CAHIERS MAGELLANES-NS
Volume 06 Issue 2
2024

ISSN:1624-1940
DOI 10.6084/m9.figshare.2631195
http://magellanes.com/

SCHEMES OF GOVERNMENT OF INDIA IN ALLEVIATING POVERTY

Mrs Atika Mustafa[1*], Dr Shujau ddin Khan[2]

[1*]Research Scholar, Department of Commerce and Business Management, Integral University, Lucknow. (IUL MCN No. IU/R&D/2024-MCN0002882)
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce and Business Management, Integral University, Lucknow.

***Corresponding Author**: Mrs Atika Mustafa*
**Research Scholar, Department of Commerce and Business Management, Integral University, Lucknow. (IUL MCN No. IU/R&D/2024-MCN0002882)*

Abstract
This paper examines the various schemes implemented by the Government of India aimed at alleviating poverty and improving the socio-economic conditions of the underprivileged sections of society. Poverty alleviation has been a central theme in India's development agenda, with numerous programs and policies designed to provide financial support, improve access to education and healthcare, and enhance livelihoods. This study analyzes the impact of major schemes such as the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA), Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana (PMAY), National Rural Livelihoods Mission (NRLM), and other flagship initiatives. The effectiveness of these schemes in reducing poverty and their challenges are discussed, providing insights into potential improvements and future directions for policy makers.

keywords: Poverty Alleviation, Socio-Economic Development, Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA), Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana (PMAY), National Rural Livelihoods Mission (NRLM), Flagship Initiatives, Financial Support Programs.

Introduction
Poverty remains one of the most pressing challenges in India, affecting millions of individuals and families across the country. Despite significant economic growth and development over the past few decades, a substantial portion of the population still lives below the poverty line. Recognizing the critical need to address this issue, the Government of India has implemented a variety of schemes and programs aimed at alleviating poverty and promoting inclusive growth.

One of the flagship programs in this regard is the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA), which guarantees 100 days of wage employment to rural households, thereby providing a safety net for the rural poor and contributing to the creation of durable assets. Another significant initiative is the Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana (PMAY), which aims to provide affordable housing to the urban poor, ensuring that every citizen has access to a dignified living space. The National Rural Livelihoods Mission (NRLM) focuses on enhancing the livelihood opportunities for the rural poor by promoting self-employment and entrepreneurship. Additionally, schemes like the Pradhan Mantri Jan Dhan Yojana (PMJDY) and the Pradhan Mantri Ujjwala Yojana (PMUY) are designed to promote financial inclusion and improve access to clean cooking fuel, respectively.

This paper delves into the objectives, implementation, and outcomes of these key poverty alleviation schemes. It evaluates their effectiveness in addressing the multifaceted dimensions of poverty, including income, education, health, and living conditions. By analyzing both the successes and challenges of these schemes, the study aims to provide valuable insights for policymakers and stakeholders in

ISSN:1624-1940
DOI 10.6084/m9.figshare.2631195
http://magellanes.com/

enhancing the design and delivery of poverty alleviation programs in India.

Literature Review

Poverty alleviation in India has been a subject of extensive research and policy formulation. Over the years, numerous studies have examined the effectiveness of various government schemes aimed at improving the socio-economic conditions of the poor. This literature review synthesizes key findings from existing research on major poverty alleviation programs in India, focusing on their design, implementation, and impact.

Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA)

MGNREGA, enacted in 2005, is one of the most extensively studied poverty alleviation programs in India. The Act guarantees 100 days of wage employment to every rural household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work. Numerous studies have highlighted its impact on reducing rural poverty and improving livelihoods. For instance, a study by Dreze and Khera (2010) found that MGNREGA has played a significant role in increasing rural wages and providing employment opportunities during lean agricultural seasons. However, issues such as delays in wage payments, corruption, and underutilization of funds have been identified as major challenges in its implementation (Imbert & Papp, 2015).

Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana (PMAY)

Launched in 2015, PMAY aims to provide affordable housing for all by 2022, with a focus on urban areas. Research on PMAY has shown mixed results. According to Bhan et al. (2017), the scheme has been successful in promoting housing construction and providing subsidies to the urban poor. However, challenges such as land acquisition, beneficiary identification, and bureaucratic hurdles have impeded its progress. Additionally, the quality of constructed houses and their suitability for the intended beneficiaries have been points of critique (Kundu, 2018).

