

Economic and Social Rights Post-Supreme Court Judgments: Empirical Study of Welfare Scheme Beneficiaries

Dr. Sonali Anant Burte¹, Sapre Yogiraj Kamalakar Archana²,

Dr. Ramkrishnan Nayak³, Bangar Nandu Bhimaji⁴

Principal¹, F.Y.LL.M, Student², Assistant Professor³, Student⁴

Ashokdada Sable Law College, Mangaon

Balasaheb Thackeray Law College, Taloja, Navi Mumbai.

Abstract: *This research paper examines the impact of recent Supreme Court judgments on the realization of economic and social rights through welfare schemes, focusing on the experiences of 150 beneficiaries. The study finds that a majority of respondents perceive improvements in their access to welfare benefits and overall economic and social status following these judicial interventions. However, challenges such as bureaucratic delays, lack of awareness, and corruption continue to hinder the full realization of these benefits. The analysis reveals that awareness of Supreme Court rulings is higher among urban respondents, contributing to better outcomes in these areas. Despite the challenges, there is a strong overall satisfaction with the Supreme Court's role in safeguarding economic and social rights. The study concludes that while the judiciary has made significant progress in promoting these rights, effective implementation of welfare schemes requires addressing existing barriers and ensuring equitable access to benefits across all regions.*

Keywords: welfare schemes

I. INTRODUCTION

The recognition and enforcement of economic and social rights are crucial for ensuring the well-being and dignity of individuals, particularly in developing nations where large segments of the population depend on state-provided welfare schemes for their basic needs. These rights, which include access to adequate housing, healthcare, education, and social security, have increasingly become a focal point in judicial discourse, especially following landmark Supreme Court judgments. The judiciary's role in interpreting and expanding these rights within the constitutional framework has profound implications for the implementation and effectiveness of welfare schemes.

Recent Supreme Court judgments have significantly shaped the landscape of economic and social rights by reinforcing the state's obligation to fulfill these rights through various welfare programs. These decisions often aim to bridge the gap between constitutional promises and the lived realities of citizens, ensuring that the benefits of welfare schemes reach the intended beneficiaries. However, the impact of such judgments on the ground remains a subject of empirical inquiry, particularly in terms of how they influence the accessibility, quality, and delivery of social welfare services.

This research paper seeks to empirically examine the effects of Supreme Court judgments on the realization of economic and social rights through welfare schemes. By focusing on the beneficiaries of these schemes, the study aims to assess whether judicial interventions have translated into tangible improvements in their lives. Through a combination of field surveys, interviews, and analysis of welfare scheme data, this research will explore the practical outcomes of court-mandated policies and their effectiveness in addressing socio-economic disparities.

The study will also investigate the challenges faced by beneficiaries in accessing welfare benefits, the role of state agencies in implementing court orders, and the broader implications of judicial activism on social justice. By providing a comprehensive analysis of the interaction between the judiciary, state mechanisms, and welfare recipients, this paper

aims to contribute to the ongoing discourse on the enforcement of economic and social rights and the role of the judiciary in promoting inclusive development.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature on corruption and its implications for economic and political systems is extensive, exploring various dimensions from the causes and consequences of corrupt practices to the effectiveness of interventions aimed at curbing corruption. This review synthesizes key contributions from the field, focusing on empirical studies that provide insights into the mechanisms of corruption, its impact on development, and the role of institutional and individual factors in perpetuating or mitigating corrupt practices.

1. Corruption and Development

The relationship between corruption and economic development has been a central theme in the literature. Barchan (1997) provides a comprehensive review of the issues surrounding corruption and development, highlighting how corruption can act as a significant barrier to economic growth by distorting market mechanisms, reducing investment, and increasing inequality. The paper emphasizes that corruption not only undermines economic efficiency but also erodes trust in public institutions, thereby weakening the overall governance framework necessary for sustainable development.

Banerjee, Hanna, and Mullainathan (2012) extend this discussion by examining the organizational aspects of corruption. They argue that corruption is deeply embedded in the structures of organizations, both public and private, and that it often results from misaligned incentives and weak enforcement mechanisms. Their analysis underscores the need for institutional reforms that align the incentives of public officials with the broader goals of economic development, suggesting that without such reforms, efforts to reduce corruption are likely to be ineffective.

2. Empirical Assessments of Corruption

Empirical studies have provided robust evidence of the pervasive effects of corruption on various aspects of economic life. Bertrand et al. (2007) conduct an experimental study on obtaining a driver's license in India, which reveals the extent to which corruption permeates everyday interactions with public officials. Their findings show that individuals can obtain a license without passing the mandatory driving test, often through bribes or personal connections, illustrating how corruption undermines the integrity of regulatory systems and leads to adverse outcomes, such as increased road accidents due to unqualified drivers.

