

**RESEARCH ARTICLE :**

# Profile characteristics of MGNREGA Beneficiaries: A study in Chhota Udaipur district of Gujarat

■ **GORDHAN SINGH BHATI, KESHA RAM AND SUNIL R. PATEL**

**ARTICLE CHRONICLE :**

**Received :**

25.04.2016;

**Revised :**

07.06.2016;

**Accepted :**

20.06.2016

**SUMMARY :** MGNREGA is one of key component of the antipoverty strategy of Government of India counting as largest employment generating programme in world ensuring right to work in a country with a population of over a billion which is demand driven programme. It focuses mainly on rural most area where people have somewhat different surrounding that makes their profile. So, it is important to study such profile characteristics that helps to get deeper understanding about this programme. Present study was conducted in Chhota Udaipur district using multistage purposive random sampling. 100 MGNREGA beneficiaries both male and female were selected randomly. Data were collected using a pre-tested interview schedule. The findings revealed that majority of the beneficiaries were from middle age group, were illiterate or had up to secondary level of education, had large and joint type of family and were from SC and ST category. Membership in one or more than one social organization, Rs. 48,001 to Rs. 1,02,000 of annual income and were landless or had marginal size of land holding. MGNREGA alone or MGNREGA in addition to labour, agriculture labour and animal husbandry was the major occupation. Significant reduction in migration habit was observed after implementation of MGNREGA. Moderately favourable to less favourable attitude towards agriculture as occupation and had medium to low economic motivation.

**KEY WORDS :**

MGNREGA,  
Beneficiaries, Attitude

**How to cite this article :** Bhati, Gordhan Singh, Ram, Kesha and Patel, Sunil R. (2016). Profile characteristics of MGNREGA Beneficiaries: A study in Chhota Udaipur district of Gujarat. *Agric. Update*, 11(3): 199-203, DOI : 10.15740/HAS/AU/11.3/199-203.

## **BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES**

MGNREGA is one of key component of the antipoverty strategy of Government of India counting as largest employment generating programme in world ensuring right to work in a country with a population of over a billion. The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) was notified on 7<sup>th</sup> September 2005. This Act covered 200 districts in the country during its first phase of

implementation during 2006-2007 and was extended to additional 130 districts in 2007-2008. The Government of India on 2nd October 2009 has renamed the NREGA as Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA). A total of 615 districts in the country is covered under MGNREGA till 2010-2011. The basic objective of the Act is to enhance livelihood security in rural areas by providing at least

Author for correspondence :

**GORDHAN SINGH  
BHATI**

Department of Extension  
Education, B.A. College  
of Agriculture, Anand  
Agricultural University,  
ANAND (GUJARAT) INDIA  
Email: [gshbhati89@gmail.com](mailto:gshbhati89@gmail.com)

See end of the article for  
authors' affiliations

100 days of guaranteed wage employment in a financial year to every household creating rural asset for the sustainable development of an agricultural and natural resource-based economy. Government is spending huge amount for this programme. It focuses mainly on rural most area where people have somewhat different surrounding that makes their profile. It is important to study such profile characteristics that helps to get deeper understanding about this programme. In this context, the present study was carried out with the objective to study the profile characteristics of beneficiaries of MGNREGA.

## RESOURCES AND METHODS

The present investigation was carried out in Chhota Udaipur district of Gujarat state using multistage purposive random sampling. Chhota Udaipur district comprises of six talukas out of which, two talukas *viz.*, Chhota Udaipur and Kavant were selected for the study. From each selected taluka, five villages were randomly selected. Ten beneficiaries were randomly selected as respondents from each selected village. Thus, the sample size consisted of 100 respondents. Data were collected with the help of pre-tested structured interview schedule. Period of data collection was from November 2014 to December 2014, collected data were tabulated and analysed by using frequency, per centage and mean.

## OBSERVATIONS AND ANALYSIS

The results obtained from the present study as well as discussions have been summarized under following heads:

### Personal and socio-economic and psychological profile of MGNREGA beneficiaries :

The data in Table 1 depict the personal, socio-economic and socio-psychological profile of MGNREGA beneficiaries.

#### Age:

A close observation of Table 1 indicates that most of the respondents (56.00 %) belonged to middle age group, followed by young age (34.00 %) and old age (10.00 %). In general, it is observed that the people from middle age group had to shoulder more family responsibility than the younger and older ones.

#### Education:

Regarding educational level of the beneficiaries, a larger number were falling under illiterate category (38.00 %) followed 27.00, 20.00, and 15.00 per cent of them had secondary, primary and higher secondary level of education, respectively. None of the beneficiaries was found to have graduate and above level of education. The probable reasons for low literacy level might be low level of awareness among tribal people about education coupled with insufficient schooling facilities and financial constraints in tribal area.

