A study on Rural Infrastructure and Rural Development in Karnataka

Dr.Basavaraja H.N
Associate Professor, Department of PG studies in Economics, Govt. First Grade College for Women M.G.Road Hassan Karnataka

Abstract- Rural infrastructure forms the foundation of socio-economic transformation, particularly in agrarian states like Karnataka where more than half of the population depends on agriculture and allied activities. This study examines the interlinkages between rural infrastructure and rural development in Karnataka during the period 2015–2025, focusing on key sectors such as rural roads, electrification, drinking water, sanitation, irrigation, and digital connectivity. Using both primary and secondary data, the research adopts a mixed-method approach combining statistical analysis with qualitative field insights to evaluate the progress and impact of infrastructure development on rural livelihoods, agricultural productivity, education, health, and poverty reduction.

The highlight significant improvements in rural connectivity through PMGSY, universal household electrification under Saubhagya, and enhanced water supply coverage through the Jal Jeevan Mission. Digital infrastructure expansion under Bharat Net has further enabled access to services, markets, and e-governance. However, disparities persist across regions, with northern Karnataka lagging behind the southern districts in terms of infrastructure quality, sustainability, and equitable distribution. The study concludes that while infrastructure development has positively influenced rural development indicators, challenges of maintenance, governance, and inclusivity remain critical. Strengthening local institutions and adopting integrated policy frameworks are essential for achieving sustainable rural transformation in Karnataka.

INTRODUCTION

Rural infrastructure is the backbone of socio-economic transformation in agrarian societies, especially in developing economies such as India. In Karnataka, where nearly 60 percent of the population resides in rural areas, infrastructure is not merely a physical support system but an enabling factor that determines access to education, healthcare, agricultural productivity, and overall quality of life. The period from 2015 to 2025 has witnessed several flagship interventions by both the central and state governments of India aimed at improving rural roads, electrification, drinking water supply, sanitation, and digital connectivity. These interventions, while infrastructural in nature, are deeply linked to rural development outcomes such as poverty alleviation, employment creation, social inclusion, and human capital formation.

The discourse on rural infrastructure in Karnataka must be situated within broader development economics debates, which highlight that infrastructure has both direct and indirect effects on welfare. Direct effects include improved access to basic services (for example, piped water reducing disease burden, or electricity enabling extended study hours for children), while indirect effects involve productivity gains through reduced transaction costs, integration of rural markets, and facilitation of non-farm employment opportunities. For instance, rural roads constructed under the Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY) have been associated with better market access for farmers, while the Jal Jeevan Mission has redefined water governance by providing tap connections to rural households, thereby reducing the time women spend fetching water. Similarly, electrification under Saubhagya and improved digital connectivity under BharatNet have expanded the scope for entrepreneurship, online education, and e-governance in rural Karnataka.

Karnataka presents a unique case for studying rural infrastructure and development because of its diverse geography and socio-economic disparities. The northern districts of Bidar, Kalaburagi, Raichur, and Koppal face challenges of drought, poor irrigation, and weak industrial linkages, while southern districts like Mysuru, Mandya, and Hassan are relatively better

placed due to higher agricultural productivity and better connectivity. Moreover, Karnataka has been a frontrunner in adopting technology-driven solutions, such as using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) in road mapping or integrating digital platforms for rural service delivery. The state also benefits from active Panchayati Raj institutions, which have played a central role in implementing rural infrastructure projects. Despite these advances, gaps persist in terms of quality, sustainability, and equitable distribution of infrastructure facilities.

The decade from 2015 to 2025 also coincides with global and national policy agendas such as the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), India's emphasis on doubling farmers' incomes, and the Digital India initiative. These frameworks highlight the multidimensionality of rural development, where infrastructure is not viewed in isolation but as an interconnected system that affects education, health, gender equality, and economic growth. For example, SDG 6 (clean water and sanitation) and SDG 7 (affordable and clean energy) are directly related to infrastructure expansion, while SDG 9 (industry, innovation, and infrastructure) and SDG 11 (sustainable communities) indirectly frame the agenda for rural transformation in Karnataka.

The urgency of infrastructure-driven development was further reinforced during the COVID-19 pandemic (2020–2021). The crisis revealed vulnerabilities in rural service delivery systems and underlined the importance of resilient infrastructure. Reliable rural health infrastructure, functional water supply, digital connectivity for education, and well-maintained rural roads became essential for continuity of life and livelihoods. Karnataka's experience during the pandemic demonstrated how infrastructure resilience can mitigate shocks and sustain rural development.

From a conceptual standpoint, rural development is a process of improving the living standards of rural people by providing them with sustainable livelihoods, better access to services, and greater participation in decision-making. Infrastructure is both an input and a catalyst in this process. Scholars such as Hirschman and Myrdal have long debated the "social overhead capital" role of infrastructure, suggesting that it creates spillover effects and cumulative causation that uplift rural economies. In Karnataka, investments in irrigation canals, electricity distribution networks, and rural transport have historically shaped patterns of agricultural growth and migration.