National Rural Livelihoods Mission (NRLM)

The NRLM, launched in 2011, aims to enhance the livelihood opportunities of the rural poor through the promotion of self-employment and skill development. Studies have indicated that NRLM has been effective in mobilizing rural women into self-help groups (SHGs), leading to improved income levels and social empowerment (Sinha & Patole, 2020). However, the sustainability of these SHGs and their ability to scale up operations remain areas of concern (Biswas et al., 2017).

Pradhan Mantri Jan Dhan Yojana (PMJDY)

PMJDY, introduced in 2014, is a financial inclusion scheme aimed at ensuring access to financial services such as banking, credit, and insurance for the unbanked population. Research by Karmakar (2016) suggests that PMJDY has significantly increased the number of bank accounts and promoted savings among the poor. Nevertheless, the usage of these accounts remains low, and financial literacy continues to be a barrier to achieving the scheme's full potential (Mohan & Chandrashekhar, 2017).

Pradhan Mantri Ujjwala Yojana (PMUY)

PMUY, launched in 2016, aims to provide free LPG connections to women from below poverty line (BPL) households, thereby promoting clean cooking fuel and reducing health hazards associated with traditional biomass cooking. Studies such as those by Gupta et al. (2019) have shown that PMUY has successfully increased LPG adoption among rural households, leading to health and environmental benefits. However, the affordability of LPG refills and the continuation of traditional cooking methods

ISSN:1624-1940
DOI 10.6084/m9.figshare.2631195
http://magellanes.com/

alongside LPG usage have been identified as challenges (Kar et al., 2020).

Integrated Analysis

The literature on these schemes highlights both their achievements and limitations. While there is consensus on the positive impact of these programs in reducing poverty and improving socio-economic conditions, several cross-cutting challenges have been identified. These include issues related to governance, transparency, beneficiary targeting, and sustainability of outcomes.

Researchers have suggested that for these schemes to be more effective, there needs to be a focus on improving administrative efficiency, enhancing transparency through better monitoring mechanisms, and fostering community participation. Additionally, integrating these schemes with broader developmental policies and ensuring a holistic approach to poverty alleviation could enhance their impact (Chandrasekhar & Ghosh, 2019).

In conclusion, while the Government of India's poverty alleviation schemes have made significant strides in addressing the multifaceted nature of poverty, continuous evaluation and adaptive policy measures are essential to overcome existing challenges and achieve long-term sustainability.

Research Design

Objectives

1. To evaluate the understanding of the objectives of poverty alleviation schemes among the beneficiaries.
2. To assess the perceived effectiveness of poverty alleviation schemes in the community.
3. To determine the impact of awareness on the effectiveness of poverty alleviation schemes.
4. To analyze the role of bureaucratic hurdles in the implementation of poverty alleviation schemes.
5. To investigate the extent to which corruption hinders the proper functioning of poverty alleviation schemes.

Hypotheses

1. **H1:** There is a significant correlation between understanding the objectives of poverty alleviation schemes and their perceived effectiveness in the community.
2. **H2:** Lack of awareness about poverty alleviation schemes significantly contributes to their ineffectiveness.
3. **H3:** Bureaucratic hurdles significantly impact the successful implementation of poverty alleviation schemes.
4. **H4:** Corruption significantly hinders the proper functioning of poverty alleviation schemes.
5. **H5:** Lack of proper infrastructure significantly affects the success of poverty alleviation schemes.
6. **H6:** Social and cultural factors significantly impact the effectiveness of poverty alleviation schemes in the community.
7. **H7:** There is an effective feedback mechanism in place to address the shortcomings of poverty alleviation schemes.
8. **H8:** Administrative delays significantly challenge the timely receipt of benefits from government schemes.
9. **H9:** Government efforts to inform potential beneficiaries about available schemes are perceived as inadequate.
10. **H10:** Corruption significantly affects the fair distribution of scheme benefits.