Bertrand, Bombardini, and Trebbi (2014) offer another empirical assessment, focusing on the lobbying process in the United States. Their study examines whether lobbying success is more attributable to "who you know" (connections) rather than "what you know" (expertise). The results indicate that personal connections play a significant role in lobbying success, suggesting that corruption, or at least favoritism, is embedded in the political process. This finding raises concerns about the fairness and transparency of policymaking, as it implies that policy outcomes may be skewed in favor of those with better access to decision-makers.

3. Monitoring and Accountability

The role of monitoring and accountability mechanisms in reducing corruption has been explored in several studies. Bubonic, Chamara Fuertes, and Schwabe (2016) investigate the effectiveness of monitoring corruptible politicians through a natural experiment. Their study demonstrates that increased monitoring and the threat of exposure significantly reduce corrupt behavior among politicians. However, the effectiveness of monitoring is contingent on the existence of credible enforcement mechanisms, suggesting that monitoring alone is insufficient without the political will and institutional capacity to enforce anti-corruption measures.

Boyd, Epstein, and Martin (2010) explore the impact of individual characteristics, such as gender, on judicial decision-making, which can have implications for corruption in the judiciary. Their study finds that female judges are less likely to engage in corrupt practices compared to their male counterparts, potentially due to differences in risk preferences or ethical standards. This finding suggests that increasing diversity in the judiciary may contribute to reducing corruption, although the effect is likely to be context-dependent and influenced by broader institutional factors.

4. Behavioral Aspects of Corruption

The behavioral foundations of decision-making in corrupt environments are also a critical area of research. Chen, Moskowitz, and Shue (2016) examine decision-making under the gambler's fallacy, exploring how this cognitive bias affects the behavior of asylum judges, loan officers, and baseball umpires. Their study reveals that individuals who have recently made a decision in one direction are more likely to make a subsequent decision in the opposite direction, even when the two decisions are independent. This bias can have significant implications for understanding how decisions are made in corrupt environments, where individuals may rely on heuristics rather than rational judgment.

Overall, the literature reviewed provides a comprehensive understanding of the multifaceted nature of corruption, highlighting the importance of institutional structures, individual behavior, and effective monitoring in addressing the challenges posed by corruption. The insights gained from these studies underscore the need for continued research to develop targeted interventions that can mitigate the adverse effects of corruption on economic development and governance.

III. ANALYSIS

The analysis focuses on the demographic profile of the respondents, their awareness of Supreme Court judgments, and their perceptions of changes in economic and social rights post-judgment.

1. Demographic Profile of Respondents

Age Distribution:

18-30 years: 45 respondents (30%)

31-45 years: 60 respondents (40%)

46-60 years: 30 respondents (20%)

60+ years: 15 respondents (10%)

The majority of respondents fall within the 31-45 age group, representing 40% of the sample. The 18-30 age group is the second largest, accounting for 30% of respondents, followed by those aged 46-60 (20%) and 60+ (10%).

Gender Distribution:

Male: 90 respondents (60%)

Female: 60 respondents (40%)

The sample has a higher proportion of male respondents (60%) compared to female respondents (40%).

Education Level:

No formal education: 23 respondents (15%)

Primary education: 45 respondents (30%)

Secondary education: 53 respondents (35%)

Higher education: 29 respondents (20%)

A significant portion of respondents have secondary education (35%), followed by primary education (30%). A smaller percentage of respondents have no formal education (15%) or higher education (20%).

Income Bracket:

Below poverty line: 60 respondents (40%)

Low income: 53 respondents (35%)

Middle income: 30 respondents (20%)

Upper-middle income: 7 respondents (5%)

The largest group of respondents falls below the poverty line (40%), with another 35% in the low-income bracket. Middle-income respondents make up 20% of the sample, and only 5% are in the upper-middle income bracket.

Geographic Location:

Urban: 75 respondents (50%)

Rural: 75 respondents (50%)

The sample is evenly split between urban and rural respondents, with each group representing 50% of the total.

2. Awareness of Supreme Court Judgments

Aware: 105 respondents (70%)

Not aware: 45 respondents (30%)

A majority of respondents (70%) reported being aware of Supreme Court judgments related to welfare schemes, while 30% were not aware.

Geographic Breakdown of Awareness:

Urban aware: 60 respondents (80% of urban respondents)

Rural aware: 45 respondents (60% of rural respondents)

Awareness is higher among urban respondents (80%) compared to rural respondents (60%).

3. Changes in Access to Welfare Benefits Post-Judgment

Improved Access: 90 respondents (60%)

No Change: 45 respondents (30%)

Worse Access: 15 respondents (10%)

Most respondents (60%) reported improved access to welfare benefits following Supreme Court judgments, while 30% reported no significant change and 10% reported worse access.

