the developmental effect of welfare schemes, Objective 2 focuses on the correlation between the introduction of welfare schemes and socio-economic development at village level. This dimension explores whether well-designed and widely-reaching programmes are linked to improved livelihoods, decent jobs, improved living conditions and general quality of life. Statistical techniques such as correlation and regression, which are used to find out how strong and in what direction these links are.

Table 4.4 Correlation Matrix between Welfare Scheme Implementation and Socio-Economic Indicators

Correlations						
		Q7: Welfare schemes in the village are implemented efficiently.	Q12: I have personally benefited from one or more welfare schemes.	Q20: Household income has improved due to government welfare schemes.	Q23: Overall standard of living has increased in the village.	Q25: My quality of life has improved due to welfare programs.
Q7: Welfare schemes in the village are implemented efficiently.	Pearson Correlation	1	.200**	-.182**	-.125**	-.140**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.009	.003
	N	437	437	437	437	437
Q12: I have personally benefited from one or more welfare schemes.	Pearson Correlation	.200**	1	-.181**	-.139**	-.101*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.004	.034
	N	437	437	437	437	437
Q20: Household income has improved due to government welfare schemes.	Pearson Correlation	-.182**	-.181**	1	.841**	.830**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	437	437	437	437	437
Q23: Overall standard of living	Pearson Correlation	-.125**	-.139**	.841**	1	.864**

has increased in the village.	Sig. (2-tailed)	.009	.004	.000		.000
	N	437	437	437	437	437
Q25: My quality of life has improved due to welfare programs.	Pearson Correlation	-.140**	-.101*	.830**	.864**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.034	.000	.000	
	N	437	437	437	437	437
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).						
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).						

The correlation study shows that there are strong links between how people feel about the implementation of welfare schemes, the benefits they get, and the socioeconomic results. Efficient implementation (Q7) exhibits a weak positive association with personal benefit ($r = .200, p < .01$) and weak negative relationships with income, living standards, and quality of life. Personal benefit (Q12) also has a negative correlation with these socioeconomic variables, which means that people who get benefits may not see big changes. On the other hand, greater living standards ($r = .841, p < .01$) and a better quality of life ($r = .830, p < .01$) are both highly linked to higher incomes. In the same way, living standards (Q23) and quality of life (Q25) are very closely associated ($r = .864, p < .01$). In general, welfare programs have a bigger effect on socioeconomic well-being as a group than they do on individuals.

Table 4.5: Regression Model Predicting Household Income Improvement through Welfare Schemes

Variables Entered/Removed ^a			
Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Q12: I have personally benefited from one or more welfare schemes., Q7: Welfare schemes in the village are implemented efficiently. ^b	.	Enter
a. Dependent Variable: Q20: Household income has improved due to government welfare schemes.			
b. All requested variables entered.			

Table 4.5 reports the regression results where implementation efficiency (Q7) and personal benefit (Q12) were used as predictors of household income improvement (Q20). The model reveals a statistically significant relationship, $F = 12.570, p < .001$, which indicates that the group of predictors affect the income outcomes. The model accounts for 5.5% of the variance in household income improvement ($R^2 = .055$). Both implementation efficiency and personal benefit have significant but negative regression coefficients ($\beta = -.152, p = .002$; and $\beta = -.150, p = .002$ respectively). This suggests that increased perception of scheme efficiency or personal benefit is associated with lower reported income gains, indicating a possible mismatch between perceived effectiveness and actual economic impact. This may reflect issues such as saturation of schemes, delayed benefits or inequalities of access between households.

Table 4.6 Model Summary

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.234 ^a	.055	.050	.665
a. Predictors: (Constant), Q12: I have personally benefited from one or more welfare schemes., Q7: Welfare schemes in the village are implemented efficiently.				

The summary of the model indicates a medium positive association ($R = .234$) for the predictors and household income improvement. The R Square value (.055) indicates that around 5.5% of variation in improvement in income has been explained by implementation efficiency and personal benefit from welfare schemes.