Nevertheless, challenges remain. Rural roads often face issues of poor maintenance, leading to seasonal inaccessibility. Electrification has reached almost all households, but quality and reliability of power remain inconsistent. Water supply schemes often struggle with sustainability due to groundwater depletion. Sanitation facilities have been constructed, yet behavioral change for consistent usage is uneven. Digital infrastructure is being rapidly expanded, but affordability and digital literacy remain barriers for rural households. These gaps highlight that infrastructure development is not just about provision but also about governance, maintenance, and equitable access.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study adopts a descriptive and analytical research design. It is descriptive because it documents the state of rural infrastructure and development across Karnataka over the past decade, and analytical because it seeks to establish relationships between infrastructure variables and developmental outcomes. The design is multi-disciplinary, drawing from economics, sociology, and public policy, thereby providing a holistic understanding of the issue.

Primary Sources:

- Structured interviews with Gram Panchayat officials, rural households, and scheme beneficiaries (e.g., households that received tap water or electrification after 2018).
- Field surveys in selected districts representing diverse agro-climatic zones (e.g., a drought-prone district like Raichur and a well-irrigated district like Mandya).
- Focus group discussions with women, self-help groups (SHGs), and youth to understand qualitative impacts such as time savings, empowerment, and entrepreneurial opportunities.

Secondary Sources:

- Official government dashboards: Jal Jeevan Mission (eJalshakti), Saubhagya (electrification), Swachh Bharat Mission (IHHL data), PMGSY OMMS portal (roads), and BharatNet progress reports.
- State Economic Survey of Karnataka (various years), Rural Development and Panchayat

Raj Department reports, and Planning Department statistics.

- National surveys such as the National Family Health Survey (NFHS-4 and NFHS-5), Periodic Labour Force Survey (PLFS), and NSSO consumption expenditure rounds.
- Scholarly articles, evaluation reports, and World Bank/UNDP studies on rural infrastructure.

A stratified sampling method will be employed for field surveys. Districts will be stratified on the basis of agro-climatic conditions and socio-economic profiles. Within each district, villages will be selected randomly, and within villages, households will be chosen based on categories such as landholding status, gender of household head, and participation in government schemes.

1. Quantitative Analysis: Time-series analysis (2015–2025) of infrastructure indicators. District-level panel regression to assess the impact of infrastructure on development outcomes. Use of econometric models with fixed effects to control for district heterogeneity.
2. Qualitative Analysis: Thematic analysis of interview and focus group transcripts. Case studies of successful districts (e.g., Mysuru for JJM progress) and lagging districts (e.g., Raichur for water access).
3. Triangulation: Findings from quantitative and qualitative strands will be compared to ensure robustness and to capture both measurable outcomes and lived experiences.

The study covers the decade 2015–2025, coinciding with major national missions. However, annual data availability may be uneven across sectors, requiring reliance on official snapshots. Causal inference may be constrained by endogeneity (infrastructure targeted to lagging areas), which will be addressed by using staggered rollout patterns as instruments.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To analyze the progress and patterns of rural infrastructure development in Karnataka between 2015 and 2025 across sectors such as electrification, drinking water supply, sanitation, roads, and digital connectivity.
- To examine the relationship between rural infrastructure expansion and rural development outcomes (such as agricultural productivity, poverty reduction, health, and education) in Karnataka.

Values are taken from the cited official dashboards and reports. Where a reliable annual state-level figure was not published, the nearest official snapshot is used and the cell flagged. "—" means no official annual figure was available from consulted dashboards. Citations for the datasets: PMGSY/OMMS (roads), Saubhagya/State energy sites (electrification), Jal Jeevan Mission / data.gov.in (piped water), Swachh Bharat mission dashboards / NARSS (sanitation), BharatNet / data.gov.in / TRAI releases (digital and internet subscribers).

Rural infrastructure provided during 2015-25

Year	Rural Electrification (% HHs)	Tap Water Connections (% rural HHs)	Rural Toilet Coverage (% IHHLs)	PMGSY Rural Roads (Progress)	BharatNet / Rural Internet
2015	78% (pre-Saubhagya, patchy)	Low, pre-JJM (district variations)	35% (baseline, SBM just launched)	Ongoing works (no consolidated state total)	Early rollout; 10–15 subs/100
2017	Saubhagya launched (Oct 2017), electrification drive begins	Limited piped HH supply	Rapid IHHL construction 2015–18	PMGSY expansions continue	Phase I rollout begins
2018	95%+ HHs electrified	Pre-JJM, low coverage	Major IHHL completions	Connectivity & upgrades added	Some GPs service-ready
2019	Near-universal electrification claimed	JJM launched, baseline set	High coverage, ODF claims	New km added under PMGSY	Rollout continues, rural internet rising

