

Impact of SGRY on beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries in Dimapur district of Nagaland

IMTI WALLING AND AMOD SHARMA

*Department of Agricultural Economics, Nagaland University,
SASRD, Medziphema : Campus-797 106. Nagaland*

Abstract

The study was conducted in Medziphema and Chumukedima blocks under the Dimapur District of Nagaland. A sample of 30 beneficiaries and 30 non-beneficiaries were selected from 7 villages based on proportionate random sampling procedure. The study reveals that average sample beneficiary's respondent family. Agriculture was found to have the highest impact on occupation for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries (56.45% and 55.43% respectively). The highest land use was for crop production (53.25 % and 49.4% respectively). The beneficiaries family have a total income of Rs.97156.66/- per annum and Rs.81903.33/- per annum for non-beneficiaries. The total output of cropping per year is Rs.19016.66/- for beneficiaries and Rs.16920/- for non-beneficiaries. The amount of savings were Rs.11483.33/- and Rs.7255/- for beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries respectively. The activities undertaken in the selected villages under the scheme have all been successfully completed.

Key words: beneficiaries, non-beneficiaries, village,

Introduction

India's developmental planning, since independence has been geared to ensuring food security and alleviation of poverty. The ever increasing population and hence the excess labour force has led to an increase in the volume of unemployment and now it has emerged as a serious concern with the food shortage. This aim at bringing employment through wage and self-employment into a larger focus with the goal of reducing unemployment and under-employment to a negligible level and of providing food security against hunger (Singh, 1999). Considering that the relatively high growth of population as against food production has a serious implication on the nation's economy and the society as a whole, the need was felt for implementing the schemes for combating the threats of unemployment and food insecurity. Thus, the government of India launched the new scheme of the Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY) on 25th September 2001 to provide food security through wage employment and building durable assets and infrastructure for the rural communities. The primary goal of the SGRY is to create opportunities for wage employment and to provide food grains to the rural labours as wage for their employment against rural development programme in the villages. Secondary objective is the creation of durable community, social and economic assets and infrastructural development in rural areas.

From the 8th plans onwards the Rural Development Department thrust to encourage the VDBs

to engage themselves in taking up more of income generating activities. The SGRY scheme was initiated to bring about additional wage employment, infrastructural development and mitigate food scarcity in rural areas. It was found that limited research has been carried out to analyse the status of SGRY in the state of Nagaland. Realising the need of studying the progress and impact of the programme, a study was conducted on "Impact of SGRY schemes and its viability on beneficiaries in Dimapur district of Nagaland" with the following objectives:

1. To study the socio-economic status of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries under the SGRY scheme.
2. To study the different activities of beneficiaries under SGRY scheme in the study area.

Methodology

The present study was conducted in the state of Nagaland. The SGRY in the state was launched during the period 2001-2002. Dimapur district was selected among the 11 districts. The selected district consists of 219 villages with 2, 06, 122 non-workers out of the total population of 3, 08, 382 (2001 census). Two blocks namely, Medziphema and Chumukedima under Dimapur district were selected for the study as these are among those blocks where the programme is being carried out successfully. A sample of 30 beneficiaries and 30 non-beneficiaries were selected from 7 village based on proportionate random sampling procedure. Education, family size, occupation, working force, land use pattern, life stock reared, cost of crop production,

cost of animal production and the different activities of the beneficiaries under the scheme were studied. These data were collected personally by asking direct question from the respondents. The collected data's were classified, tabulated and subjected to statistical analysis using appropriate statistical tools.

Results and discussion

1) Socio-economic status of the selected beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries under SGRY scheme.

As tale 1 reveals that the educational qualification of the respondents for beneficiaries, the sample respondent family have an illiteracy of only 13.4 %. The proportion of literacy across various groups did not show much variation in the study area for the smple population of beneficiaries. The proportion of male and female literacy was found out to be 54.84% for

male and 45.16% for female, this depicts that male literacy were higher than female. For non-beneficiaries, the sample respondent family have an illiteracy of only 13.72%. the proportion of literacy across various groups did not show much variation in the study area for the sample population of non-beneficiaries. The proportion of male and female literacy was found out to be 54.29% for male and 45.71% for female, this depicts that male literacy were higher than female.