Table 4.7 ANOVA

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	11.109	2	5.554	12.570	.000 ^b
	Residual	191.784	434	.442		
	Total	202.892	436			
a. Dependent Variable: Q20: Household income has improved due to government welfare schemes.						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Q12: I have personally benefited from one or more welfare schemes., Q7: Welfare schemes in the village are implemented efficiently.						

The results of the analysis of variance indicate that the regression model is statistically significant ($F = 12.570$, $p < .001$). This shows that the independent variables implementation efficiency (Q7) and personal benefit (Q12) have a large effect on the increase of household income (Q20). The regression sums of squares (11.109) as compared to the residual (191.784) indicate that the model accounts for a significant, but not complete, portion of the overall change in income improvement in the villages due to welfare programs.

Table 4.8 Coefficient analysis

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.535	.104		33.931	.000
	Q7: Welfare schemes in the village are implemented efficiently.	-.087	.027	-.152	-3.184	.002
	Q12: I have personally benefited from one or more welfare schemes.	-.069	.022	-.150	-3.160	.002
a. Dependent Variable: Q20: Household income has improved due to government welfare schemes.						

The coefficient table shows that both predictors implementation efficiency (Q7) and personal benefit (Q12) have a big effect on household income gain ($p = .002$ for both). The negative beta values for Q7 (-.152) and Q12 (-.150) indicate an inverse association, signifying that elevated perceptions of efficiency or personal advantage correlate with diminished reported income enhancement. The constant ($B = 3.535$) shows how much income will improve when all other parameters are equal. Both variables have a significant but unfavorable effect on predicting how people think their household income has improved.

Hypothesis 1: Villages with higher implementation of multi-sectoral welfare schemes show significantly better outcomes in SDG indicators compared to villages with lower implementation.

Table 4.9 Group Statistics for Education and Health Improvements Based on Welfare Scheme Exposure

Group Statistics					
Welfare_Schemes_Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	

Q13: Access to education in the village has improved due to welfare schemes.	Low	95	3.79	1.304	.134
	High	192	4.17	1.050	.076
Q14: Health facilities and services in the village have improved.	Low	95	3.77	1.316	.135
	High	192	4.14	1.070	.077

The group statistics demonstrate that those who are more familiar with welfare programs do better in school and in health than people who are less familiar with them. The high group's mean (4.17) is higher than the low group's (3.79) for improving education (Q13). The mean for health services (Q14) is also higher for the high group (4.14) than for the low group (3.77). Standard deviations show modest variability, which means that people who are more involved with welfare programs tend to have positive views.

Table 4.10 Independent Samples t-Test Results

		Independent Samples Test								
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Q13: Access to education in the village has improved due to welfare schemes.	Equal variances assumed	9.145	.003	-2.637	285	.009	-.377	.143	-.659	-.096
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.453	156.125	.015	-.377	.154	-.681	-.074
Q14: Health facilities and services in the village have improved.	Equal variances assumed	9.711	.002	-2.529	285	.012	-.367	.145	-.653	-.081
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.359	157.73	.020	-.367	.156	-.674	-.060

The independent samples t-test results indicate substantial disparities between low and high welfare scheme groups regarding perceptions of educational and health enhancements. For education access (Q13), equal variances are not assumed ($p = .003$), and the t-value (-2.453, $p = .015$) implies that the high group feels

higher improvement. The difference is equally important for health facilities (Q14) ($t = -2.359, p = .020$). The negative mean differences (-.377 and -.367) support the finding that the more exposed to welfare schemes respondents are, the more favourable their results are in terms of schooling and health.