#### Cast:

The perusal of data presented in Table 1 reveal that less than half (46.00 %) of beneficiaries belonged to schedule caste, while 43.00 per cent and 11.00 per cent of the beneficiaries were from schedule tribe and other back ward caste, respectively. None of them was from general cast. Thus, it can be concluded that great majority (89.00 %) of beneficiaries were either from schedule cast or schedule tribe. Since the study was conducted in tribal area, such results are obvious and expected.

#### Size of family:

Table 1 also revealed that 75.00 per cent of respondents belonged to large sized family and rest 25.00 per cent of them had small size of family. The probable reason behind such trend of result is less awareness among tribal people about family planning and hence more number of children per family as well as prevalence of joint family system in rural area.

#### Types of family:

The data presented in Table 1 show that 77.00 per cent of respondents belonged to joint type of family and rest 23.00 per cent of respondents had nuclear type of family. Probable reason might be prevalence of joint type of family system in the tribal area, that too with dominance.

#### Social participation:

It could be observed from Table 1 that 39.00 per cent of the respondents had membership in one organization, while 31.00 per cent of them had membership in more than one organizations. Further, 24.00 per cent of respondents had no membership in any organization, while 6.00 per cent of them were position

**Table 1 : Personal and socio-economic and psychological profile of MGNREGA beneficiaries**

Category	No.	%
<b>Age</b>		
Young (up to 35 years)	34	34.00
Middle (36 to 50 years)	56	56.00
Old (above 50 years)	10	10.00
<b>Education</b>		
Illiterate	38	38.00
Primary School	20	20.00
Secondary School	27	27.00
Higher secondary	15	15.00
Graduate and above	00	00.00
<b>Caste</b>		
Schedule tribe	43	43.00
Schedule caste	46	46.00
Other back ward caste	11	11.00
General	00	00.00
<b>Size of family</b>		
Small size(up to 4)	25	25.00
Large size(above 4)	75	75.00
<b>Types of family</b>		
Joint type	77	77.00
Nuclear type	23	23.00
<b>Social participation</b>		
No membership	24	24.00
Membership in one organization	39	39.00
Membership in more than one organizations	31	31.00
Membership along with position holding	06	06.00
<b>Land holding</b>		
Landless	69	69.00
Marginal (up to 1.00 ha)	24	24.00
Small (1.1 ha to 2.00 ha)	07	07.00
<b>Annual income</b>		
Up to Rs. 48,000	12	12.00
Rs. 48,001 to Rs. 66,000	37	37.00
Rs. 66,001 to Rs. 84,000	19	19.00
Rs. 84,001 to Rs. 1,02,000	30	30.00
Above Rs. 1,02,000	02	02.00
<b>Occupation</b>		
MGNREGA	24	24.00
MGNREGA + labour	25	25.00
MGNREGA + Agriculture labour + Animal husbandry	20	20.00
MGNREGA + Farming + Animal husbandry + Other	31	31.00
<b>Migration habit</b>		
<i>Before MGNREGA</i>		
Low migration (0 to 2 score)	31	31.00
Medium migration (3 to 4 score)	46	46.00
High migration(5 to 6 score)	23	23.00

Table 1 contd...

Contd.... Table 1

<i>After MGNREGA</i>		
Low migration (0 to 2 score)	79	79.00
Medium migration (3 to 4 score)	21	21.00
High migration(5 to 6 score)	00	00.00
<b>Attitude towards agriculture as an occupation</b>		
Least favorable(12 to 21 score)	12	12.00
Less favorable (22 to 31 score)	27	27.00
Moderately favorable (32 to 41 score)	51	51.00
More favorable (42 to 51 score)	06	06.00
Most favorable (52 to 60 score)	04	04.00
<b>Economic motivation</b>		
Very low (6 to 10 score)	09	09.00
Low (11 to 15 score)	25	25.00
Medium (16 to 20 score)	46	46.00
High (21 to 25 score)	20	20.00
Very high (26 to 30 score)	00	00.00

holders along with membership. The data obtained from table lead to conclude that majority (76.00 %) of the respondents had membership in at least one social organization. During field survey it was observed that majority of respondents were members in milk co-operative society of AMUL network (Sugam dairy, Vadodara ).

#### *Land holding:*

It is noticed from Table 1 that a most number of the respondents 69.00 per cent of the beneficiaries were landless, whereas 24.00 per cent and 07.00 per cent of them possessed marginal and small size of land holding, respectively. Thus, it can be concluded that very great majority of the beneficiaries (93.00 %) had no land holding or meager land holding and perhaps because of this reason, they might have resorted to MGNREGA for sustaining livelihood.