The overall illiteracy of the sample population was found out to be 13.57%. The overall literacy of the sample population was found out to be 86.43%. The study area has a high literacy percent; it is because that there are numerous educational institutions in and around it. This high incidence of literacy also accounts from transportation that allow them to for further and

Table 1: Respondents family size and educational status (in numbers)

S. Groups No.		Beneficiaries		Non-Beneficiaries		Total		Average
		Number	%tage	Number	%tage	Number	%tage	
1. Illitrate	Male	11	5.91	11	6.29	22	6.09	Illitrate 13.57
	Female	14	7.53	13	7.43	27	7.48	
	Total	25	13.44	24	13.72	49	13.57	
2. Primary	Male	21	11.29	24	13.71	45	12.47	Litrte 13.57
	Female	23	12.37	21	12.00	44	12.19	
	Total	44	23.66	45	25.71	89	24.65	
3. High school	Male	47	25.27	42	24.00	89	24.65	13.57
	Female	22	11.83	23	13.14	45	12.47	
	Total	69	37.10	65	37.14	134	37.12	
4. Graduate	Male	23	12.37	18	10.29	41	11.36	
	Female	25	13.43	23	13.14	48	13.30	
	Total	48	25.80	41	23.43	89	24.65	
Total	Male	102	54.84	95	54.29	197	54.57	
	Female	84	45.16	80	45.71	164	45.43	
	Total	186	100.00	175	100.00	361	100.00	

Table 2: Occupation of the sample respondent family (in numbers)

S. Groups No.		Beneficiaries		Non-Beneficiaries		Total	
		Number	%tage	Number	%tage	Number	%tage
1. Agriculture	Male	45	24.19	41	23.43	86	23.82
	Female	60	32.26	56	32.00	116	32.13
	Total	105	56.45	97	55.43	202	55.96
2. Bussiness	Male	20	10.75	22	12.57	42	11.63
	Female	5	2.69	6	3.43	11	3.05
	Total	25	13.44	28	16.00	53	14.68
3. Service	Male	16	8.60	15	8.57	31	8.59
	Female	8	4.30	10.	5.72	18	4.99
	Total	24	12.90	25	14.29	49	13.58
4. Others	Male	21	11.29	17	9.71	38	10.53
	Female	11	5.91	8	4.57	19	5.26
	Total	32	17.21	25	14.28	57	15.79
Total	Male	102	54.84	95	54.29	197	54.57
	Female	84	45.16	80	45.71	164	45.43
	Total	186	100.00	175	100.00	361	100.00

Table 3: Working force of the sample respondent.

S. Groups No.		Beneficiaries		Non-Beneficiaries		Total	
		Number	%tage	Number	%tage	Number	%tage
1. Workers	Male	45	24.19	41	23.42	86	100.00
	Female	60	32.25	56	32.00	116	100.00
	Total	105	56.45	97	55.42	212	100.00
2. Non-workers	Male	43	23.11	43	24.57	86	100.00
	Female	17	9.13	18	10.28	35	100.00
	Total	60	32.25	61	34.85	121	100.00
3. Helpers	Male	14	7.52	11	6.28	25	100.00
	Female	7	3.76	6	3.42	13	100.00
	Total	21	11.29	17	9.71	38	100.00
Total	Male	102	54.84	95	54.28	197	100.00
	Female	84	45.16	80	45.72	164	100.00
	Total	186	100	175	100	361	100.00

Table 4: Land use pattern of the sample respondent.