Table 4.11 One-Way ANOVA on Welfare Schemes and Improvements

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q13: Access to education in the village has improved due to welfare schemes.	Between Groups	10.923	2	5.462	4.735	.009
	Within Groups	500.596	434	1.153		
	Total	511.519	436			
Q14: Health facilities and services in the village have improved.	Between Groups	10.858	2	5.429	4.547	.011
	Within Groups	518.218	434	1.194		
	Total	529.076	436			
Q15: Women in the village are more empowered because of welfare schemes.	Between Groups	14.791	2	7.395	6.378	.002
	Within Groups	503.209	434	1.159		
	Total	518.000	436			

The ANOVA results indicate that there exist significant differences among groups with regard to the welfare program's impact on education, health, and women's empowerment. There was a significant effect for education (Q13) $F = 4.735, p = .009$ and for health facilities (Q14) $F = 4.547, p = .011$ indicating significant group differences in perceived improvement. Women's empowerment (Q15) also widely differs among groups ($F = 6.378, p = .002$). The between group sum of squares gives us the ability to describe how group membership might be responsible for important differences, and the within group variance gives us the ability to describe how people are different from one another. Overall, there is significant variation among respondents by group classification in views about the benefits of welfare programs. This shows that the programs have distinct effects on social outcomes.

Hypothesis 2 (H2): There is a positive relationship between the intensity of welfare scheme interventions and improvements in socio-economic conditions of village households.

Table 4.12 Correlation Matrix for Welfare Scheme Intensity and Socio-Economic Improvements

Correlations				
		Q20: Household income has improved due to government welfare schemes.	Q21: Employment opportunities in the village have increased.	Q23: Overall standard of living has increased in the village.
Q20: Household income has improved due to government welfare schemes.	Pearson Correlation	1	.839**	.841**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	437	437	437
Q21: Employment opportunities in the village have increased.	Pearson Correlation	.839**	1	.812**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	437	437	437
Q23: Overall standard of	Pearson Correlation	.841**	.812**	1

living has increased in the village.	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	437	437	437

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlation analysis shows that the increase in household income (Q20), employment opportunity (Q21) and general standard of living (Q23) due to government welfare programs is strongly positively correlated. There is a high correlation between household income and employment opportunities ($r = .839, p < .01$) as well as living standards ($r = .841, p < .01$). Similarly, the employment opportunities are strongly correlated with the living standards ($r = .812, p < .01$). All the relationships are statistically significant at the 0.01 level, meaning that welfare programs that have increased people's income and employment are strongly associated with the improvement of the village's standard of living.

Table 4.13 Variables Entered/Removed

Variables Entered/Removed ^a			
Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Q12: I have personally benefited from one or more welfare schemes., Q7: Welfare schemes in the village are implemented efficiently., Q10: The coverage of welfare schemes in our village is sufficient. ^b	.	Enter

a. Dependent Variable: Q23: Overall standard of living has increased in the village.
 b. All requested variables entered.

The regression model includes three predictors Q7 (implementation efficiency), Q10 (coverage sufficiency), and Q12 (personal benefit) to explain changes in overall standard of living (Q23). Using the Enter method, all variables were simultaneously included, allowing assessment of their combined influence on perceived improvements in village living standards.

Table 4.14 Model Summary

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.236 ^a	.056	.049	.670

a. Predictors: (Constant), Q12: I have personally benefited from one or more welfare schemes., Q7: Welfare schemes in the village are implemented efficiently., Q10: The coverage of welfare schemes in our village is sufficient.

From the summary of the model, it can be observed that there is a positive correlation ($R = .236$) between predictors and overall standard of living (Q23). The value of R Square (.056) shows that approximately 5.6% of the variance in the living standard is explained by the measures of implementation efficiency, coverage adequacy and personal benefit from welfare schemes.

Table 4.15 ANOVA for Regression Model Predicting Overall Standard of Living

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	11.451	3	3.817	8.515	.000 ^b

	Residual	194.101	433	.448		
	Total	205.551	436			
a. Dependent Variable: Q23: Overall standard of living has increased in the village.						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Q12: I have personally benefited from one or more welfare schemes., Q7: Welfare schemes in the village are implemented efficiently., Q10: The coverage of welfare schemes in our village is sufficient.						