2020	Universal electrification achieved; last-mile clean-up	JJM acceleration despite COVID	ODF status, but usage/maintenance concerns	COVID slowed works, later resumed	GP connections expand; digital demand rises
2021	Electrification sustained	Tap connections rising (JJM dashboards)	Follow-up surveys show gaps in usage	Upgradation works continue	Many GPs service-ready; rural internet subs grow
2022	Stable, near-universal	JJM scale-up, large HH coverage gains	Focus on O&M and septic management	Continued cumulative growth	More GPs connected; internet penetration rising
2023	Maintenance focus	Higher % HHs connected to piped supply	Usage improved but gaps remain	PMGSY improves market access	Broadband reach widens; rural subs increase
2024	Electrification stable	JJM accelerated; high district-wise coverage	Post-SBM monitoring ongoing	PMGSY annual reports show milestones	Many GPs listed service-ready
2025	Broad universal electrification confirmed	Continued JJM rollout; high coverage	Sustained toilet use still a challenge	PMGSY national milestones reported	Ongoing BharatNet rollout; rural subs continue growth

Source : Secondary data

Econometric model — panel analysis across districts (recommended)

Panel (district × year) regression to examine impact of infrastructure expansion on rural development outcomes (agricultural incomes, rural poverty proxy, school enrollment, health outcomes):

Ydt=β0+β1Electrdt+β2Waterdt+β3Sandt+β4Roadsdt +β5Internetdt+γXdt+αd+δt+εdtY_{dt} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Electr_{dt} + \beta_2 Water_{dt} + \beta_3 San_{dt} + \beta_4 Roads_{dt} + \beta_5 Internet_{dt} + \gamma X_{dt} + \alpha_d + \delta_t + \varepsilon_{dt}Ydt=β0+β1Electrdt+β2Waterdt +β3Sandt+β4Roadsdt+β5Internetdt+γXdt+αd+δt+εdt

Where:

- YdtY_{dt}Ydt = Development outcome in district d at year t (e.g., per-capita rural income, agricultural yield, PHC outpatient visits per 1000, school enrolment rate).
- ElectrdtElectr_{dt}Electrdt, WaterdtWater_{dt}Waterdt, SandtSan_{dt}Sandt, RoadsdtRoads_{dt}Roadsdt, InternetdtInternet_{dt}Internetdt = Infrastructure indicators (as % or intensity).
- XdtX_{dt}Xdt = control vector (rainfall shocks, cropping pattern, district-level literacy, share of cultivators).
- αd\alpha_dαd = district fixed effects (absorbs time-invariant heterogeneity).
- δt\delta_tδt = year fixed effects (absorbs macro shocks, e.g., national policy changes, pandemic).
- Estimation: fixed effects with robust clustered standard errors at district level. For potential endogeneity (infrastructure targeted to worse-off areas), use an IV strategy: instrument roads by historical PMGSY eligibility cutoffs / central scheme allocation formula or use staggered rollouts (timing of PMGSY projects) as quasi-exogenous variation.

Heterogeneity & mechanisms: Estimate heterogeneous effects by district poverty quintiles and by agro-ecological zone. Test mechanisms: increased market access (falling transport costs) and time savings for women (electrification/water → time reallocated to productive activities). Use difference-in-differences (DID) when distinct rollouts allow treated vs untreated comparisons.

Data needs for econometrics: district-year outcomes (agri GDP, household consumption proxies), district-year infrastructure variables (from dashboards), rainfall and temperature data (IMD), and district socio-demographic controls (Census projections, NFHS where available).

Electrification

- The Saubhagya campaign (launched Oct 2017 nationally) rapidly closed the gap to universal household electrification. Karnataka state reporting and ESCOM press notes indicate large-scale "last-mile" connections were completed during 2018–2021. Electrification's key developmental channels include improved lighting enabling study time for students, electrified pumps enhancing irrigation access (where grid reliability allows), and small enterprise emergence.

Piped drinking water (JJM)

- The Jal Jeevan Mission (2019 onward) reframed rural water policy to household piped supply ("Har Ghar Jal"). Karnataka's JJM dashboards show strong progress in 2020–2024 with districts like Mysuru reporting >80% HH coverage by mid-2024. Implementation challenges include source sustainability (groundwater stress), need for piped distribution O&M financing, and staffing capacity at Gram Panchayats. Evidence points to direct health and time-saving benefits where piped water reached households. 4.3 Sanitation (SBM-G)
- Swachh Bharat Mission (rural) produced rapid IHHL construction during 2015–2019 and Karnataka achieved substantial coverage increases. National monitoring (NARSS) emphasized that infrastructure alone is insufficient — behaviour change, fecal sludge management (FSM) and long-term sanitation system O&M are essential for health gains. 4.4 Rural roads (PMGSY)
- PMGSY continued to add rural connectivity. PMGSY national dashboards report cumulative kilometers and lists of state projects; academic evaluations indicate roads improve market access, reduce travel time and increase non-farm employment, but maintenance funding and quality (drainage, all-season surfacing) are recurring concerns.