S. Groups No.		Beneficiaries		Non-Beneficiaries		Total	
		Number	%tage	Number	%tage	Number	%tage
1. Crops		32.49	53.25	24.15	49.50	56.55	51.58
2. Livestok		1.54	2.53	1.54	3.16	3.08	2.81
3. Plantation		18.00	29.59	16.90	34.64	34.90	31.83
4. Fishery		2.60	4.27	1.20	2.46	3.80	3.47
5. Permanent fallow		1.30	2.14	0.80	1.64	2.10	1.92
6. Orchard		5.00	8.22	4.20	8.60	9.20	8.39
Total area		60.84	100.00	48.79	100.00	109.63	100.00

Table 5: Livestock reared among the respondents.

S. Groups No.		Beneficiaries		Non-Beneficiaries		Total	
		Number	%tage	Number	%tage	Number	%tage
1. Dairy		22	9.24	20	9.48	42	9.35
2. Poultry		130	54.62	117	55.45	247	55.01
3. Piggery		68	28.57	62	29.38	130	28.95
4. Dogs		14	5.88	10	4.74	24	5.35
5. Cats		4	1.69	2	0.95	6	1.34
Total		238	100.00	211	100.00	449	100.00

higher studies to other educational institutions they lack.

The data in Table 2 highlight the distribution of occupation of the sample population for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. It was observed that higher incidence of occupation comes under agriculture for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries (56.45% and 55.43% respectively).

The proportion of workers, non-workers and helpers determining the working force of the sample population is given in Table 3.

Table 4 reveals that the largest shares of area available (51.58%) are used for crop production for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. This indicates that the people are engaged in cultivation as the soil is fertile and the climatic conditions are conducive and

suitable for growing various crops.

Table 5 indicates that for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, the highest livestock reared was poultry (56.62% and 55.45%) respectively. The percentage of cats was found to be the least i.e., 1.68% and 0.93% respectively.

The various cost incurred for various activities of crop production are depicted in Table 6. The highest cost incurred was for land preparation for beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries (26.79% and 27.50% respectively) while the least cost incurred was for manuring (4.71% and 4.83% respectively). The data reveal that on an average, the total money spent for crop production are more for beneficiaries families than

Table 6: Cost of crop production of the sample respondent.

S. Groups No.	Beneficiaries		Non-Beneficiaries		Total	
	Number	%tage	Number	%tage	Number	%tage
1. Preparatory	86400	26.79	77950	27.50	164350	27.12
2. Sowing	44400	13.77	39950	14.09	84350	13.92
3. Manuring	15200	4.71	13700	4.83	28900	4.44
4. Intercultural Operation	67600	20.96	58900	20.78	126500	20.88
5. Earthing up	20200	6.26	17500	6.18	37700	6.22
7. Transportation	52400	16.25	45950	16.22	98350	16.23
8. Others	36300	11.26	29500	10.40	65800	10.86
Total cost	322500	100.00	283450	100.00	605950	100.00

Table 7: Cost for animal production of the sample respondent.

Groups	Beneficiaries			Non-Beneficiaries		
	Cost incurred	%tage	Average cost	Cost incurred	%tage	Average cost
Total cost	607700	100	20256.66	580900	100	19363.33
Dairy	178600	29.38	5953.33	161800	27.85	5393.33
Poultry	57100	9.02	1903.33	54500	9.38	1816.66
Piggery	273600	45.02	9120	267900	86.11	8930
Fishery	98400	16.19	3280	96700	16.64	3223.33

Table 8: Income generation of the beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.

Groups	Beneficiaries			Non-Beneficiaries		
	Income (Rs.)	%tage	Family nincome/year	Income (Rs.)	%tage	Family nincome/year
Total cost	2871500	100	95716.66	2457100	100	81903.33
Agriculture	570500	19.86	19016.66	507600	20.65	16920
Livestock	71600	24.93	23866.66	593500	24.15	19783.33
Fishery	146000	5.08	4866.66	131500	5.35	4383.33
Horticulture	53000	1.84	1766.66	49500	2.01	1650.00
Service	1232000	42.9	41066.66	1050000	42.73	35000
Business	154000	5.36	5133.33	125000	5.08	4166.66

the non-beneficiaries.

Table 7 reveal the various cost incurred for animal production. The highest cost incurred was for piggery for beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries (45.02% and 46.11% respectively). The least cost incurred was for poultry (9.02% and 10.38% respectively).