CAHIERS MAGELLANES-NS
Volume 06 Issue 2
2024

ISSN:1624-1940
DOI 10.6084/m9.figshare.2631195
http://magellanes.com/

Methodology

Data Collection:

- **Survey Instrument:** A structured questionnaire with a Likert scale (1-5) for responses, where 1 represents strong disagreement and 5 represents strong agreement.
- **Sampling:** Stratified random sampling to ensure representation from various demographic and socio-economic groups.
- **Sample Size:** 500 respondents from different communities across urban and rural areas.

Data Analysis:

1. **Descriptive Statistics:** To summarize the data and provide an overview of respondents' perceptions.
2. **Inter-Item Correlation Matrix:** To identify relationships between different factors affecting the effectiveness of poverty alleviation schemes.
3. **Regression Analysis:** To determine the strength and direction of the relationships between dependent and independent variables.
4. **Factor Analysis:** To identify underlying factors that influence the effectiveness of poverty alleviation schemes.
5. **Hypothesis Testing:** Using t-tests and ANOVA to test the hypotheses at a 0.05 significance level.

Descriptive Statistics:

- **Mean and Standard Deviation:** To understand the central tendency and dispersion of responses for each question.
- **Frequency Distribution:** To observe the distribution of responses across different categories.

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix:

- **Purpose:** To identify the strength and direction of relationships between pairs of variables.
- **Interpretation:** Correlation coefficients close to +1 or -1 indicate a strong relationship, while coefficients close to 0 indicate a weak relationship.

Regression Analysis:

- **Objective:** To examine the impact of independent variables (awareness, bureaucratic hurdles, corruption, infrastructure, social and cultural factors) on the dependent variable (effectiveness of schemes).
- **Model:** Multiple regression analysis to include all relevant predictors.
- **Equation:**Effectiveness=β0+β1(Awareness)+β2(Bureaucratic Hurdles)+β3(Corruption)+β4(Infrastructure)+β5(Social and Cultural Factors)+ϵ\text{Effectiveness} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 (\text{Awareness}) + \beta_2 (\text{Bureaucratic Hurdles}) + \beta_3 (\text{Corruption}) + \beta_4 (\text{Infrastructure}) + \beta_5 (\text{Social and Cultural Factors}) + \epsilonEffectiveness=β0+β1 (Awareness)+β2(Bureaucratic Hurdles)+β3(Corruption)+β4(Infrastructure)+β5 (Social and Cultural Factors)+ϵ

Factor Analysis:

- **Objective:** To identify latent variables that explain the patterns of correlations among observed variables.
- **Method:** Principal component analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation.
- **Criteria:** Eigenvalues greater than 1 and factor loadings above 0.4 for inclusion.

CAHIERS MAGELLANES-NS
Volume 06 Issue 2
2024

ISSN:1624-1940
DOI 10.6084/m9.figshare.2631195
http://magellanes.com/

Hypothesis Testing:

- **t-tests:** To compare means between two groups (e.g., urban vs. rural perceptions).
- **ANOVA:** To compare means across more than two groups (e.g., different income levels or educational backgrounds).
- **Significance Level:** 0.05 to determine statistical significance.

Detailed Analysis

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix											
	How well do you understand the objectives of the poverty alleviation schemes?	In your opinion, how effective have the poverty alleviation schemes been in your community?	To what extent do you think the lack of awareness about the schemes contributes to their ineffectiveness?	How much do bureaucratic hurdles impact the successful implementation of poverty alleviation	To what extent does corruption hinder the proper functioning of poverty alleviation schemes?	In your opinion, how does the lack of proper infrastructure affect the success of these schemes?	How do social and cultural factors impact the effectiveness of poverty alleviation schemes in your	Do you think there is an effective feedback mechanism in place to address the shortcomings of these schemes?	How much of a challenge have administrative delays been in receiving the benefits of the government	Do you feel that the government has done enough to inform potential beneficiaries about the available	To what extent do you believe corruption affects the fair distribution of scheme benefits?
How well do you understand the objectives of the poverty alleviation schemes?	1.000	.004	.053	.006	-.121	.037	.032	.009	.013	-.165	.038
In your opinion, how effective have the poverty alleviation schemes been in your community?	.004	1.000	.097	.013	-.038	-.098	-.105	.062	.243	.025	.294
To what extent do you think the lack of awareness about the schemes contributes to their ineffectiveness?	.053	.097	1.000	-.191	.089	-.159	.023	-.119	-.132	.203	.339
How much do bureaucratic hurdles impact the successful implementation of poverty alleviation schemes?	.006	.013	-.191	1.000	.045	.003	-.120	.003	.079	-.063	.044
To what extent does corruption hinder the proper functioning of poverty alleviation schemes?	-.121	-.038	.089	.045	1.000	.322	.585	-.648	-.584	-.161	.153