#### *Annual income:*

Data presented in Table 1 revealed that majority of the beneficiaries had annual income ranging from Rs. 48,001 to Rs. 66,000 (37 %), followed by 30.00 per cent, 19.00 per cent and 12.00 per cent with Rs. 84,001 to Rs. 1,02,000, Rs. 66,001 to Rs. 84,000, and up to Rs. 48,000 annual income, respectively. Majority of beneficiaries had no land holding and their major sources of income were MGNREGA, labour and to some extent animal husbandry. This might be the probable reason for their comparatively lower annual income.

#### *Occupation:*

Table 1 revealed that 24.00 per cent of the beneficiaries were solely dependent on MGNREGA for their livelihood, while 25.00 per cent of them were dependent on MGNREGA + labour. Further, 20.00 per cent and 31.00 per cent of them were engaged in MGNREGA + Agriculture labour + animal husbandry and MGNREGA + farming + animal husbandry + other, respectively for their livelihood. It can be concluded that for majority land less beneficiaries (69.00 %), MGNREGA alone or in addition to labour, agriculture labour and animal husbandry was the major occupation.

#### *Migration habit:*

The distributional analysis pertaining to migration habit of the respondent beneficiaries before and after implementation of MGNREGA presented in Table 1 indicate that less than half (46.00 %) of the respondents belonged to medium category of migration, followed by low and high category with 31.00 and 23.00 per cent, respectively. But after implementation of MGNREGA majority of respondent beneficiaries (79.00 %) fell in low category of migration, followed by 21.00 per cent who had medium migration. None of them was found under high migration category.

Thus, majority (69.00 %) of the respondents, before implementation of MGNREGA, had medium to high migration while after implementation of MGNREGA, majority (79.00 %) of them had low migration towards urban area. Further, chi-square value was found

significant at 5 per cent level. Hence, it can safely be inferred that MGNREGA helped in checking the migration of the beneficiaries as they got the employment opportunities for more days through MGNREGA at their native place itself.

*Attitude towards agriculture as an occupation:*

The data given in Table 1 illustrate that more than half (51.00 %) of the beneficiaries had moderately favorable attitude towards agriculture as an occupation, while 27.00 per cent and 12.00 per cent of them had less favorable and least favorable attitude towards agriculture as an occupation, respectively. Only 6.00 per cent and 4.00 per cent of the beneficiaries had more favorable and most favorable attitude towards agriculture as an occupation, respectively.

*Economic motivation:*

Table 1 shows that less than half (46.00 %) of the beneficiaries had medium economic motivation, while one fourth (25.00 %) of beneficiaries were found to have low economic motivation followed by 20.00 per cent and 09.00 per cent of them with high and very low economic motivation, respectively. More or less similar results was also found by Badodiya *et al.* (2012); Bishnoi *et al.* (2012); Chaudhari and Biwas (1996); Gulkari (2011); Hiremath (1993) and Kyatanagoudar (2011).

**Conclusion:**

Majority of the respondents belonged to the middle age group, slightly less than two fifth of the MGNREGA beneficiaries were illiterate, less than half of beneficiaries belonged to schedule caste. Out of interviewed beneficiaries, majority of beneficiaries belonged to large sized and joint type of family who were landless. Slightly less than two fifth had membership in one organization

while nearly two fifth were found with medium annual income and nearly half of the beneficiaries (49.00 %) were dependant on MGNREGA alone or MGNREGA + labour for their livelihood. Majority of them showed reduced migration after MGNREGA, had moderately favorable attitude towards agriculture as an occupation and medium economic motivation.

Authors' affiliations :

**SUNIL R. PATEL**, College of Agriculture (A.A.U.), JUBUGAM (GUJARAT) INDIA

**KESHA RAM**, Department of Extension Education, B.A. College of Agriculture, Anand Agricultural University, ANAND (GUJARAT) INDIA

**REFERENCES**

**Badodiya, S.K.**, Tomar, S., Patel, M.M. and Daipuria, O.P. (2012). Impact of Swarnajayanti Gram SwarozgarYojana on Poverty Alleviation. *Indian Res. J. Ext. Edu.*, **12** (3): 37-41.

**Bishnoi, I.**, Verma, S. and Rai, S. (2012). "MNREGA: An Initiative towards Poverty Alleviation through Employment Generation", *Indian Res. J. Extn. Edu. Special Issue*, **1**: 169-173.

**Chaudhari, R. Ajitava** and Biwas, R. (1996). Integrated rural development Programme, poverty alleviation and development: A comparative study of west Bengal. *J. Rural Dev.*, **15** : 283-286.

**Gulkari, K.D.** (2011). Attitude of beneficiaries toward National Horticultural Mission. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, Anand Agricultural University, Anand, GUJARAT (INDIA).

**Hiremath, V.M.** (1993). A study of knowledge and attitude of the farmers towards Horticultural Development Programme in Pune District. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth, Rahuri, Ahmednagar, M.S. (INDIA).

**Kyatanagoudar, S.B.** (2011). Knowledge and attitude of rural people about National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS)", M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad, KARNATAKA (INDIA).