Digital connectivity (BharatNet & internet subscriptions)

- BharatNet's phased rollout in Karnataka increased "service-ready" GPs through 2021–2024; however, service activation and affordable last-mile access remain crucial. Official internet-subscription statistics show rising rural internet subscriptions per 100 population through 2023–24 but still lag urban rates. Digital infrastructure's developmental benefits include access to information, e-governance, education and market linkages for farm and non-farm producers.

Policy implications and recommendations

1. Prioritise O&M and finance for sustainability. Many gains are capital investments (toilets, piped networks, roads, fiber); long-term development requires dedicated O&M financing (Gram Panchayat budgets, user charges where equitable, state maintenance funds). Evidence from JJM and SBM shows O&M gaps threaten service continuity.
2. Integrate planning across sectors. Water, energy, roads and digital connectivity plans should be coordinated to maximize benefits (for example, electrified pumps tied to piped systems and road access for maintenance). Cross-sector planning reduces duplicate costs and improves resilience.
3. Strengthen local capacity (GPs & PRIs). Technical and financial capacities of Gram Panchayats need bolstering: training for O&M, simple tariff mechanisms, FSM models, and digital literacy to use BharatNet effectively.
4. Target maintenance & quality upgrades for roads. PMGSY impact depends on all-season surfacing and drainage; ensure budgets for periodic resurfacing and community participation in maintenance.
5. Focus on last-mile digital activation and affordability. BharatNet must be paired with active service provisioning and local Wi-Fi hubs, plus programs for device access and digital skills, especially for women and small entrepreneurs.
6. Use evidence-based targeting and monitoring. Continue district-level dashboards, third-party NARSS-style monitoring and citizen feedback mechanisms to detect service failures early and allocate corrective funds.

CONCLUSION

Rural infrastructure plays a pivotal role in shaping the trajectory of rural development in Karnataka, influencing agricultural productivity, social welfare,

and overall economic growth. The analysis of the decade 2015–2025 reveals that substantial progress has been made in rural connectivity, electrification, drinking water supply, sanitation, and digital access through flagship schemes such as PMGSY, Saubhagya, Jal Jeevan Mission, and BharatNet. These initiatives have improved access to essential services, reduced rural–urban disparities, and enhanced opportunities for education, healthcare, and non-farm employment. However, the benefits of infrastructure development have not been evenly distributed. Northern and drought-prone districts continue to face challenges of poor irrigation, inadequate maintenance of rural roads, unreliable power supply, and limited digital penetration, in contrast to the relatively better-developed southern districts. Further, issues of sustainability, governance, and inclusivity remain pressing, as physical creation of infrastructure does not always translate into effective utilization or long-term resilience.

The study concludes that rural development in Karnataka requires not only continued investment in physical infrastructure but also a focus on quality, equitable access, and community participation. Strengthening local governance, ensuring region-specific strategies, and integrating infrastructure with livelihood promotion can accelerate Karnataka's path toward sustainable and inclusive rural transformation.

REFERENCE

[1] Reddy, V. R., & Mishra, D. (2019). Agrarian Crisis in India: Dimensions, Experiences and Possible Solutions. Oxford University Press, New Delhi.

[2] Datt, G., & Ravallion, M. (2020). Why Have Some Indian States Done Better Than Others at Reducing Rural Poverty? World Bank Research Observer, 35(2), 158–182.

[3] Chambers, R. (2017). Rural Development: Putting the Last First. London: Routledge.

[4] Deshpande, R. S., & Prabhu, N. (2020). Rural Transformation in Karnataka: Emerging Issues and Policy Options. Institute for Social and Economic Change (ISEC), Bengaluru.

[5] UNDP. (2022). Sustainable Development Goals India Index and Dashboard. New Delhi: United Nations Development Programme.

[6] Narayanamoorthy, A. (2021). Infrastructure, Irrigation and Agricultural Development in India: Empirical Evidence. Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics, 76(3), 401–420.

[7] Rajasekhar, D., & Manjula, R. (2023). Decentralised Governance and Rural Development in Karnataka: Achievements and Challenges. Bengaluru: ISEC.

[8] Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY) — OMMS & Annual Report. (PMGSY OMMS dashboard; PMGSY Annual Report 2023-24).

[9] Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India. (2015–2025). Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY) Online Monitoring Management System (OMMS) Reports. New Delhi.