4. Satisfaction with Implementation of Welfare Schemes

Highly Satisfied: 30 respondents (20%)

Satisfied: 75 respondents (50%)

Neutral: 23 respondents (15%)

Dissatisfied: 15 respondents (10%)

Highly Dissatisfied: 7 respondents (5%)

The majority of respondents (70%) are either satisfied or highly satisfied with the implementation of welfare schemes post-judgment. A smaller proportion of respondents are neutral (15%), dissatisfied (10%), or highly dissatisfied (5%).

5. Perceived Improvement in Economic Status

Significant Improvement: 38 respondents (25%)

Moderate Improvement: 68 respondents (45%)

No Improvement: 30 respondents (20%)

Worsened: 15 respondents (10%)

Most respondents (70%) reported some level of improvement in their economic status, with 25% reporting significant improvement and 45% reporting moderate improvement. However, 20% of respondents saw no improvement, and 10% reported a worsening of their economic situation.

6. Perceived Improvement in Social Status

Significant Improvement: 30 respondents (20%)

Moderate Improvement: 75 respondents (50%)

No Improvement: 38 respondents (25%)

Worsened: 7 respondents (5%)

Half of the respondents (50%) reported moderate improvement in their social status, with another 20% reporting significant improvement. However, 25% reported no improvement, and 5% perceived their social status to have worsened.

7. Challenges Faced in Accessing Welfare Benefits Post-Judgment

Bureaucratic Delays: 60 respondents (40%)

Lack of Awareness: 38 respondents (25%)

Corruption: 23 respondents (15%)

Geographic Barriers: 15 respondents (10%)

Other: 15 respondents (10%)

The most common challenge reported by respondents was bureaucratic delays (40%), followed by lack of awareness (25%), corruption (15%), and geographic barriers (10%).

8. Overall Satisfaction with the Supreme Court's Role

Very Satisfied: 45 respondents (30%)

Satisfied: 60 respondents (40%)

Neutral: 30 respondents (20%)

Dissatisfied: 10 respondents (7%)

Very Dissatisfied: 5 respondents (3%)

Overall satisfaction with the Supreme Court's role in safeguarding economic and social rights is high, with 70% of respondents expressing satisfaction (either satisfied or very satisfied). A smaller proportion of respondents are neutral (20%) or dissatisfied (10%).

Summary of Findings

The descriptive analysis reveals that the majority of welfare scheme beneficiaries perceive a positive impact from Supreme Court judgments on their access to benefits and their overall economic and social status. However, challenges such as bureaucratic delays and lack of awareness continue to hinder the full realization of these rights. The findings suggest a generally favorable view of the Supreme Court's role, but also highlight areas where implementation could be improved to better serve the needs of beneficiaries.

IV. RESULTS

The result focuses on the demographic characteristics of the respondents, their awareness of Supreme Court judgments, their perceptions of changes in economic and social rights following these judgments, and the challenges they face in accessing welfare benefits.

1. Demographic Characteristics

Age Distribution:

The respondents' age distribution was as follows: 30% were between 18-30 years, 40% between 31-45 years, 20% between 46-60 years, and 10% were above 60 years. The majority of respondents were in the 31-45 age group.

Gender Distribution:

60% of the respondents were male, while 40% were female. This indicates a slightly higher representation of males in the sample.

Education Level:

Educational backgrounds varied, with 15% of respondents having no formal education, 30% having completed primary education, 35% with secondary education, and 20% with higher education. This suggests a diverse range of educational attainment among the beneficiaries.

Income Bracket:

Regarding income levels, 40% of the respondents were below the poverty line, 35% were in the low-income bracket, 20% were middle-income earners, and 5% were in the upper-middle-income bracket.

Geographic Location:

The respondents were evenly split between urban and rural areas, with 50% residing in each.

2. Awareness of Supreme Court Judgments

Awareness Levels:

70% of respondents reported being aware of Supreme Court judgments that have influenced welfare schemes. The remaining 30% indicated they were not aware of such judgments.

Geographic Variation in Awareness:

Awareness was higher among urban respondents (80%) compared to rural respondents (60%).

3. Perceived Impact of Supreme Court Judgments on Access to Welfare Benefits

Improvement in Access:

60% of the respondents reported an improvement in access to welfare benefits following Supreme Court judgments.

However, 30% reported no significant change, and 10% experienced a decline in access.

4. Satisfaction with Implementation of Welfare Schemes

Overall Satisfaction:

50% of the respondents were satisfied with the implementation of welfare schemes post-judgment, while 20% were highly satisfied. On the other hand, 15% were neutral, 10% were dissatisfied, and 5% were highly dissatisfied.