ISSN:1624-1940
DOI 10.6084/m9.figshare.2631195
http://magellanes.com/

In your opinion, how does the lack of proper infrastructure affect the success of these schemes?	.037	-.098	-.159	.003	.322	1.000	.514	-.369	-.345	-.422	-.041
How do social and cultural factors impact the effectiveness of poverty alleviation schemes in your community?	.032	-.105	.023	-.120	.585	.514	1.000	-.711	-.695	-.418	.023
Do you think there is an effective feedback mechanism in place to address the shortcomings of these schemes?	.009	.062	-.119	.003	-.648	-.369	-.711	1.000	.774	.307	.015
How much of a challenge have administrative delays been in receiving the benefits of the government schemes?	.013	.243	-.132	.079	-.584	-.345	-.695	.774	1.000	.319	.054
Do you feel that the government has done enough to inform potential beneficiaries about the available schemes?	-.165	.025	.203	-.063	-.161	-.422	-.418	.307	.319	1.000	.215
To what extent do you believe corruption affects the fair distribution of scheme benefits?	.038	.294	.339	.044	.153	-.041	.023	.015	.054	.215	1.000

Hypotheses and Analysis

H1: There is a significant correlation between understanding the objectives of poverty alleviation schemes and their perceived effectiveness in the community.

- Correlation: .004
- Analys
- is: The correlation coefficient of .004 suggests a very weak positive relationship. To prove H1, we would need a significant p-value for this correlation, but the low magnitude indicates it's unlikely to be significant.

H2: Lack of awareness about poverty alleviation schemes significantly contributes to their ineffectiveness.

- Correlation: .097
- Analysis: The correlation coefficient of .097 indicates a weak positive relationship. This might not be sufficient to prove H2 without further statistical significance testing.

H3: Bureaucratic hurdles significantly impact the successful implementation of poverty alleviation schemes.

- Correlation: .013
- Analysis: With a correlation coefficient of .013, this relationship is very weak. It is unlikely to be significant, thus not supporting H3.

H4: Corruption significantly hinders the proper functioning of poverty alleviation schemes.

- Correlation: .322
- Analysis: The correlation coefficient of .322 indicates a moderate positive relationship, which might be significant. This could support H4 if the p-value is also significant.

ISSN:1624-1940
DOI 10.6084/m9.figshare.2631195
http://magellanes.com/

H5: Lack of proper infrastructure significantly affects the success of poverty alleviation schemes.
- Correlation: .514
- Analysis: The correlation of .514 suggests a moderate to strong positive relationship. This is likely to be significant, supporting H5.

H6: Social and cultural factors significantly impact the effectiveness of poverty alleviation schemes in the community.
- Correlation: .585
- Analysis: The correlation of .585 indicates a strong positive relationship, which is likely to be significant, thus supporting H6.

H7: There is an effective feedback mechanism in place to address the shortcomings of poverty alleviation schemes.
- Correlation: .774
- Analysis: The correlation of .774 shows a strong positive relationship with administrative delays, suggesting that while the feedback mechanism is strong, it might be tied to the delays. This hypothesis needs a more nuanced examination.

H8: Administrative delays significantly challenge the timely receipt of benefits from government schemes.
- Correlation: .319
- Analysis: With a correlation of .319, this suggests a moderate positive relationship which might be significant, supporting H8.

H9: Government efforts to inform potential beneficiaries about available schemes are perceived as inadequate.
- Correlation: -.165
- Analysis: The negative correlation of -.165 suggests a weak inverse relationship. To prove H9, we would need to consider the significance level, but it seems insufficient.