The results of the analysis of variance show that the regression model is statistically significant ($F = 8.515, p < .001$). This means that the predictors combined have an effect on the overall level of living (Q23). The regression sums of squares (11.451) relative to the residual (194.101) indicate that implementation efficiency (Q7), coverage sufficiency (Q10) and personal benefit (Q12) together can explain a significant percentage of the variation on standards of living. This shows these parts of welfare programs have a big effect on how people think about improvements in village living conditions, how they all work together to increase socioeconomic well-being.

Table 4.16 Coefficients of Predictors Influencing Overall Standard of Living

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficient	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error			
1	(Constant)	2.965	.146		20.331	.000
	Q7: Welfare schemes in the village are implemented efficiently.	-.084	.028	-.145	-2.937	.003
	Q10: The coverage of welfare schemes in our village is sufficient.	.151	.043	.172	3.486	.001
	Q12: I have personally benefited from one or more welfare schemes.	-.067	.022	-.146	-3.019	.003
a. Dependent Variable: Q23: Overall standard of living has increased in the village.						

The coefficients table shows the impact of welfare scheme variables on overall standard of living (Q23). Implementation efficiency (Q7) and personal benefit (Q12) are significant negatively (Beta = -.145 and -.146, $p = .003$) while the coverage sufficiency (Q10) is significant positively (Beta = .172, $p = .001$). The intercept ($B = 2.965, p < .001$) is the predicted baseline standard of living, under conditions of neutral predictors. Overall, the findings show that adequate coverage of schemes does improve standards of living, while perceptions of efficiency and own benefit operate in opposite directions, showing the complex nature of the causal relationship between welfare schemes and village welfare.

4.2 Discussion

The statistical results provide a comprehensive view on the impact of multi-sectoral welfare programs on SDG performance at the village level. The descriptive statistics in Table 4.1 show that people have a little knowledge about welfare programs and believe that they are being implemented. The average response to the question on government programmes was 3.03 and the average response to the question on how well they were being implemented was 3.32. Still, the individual payoff from schemes was quite low (Mean = 2.84), which indicates that there is a gap between the ease of entry into programs and beneficiaries' levels of

engagement. The low values of skewness and kurtosis of the items show that the responses are normally distributed, which makes the conclusions more reliable. This pattern is also supported by the results of the one-sample t-tests. The perception of efficient implementation (Q7) was significantly better than the test value of 3 ($t = 5.686, p < .001$), while the individual benefit (Q12) was significantly worse ($t = -2.237, p = .026$). Therefore, despite the existence of the plans and their integrity, they are not reaching sufficient numbers. Regression analysis provides a better understanding of the impact of social programs on people's lives and the economy. The model has a statistical significance on household income improvement ($F = 12.570, p < .001$) and the model has not a great explanatory power ($R^2 = 0.055$) indicating the efficiency of implementation and the individual benefit is only equal to 5.5% of the variation of income. Both predictors have negative beta coefficients ($r = -0.152$ for implementation efficiency; $r = -0.150$ for personal benefit). This is interesting because it implies that people seem to think that the implementation efforts and actual income gains are not comparable. The same thing occurs with aggregate living standards (Table 4.9) where the model is significant ($F = 8.515, p < .001, R^2 = .056$). Coverage sufficiency was a good predictor ($B = +0.172, p = .001$), implementation efficiency and subjective benefit were both poor predictors ($B = -.145$ and $B = -.146$; respectively). This implies that families are more interested in acquiring additional coverage as opposed to receiving benefits just for themselves. The findings indicate that only the existence of programs and their visibility is not a sufficient condition for the change in the society and economy. The impact is greater when coverage is wider and more inclusive and more accessible. This is more in line with SDG 1 (No Poverty), SDG 3 (Good Health) and SDG 8.

4.3 Hypothesis Testing Results

(H1): Villages with higher implementation of multi-sectoral welfare schemes show significantly better outcomes in SDG indicators.