5. Perceived Improvement in Economic Status

Economic Status Changes:

45% of respondents reported moderate improvements in their economic status due to better access to welfare benefits.

Additionally, 25% reported significant improvement, while 20% saw no change, and 10% reported a decline in their economic situation.

6. Perceived Improvement in Social Status

Social Status Changes:

In terms of social status, 50% of respondents noted moderate improvements, 20% significant improvements, 25% no change, and 5% a decline in social status.

7. Challenges Faced in Accessing Welfare Benefits Post-Judgment

Common Challenges:

The most frequently reported challenge was bureaucratic delays (40%), followed by lack of awareness (25%), corruption (15%), geographic barriers (10%), and other issues (10%).

8. Overall Satisfaction with the Supreme Court's Role

Perception of the Supreme Court's Role:

70% of respondents expressed satisfaction with the Supreme Court's role in protecting economic and social rights, with 30% being very satisfied and 40% satisfied. Meanwhile, 20% were neutral, and 10% were dissatisfied, including a small portion (3%) who were very dissatisfied.

Summary of Findings

The results indicate that the majority of beneficiaries perceive positive changes in their access to welfare benefits and overall economic and social status following Supreme Court judgments. Awareness of these judgments was found to be higher in urban areas, which likely contributes to the reported improvements in access and satisfaction with welfare schemes. However, significant challenges, such as bureaucratic delays, lack of awareness, and corruption, still hinder the full realization of these benefits. Despite these obstacles, the general sentiment towards the Supreme Court's role is positive, reflecting the judiciary's crucial role in ensuring the effective implementation of welfare schemes.

These findings highlight the importance of judicial oversight in safeguarding economic and social rights, particularly for vulnerable populations. The results also suggest areas where the administration of welfare schemes could be improved to ensure that the benefits of judicial decisions are fully realized by all beneficiaries.

V. CONCLUSION

The empirical study of welfare scheme beneficiaries following recent Supreme Court judgments highlights the significant impact of judicial intervention on the realization of economic and social rights in the country. The analysis reveals that a substantial portion of the population perceives improvements in their access to welfare benefits and their overall economic and social status as a direct result of these judgments. This underscores the vital role that the judiciary plays in not only upholding constitutional rights but also in ensuring that the benefits of welfare schemes reach those who need them most.

The findings suggest that awareness of Supreme Court rulings is crucial for beneficiaries to fully leverage the advantages of these welfare schemes. Higher awareness levels among urban respondents compared to their rural counterparts indicate a gap in the dissemination of information, which could potentially limit the impact of these judicial decisions in rural areas. Addressing this disparity is essential to achieving equitable outcomes across different geographic regions.

However, the study also highlights ongoing challenges, such as bureaucratic delays, lack of awareness, and corruption, which continue to hinder the effective implementation of welfare schemes. These barriers must be addressed to ensure that the positive effects of judicial rulings are not undermined. The overall satisfaction with the Supreme Court's role reflects a strong public trust in the judiciary's ability to protect and promote economic and social rights, though there remains room for improvement in the practical execution of these judgments.

In conclusion, while the Supreme Court has made significant strides in advancing economic and social rights through its judgments, the realization of these rights requires continued efforts to enhance the implementation of welfare schemes. Ensuring broader awareness, reducing bureaucratic obstacles, and combating corruption are critical steps towards ensuring that all beneficiaries can fully enjoy the benefits intended by these judicial decisions. The study calls for a more robust and inclusive approach to the administration of welfare schemes, one that fully aligns with the judiciary's vision of justice and equity for all citizens.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Banerjee, A., Hanna, R., & Mullainathan, S. (2012). Corruption. In *Handbook of Organizational Economics* (pp. TBD). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- [2]. Barchan, P. (1997). Corruption and development: A review of issues. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 35(4), 1320–1346.
- [3]. Bertrand, M., Bombarding, M., & Trebbia, F. (2014). Is it whom you know or what you know? An empirical assessment of the lobbying process. *American Economic Review*, 104(12), 3885–3920.
- [4]. Bertrand, M., Janko, S., et al. (2007). Obtaining a driver's license in India: An experimental approach to studying corruption. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122(4), 1639–1676.
- [5]. Bubonic, G. J., Chamara Fuertes, L. R., & Schwabe, R. (2016). Monitoring corruptible politicians. *American Economic Review*, 106(8), 2371–2405.
- [6]. Boyd, C. L., Epstein, L., & Martin, A. D. (2010). Untangling the causal effects of sex on judging. *American Journal of Political Science*, 54(2), 389–411.
- [7]. Chen, D. L., Moskowitz, T. J., & Shue, K. (2016). Decision making under the gambler's fallacy: Evidence from asylum judges, loan officers, and baseball umpires. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 131(3), 1181–1242