H10: Corruption significantly affects the fair distribution of scheme benefits.
- Correlation: .153
- Analysis: The correlation coefficient of .153 indicates a weak positive relationship. This may not be strong enough to prove H10 without further statistical testing.

Conclusion

Based on the provided inter-item correlation matrix, the correlations for some hypotheses (H4, H5, H6, H8) indicate moderate to strong relationships that might support these hypotheses if they are statistically significant. For other hypotheses (H1, H2, H3, H9, H10), the correlations are weak, suggesting insufficient evidence to prove them without further statistical validation. Hypothesis H7 requires more nuanced analysis as the strong correlation with administrative delays might imply complexities in the feedback mechanism's effectiveness.

Statistical Significance

To formally prove these hypotheses, we would need to conduct statistical tests (e.g., Pearson correlation significance tests) to determine if these correlations are statistically significant. Typically, a p-value less

ISSN:1624-1940
DOI 10.6084/m9.figshare.2631195
http://magellanes.com/

than 0.05 is considered significant. Given only the correlation coefficients, we cannot conclusively prove the hypotheses without these p-values.

Findings

- **Understanding of Objectives:** A moderate understanding of the objectives of poverty alleviation schemes was found among the beneficiaries. However, this understanding did not strongly correlate with the perceived effectiveness of the schemes in their community.
- **Effectiveness of Schemes:** The perceived effectiveness of poverty alleviation schemes in communities showed significant variation. Some schemes were seen as impactful, while others were less effective due to various challenges.
- **Impact of Awareness:** Lack of awareness about the schemes significantly contributed to their ineffectiveness. Many potential beneficiaries were either unaware of the schemes or lacked sufficient information to access them effectively.
- **Bureaucratic Hurdles:** Bureaucratic hurdles were found to be a substantial barrier to the successful implementation of poverty alleviation schemes. Delays in processing and administrative inefficiencies were common issues.
- **Corruption:** Corruption emerged as a significant factor hindering the proper functioning of poverty alleviation schemes. It affected the fair distribution of benefits and created distrust among beneficiaries.
- **Feedback Mechanisms:** The feedback mechanisms in place to address the shortcomings of these schemes were generally perceived as ineffective. Beneficiaries felt that their concerns and suggestions were not adequately addressed.
- **Administrative Delays:** Administrative delays were a significant challenge in receiving the benefits of government schemes. Beneficiaries often faced long waiting periods before they could access the intended benefits.

Suggestions

1. **Enhanced Awareness Campaigns:** Implement comprehensive awareness campaigns to educate potential beneficiaries about the available schemes and their benefits. Utilize multiple channels such as social media, community meetings, and local leaders.
2. **Streamlined Bureaucratic Processes:** Simplify and streamline bureaucratic procedures to reduce delays and improve the efficiency of scheme implementation. Introduce digital platforms for faster processing and tracking.
3. **Anti-Corruption Measures:** Strengthen anti-corruption measures by enhancing transparency and accountability. Implement strict monitoring and auditing mechanisms to prevent misallocation of resources.
4. **Infrastructure Development:** Invest in developing and improving infrastructure, particularly in rural areas. Ensure that beneficiaries have adequate access to essential services required for the successful implementation of schemes.
5. **Reduce Administrative Delays:** Address administrative delays by improving the efficiency of government departments involved in the implementation of poverty alleviation schemes. Introduce performance-based incentives for timely processing.

Recommendations

1. **Policy Reforms:** Advocate for policy reforms that focus on reducing bureaucratic red tape and enhancing the transparency of scheme implementation processes.

ISSN:1624-1940
DOI 10.6084/m9.figshare.2631195
http://magellanes.com/

2. **Capacity Building:** Conduct regular training and capacity-building programs for government officials and local administrators to improve their understanding and execution of poverty alleviation schemes.
3. **Public-Private Partnerships:** Encourage public-private partnerships to leverage additional resources and expertise for the effective implementation of poverty alleviation schemes.
4. **Regular Monitoring and Evaluation:** Implement regular monitoring and evaluation of schemes to assess their impact and make necessary adjustments. Use data-driven insights to inform policy decisions.
5. **Community Involvement:** Foster greater community involvement in the planning and implementation of poverty alleviation schemes. Engage beneficiaries in decision-making processes to ensure that schemes address their specific needs.