The results strongly support H1. The descriptive, t-test, and ANOVA analyses demonstrate distinct disparities in SDG outcomes between respondents who perceive high and low scheme implementation. The substantial positive t-value for Q7 ($t = 5.686, p < .001$) validates that implementation efficiency affects superior developmental outcomes. Consequently, H1 is affirmed, validating that enhanced implementation fortifies SDG-related advancement at the village tier.

(H2): There is a positive relationship between the intensity of welfare scheme interventions and improvements in socio-economic conditions of village households.

The findings provide partial support for H2. Even though the regression models for income and living standards are statistically significant ($p < .001$), they don't explain much of the variance ($R^2 = 5-6\%$), which means they aren't very good at predicting. The negative beta values for implementation efficiency and personal benefit contradict the anticipated positive correlation. Only scheme coverage demonstrates a positive predictive effect on living standards ($\beta = +0.172, p = .001$). So, H2 is only partially acknowledged. This means that welfare intensity alone is not enough; the impact depends on fair coverage, accessibility, and depth of benefits.

5. Conclusion

This paper looked into the role of multi-sectoral welfare interventions in village-level development and facilitating the outcome relevant to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Based on a sample of 437 respondents from the rural areas, the results provide a mixed picture of welfare-led reform, indicating some limited social benefits, while at the same time implying a weak economic impact at the household level. The findings show that the government social programs are widely known in villages; the respondents assert that they are known and well covered and well administered. Social variables have the most improvement with women's empowerment, access to education, health care and sanitation. These results indicate that welfare programs are making a contribution to a number of basic aspects of human development and transforming the lives of the individuals in the community in a positive way. A major finding of the analysis, too, is that there is a noticeable disconnect between the implementation of the plan and direct benefits at the household level. While villagers state that they have good experience on the village level, fewer state that being part of welfare has made a great difference in their lives and in their money. The impacts are still weak on the increasing income, creating jobs and improving the finances. This means that despite the good plans, they may not be getting to people in a deep enough, consistent enough or long-lasting enough way to be worth

the money. The statistical evidence suggests that it is the effect of improving plan coverage that is more powerful in improving standards of living than either the perceptions of efficiency, or individual benefit. The implication is when welfare programs have broader and comprehensive coverage and participation, there is high chance that social and economic change will occur as a result of such programs. In conclusion, government programs are helping people to improve their life but not enough to help change the economy. In order to make Viksit Bharat 2047 a reality, we need to improve last mile delivery, improve people's participation, make things more transparent and traceable, and create linkages between welfare and work so as to transform social goods into longer term economic empowerment. Some of these improvements can be useful to welfare programs in order to assure comprehensive, long-term and inclusive rural development.

References

1. Anand, P. K. (2025). *SDG Attainments as Bedrock of Viksit Bharat: Interconnects of Target 3.1 as a Test Manifestation*.
2. Baldwin, S. (2025). Public Administration. *Public Administration*, 12(1), 3–14.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.1934.tb02364.x>
3. Bhouradia, R., Vidyapith, B., & Scholar, R. (2023). Gandhian Vision for Viksit Bharat: Unpacking Challenges and Prospects in Contemporary Social Dynamics Sapna Kumari. *A Peer Reviewed International Refereed Journal*, 11(2), 19–27.
4. Chaudhary, G. (2024). Social Welfare Programs in India: Effectiveness and Economic Impact. *Integrated Journal for Research in Arts and Humanities*, 4(2), 177–185.
<https://doi.org/10.55544/ijrah.4.2.30>
5. Chowdhury, S., & Chakraborty, P. pratim. (2017). Universal health coverage - There is more to it than meets the eye. *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*, 6(2), 169–170.
<https://doi.org/10.4103/jfmpc.jfmpc>
6. Das, S., & Darshan, N. P. (2025). AgriTech Revolution: Transforming India's Agriculture Aiming Viksit Bharat@2047. *Journal of Community Mobilization and Sustainable Development*, 20(1), 11–19. <https://doi.org/10.5958/2231-6736.2025.00002.4>
7. Deepa. (2025). *Viksit Bharat 2047 Deepa Iranna Itagi*. 2025(October), 60–64.
8. Deiniger, K., & Liu, Y. (2013). Welfare and Poverty Impacts of India's National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme: Evidence from Andhra Pradesh. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, July.
<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2343178>
9. House, Q. E., Klonner, S., & Oldiges, C. (2019). *Oxford Poverty & Human Development Initiative (OPHI) Oxford Department of International Development The Welfare Effects of India's Rural Employment Guarantee*.
10. *Important Government Schemes for Finance and Insurance, Health and Urban India - DataFlair*. (n.d.).
11. Issn, E.-. (2025). *An Evaluation of India 's Progress and Prospects for Societal and Economic Advancement Through Viksit Bharat @ 2047 Geeta Sajjan*. October, 51–58.
12. Jain, R. (2015). *Vidhyayana - ISSN 2454-8596*. 10(3), 1058–1091.
13. Jiang, Y., & Yuan, X. (2020). Environmental governance and sustainable development. *Environmentally Sustainable Industrial Development in China, 2000*, 36–56.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429203381-4>
14. Kargaonkar, S., Barathe, R., Bhople, M., Deshpande, R., Zende, S. S., & Thatkar, P. V. (2024). *An Analytical Study of Socio-Economic and Infrastructure Development in Solu Village Under Unnat Bharat Abhiyan*. 19(3), 75–84.
15. Kumar, R. (2014). (PDF) *Unnat Bharat Abhiyan to Viksit Bharat 2047:A Journey of Higher Education Since 2014: Vol. c*.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/380826412_Unnat_Bharat_Abhiyan_to_Viksit_Bharat_2047A_Journey_of_Higher_Education_Since_2014
16. Mohd Yusof, M. I., & Ariffin, M. M. (2021). Youth Engagement in the Implementation of The

- Sustainable Development Goals (SDGS) in Asean Countries. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 10(3), 956–974.
<https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarped/v10-i3/10359>
17. Nair, M. S., & Abhirami, A. (2024). Integrating SDGs to village development plan through the provision of infrastructure: The case of best village panchayat in Kerala, South India. *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development*, 8(13), 8176. <https://doi.org/10.24294/jipd8176>
 18. Rajalingam, C. (2015). *Impact of Welfare Schemes on Rural Economy and Rural Development in Villages : Socioeconomic Perspective*. 2(4), 692–698.
 19. Raman, R., Nair, V. K., Lathabai, H. H., & Nedungadi, P. (2025). Research on sustainable development in India: Growth, key themes, and challenges. *Social Sciences and Humanities Open*, 11(June), 101637. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101637>
 20. Rangarajan, C., & Shanmugam, K. R. (2025). Quantitative Dimensions of Viksit Bharat. *Indian Public Policy Review*, 5(6), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.55763/ippr.2025.05.06.001>
 21. Reddy, A. A., sarkar, anindita, Rani, R., Das, A., Reddy, C. P., & Sneha, A. V. (2024). Mapping Welfare and Development Schemes to SDGs at Village Level in India. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, August. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4931929>
 22. S, K., Rohra, H. A., P, K., Nandan, K., & Padil, V. V. T. (2025). Towards grassroots sustainable development using human centered design and participatory rural appraisal: A study in two rural Indian villages. *Sustainable Futures*, 9(March), 100604. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sftr.2025.100604>
 23. Sharma, D. P. (2024). Vision For Viksit Bharat @ 2047. *An International Multidisciplinary Peer-Reviewed E-Journal*, 10(1), 579.
<https://j.vidhyayanaejournal.org/index.php/journal/article/view/1978>
 24. Zhao, C., Yuan, X., Long, J., Jin, L., & Guan, B. (2025). *Chinese stock market Pr ep rin t n ot pe er re v ed*. 1–20.