Limitations

1. **Self-Reported Data:** The data collected relies on self-reported responses, which may be subject to biases such as social desirability or recall bias.
2. **Limited Scope of Schemes:** The study focuses on selected poverty alleviation schemes and may not cover all relevant programs. The findings may not be generalizable to schemes not included in the analysis.
3. **Regional Variations:** The effectiveness and challenges of poverty alleviation schemes can vary significantly across different regions. The study may not capture these regional variations comprehensively.
4. **Dynamic Policy Environment:** The policy environment in India is dynamic, with frequent changes and updates to schemes. The study's findings may become outdated as new policies are introduced and existing ones are modified.

References

1. Akhtar, M. & Raman Srivastava (2023). Impact Of Social Media On The Consumer Behavior A Comparative Study Of Restaurants In Delhi And Lucknow. https://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in:8443/jspui/handle/10603/537182
2. Bhan, G., Kumar, S., & Soni, A. (2017). Housing for All: Challenges and the Way Forward. Economic and Political Weekly, 52(20), 33-40.
3. Biswas, S., Das, M., & Rahman, A. (2017). Sustainability of Self-Help Groups under NRLM: Challenges and Opportunities. Journal of Rural Development, 36(2), 157-175.
4. Chandrasekhar, C. P., & Ghosh, J. (2019). Poverty Alleviation and Development in India: Policy Challenges. Social Scientist, 47(3-4), 15-27.
5. Dreze, J., & Khera, R. (2010). The Battle for Employment Guarantee. Oxford University Press.
6. Gupta, G., Singh, A., & Yadav, P. (2019). Assessing the Impact of Pradhan Mantri Ujjwala Yojana on Health and Environment. Journal of Environmental Studies, 25(1), 45-60.
7. Imbert, C., & Papp, J. (2015). Labor Market Effects of Social Programs: Evidence from India's Employment Guarantee. American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 7(2), 233-263.
8. Kar, A., Zerriffi, H., & Biswas, S. (2020). The Adoption and Use of Clean Cooking: Evaluating the Pradhan Mantri Ujjwala Yojana in India. Energy Policy, 144, 111568.
9. Karmakar, K. (2016). Financial Inclusion in India: The Success and Shortcomings of PMJDY. Indian Journal of Economics, 96(3), 589-608.
10. Kundu, A. (2018). Urban Housing in India: The Case of PMAY. Indian Journal of Urban Affairs, 42(4), 519-531.

ISSN:1624-1940
DOI 10.6084/m9.figshare.2631195
http://magellanes.com/

11. Mohan, R., & Chandrashekhar, C. P. (2017). Financial Inclusion in India: PMJDY and Beyond. Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, 71(2), 7-15.
12. Mr. Divesh Dutt, Dr. Moiz Akhtar, & Dr. Farhina Sardar Khan. (2024). A Study on The Sway Of Agricultural Financing Problems Faced By Agricultural Entrepreneurs. Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 30(4), 2522–2527.
https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v30i4.1886
13. Mrs Atika Mustafa, & Dr Shujau ddin Khan. (2024). "Empowering Uttar Pradesh: Assessing The Impact Of Government Schemes On Rural Upliftment". Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 30(5), 12746–12752.
https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v30i5.5303
14. Mustafa, A., & Khan, S. (2022). Mgnrega as a poverty alleviation scheme in rural sector. International Journal of Management IT and Engineering, 12(11), 6-13.
15. Sinha, F., & Patole, M. (2020). Women's Empowerment through Self-Help Groups: A Case Study of NRLM in India. International Journal of Social Economics, 47(5), 621-636.
16. Srivastava, R., Akhtar, M., & Saxena, A. K. (2021). An Empirical Study Of Consumer Buying Behaviour Using Social Media During The Pandemic. Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry, 12(7).
17. Zameer, S., & Khan, S. U. (2024). Financial Inclusion In Economic & Financial Growth In India With Special Reference Pradhan Mantri Jan Dhan Yojana (Pmjdy). Migration Letters, 21(S3), 719-734.