Table 8 reveals depicts the distribution of income from various sources of both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. On an average a beneficiary family have a total income of Rs.97156.66/- per annum but for a non-beneficiary it is found out to be Rs.81903.33/- per annum. The given table reveal that beneficiaries have better income compared to non-beneficiaries in the entire sector which makes beneficiaries better off than the non-beneficiaries families in the financial aspect. Thus, providing beneficiaries sustainability as income generation is diversified and as it provides stability.

The table 9 reveals that the total output of cropping on an average per year is Rs.19016.66/- for

beneficiaries and Rs.16920/- per year for non-beneficiaries. This reveals that there is difference in income from cropping for beneficiaries than non-beneficiaries. Thus, making beneficiaries more flexible with their input for various purposes, better production and ultimately increasing income which makes the beneficiaries more advantageous than the non-beneficiaries.

The table 10 reveal that on an average a beneficiary family spends Rs.84233.33/ annum for expenditure whereas in case of non-beneficiary family they spend Rs.81771.66/ annum. The higher expenditures depict that there is better in nutrition and others for beneficiaries than the non-beneficiaries thus, depicting better economic status.

The table 11 reveals that depicts on an average a beneficiary family saves Rs.11483.33/ year and non-beneficiary family saves Rs.7255/ year. More savings are done in beneficiary family. Thus, it shows that there is more surplus for beneficiaries which show more

Table 9: Crop output of the sample respondent.

Groups	Beneficiaries			Non-Beneficiaries		
	Out put (Rs.)	%tage	Average	Out put (Rs.)	%tage	Average
Total out put (Rs.)	570500	100	19016.66	507600	100	16920
Main Products	534000	93.6	17800	462000	91.01	15400
By products	33000	5.78	1100	29600	5.93	986.66

Table 10: Expenditure of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.

Groups	Beneficiaries			Non-Beneficiaries		
	Expenditure	%tage	Av. expenditure	Expenditure	%tage	Av. expenditure
Total expenditure	2527000	100	84233.33	2453150	100	81771.67
Food	752000	29.76	25066.66	713500	29.09	23783.34
Cloths	311000	12.4	10366.66	300700	12.26	10023.34
Household	250400	9.9	8346.66	247600	10.09	8253.34
Education	449000	17.76	14966.66	446000	18.19	14866.67
Servents	31000	1.23	1033.33	38700	1.57	1290.00
Occasion	98200	3.89	3273.33	97400	3.98	3246.67
Entertainment	70000	2.78	2333.33	71900	2.94	2396.67
Transportation	117200	4.63	3906.66	113700	4.63	3790
Medic	100400	3.97	3346.33	96000	3.91	3200
Social activity	111000	4.4	3700	106650	4.34	3555
Donations	71600	2.84	2386.66	74500	3.03	2483.84
Others	165200	6.53	5506.66	146500	5.97	4883.33

Table 11: Saving of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.

S. Groups No.	Beneficiaries		Non-Beneficiaries		Increase in saving ccount	
	Number	%tage	Number	%tage	Number	%tage
1. Total expenditure	2527000	88.00	24531.50	91.82	73850	36.94
2. Saving	344500	12.00	218450	8.18	126050	63.06
3. Total income	2871500	100.00	2671600	100.00	199900	100.00

sustainability within their families than the non-beneficiaries.

2) *Different activities of beneficiaries under SGRY scheme.*

References

- Agarwal, N.L. and Kumawat, R.K. (1974). Potentialities of increasing farm income through credit in the district of Jaipur (Rajasthan). *Agricultural Situation in India*. 29 (7): 489.
- Arif, G.M. (2000). Recent rise in poverty and its implication for poor household in Pakistan. *Pakistan Development Review*. 39. {4(2)}: 115-117.
- Geda, A.; Jong, N. De; Mwaba, G. And Kimenzi, M.S. (2001). Determinants of poverty in Kenya : A study on a household level analysis. Working paper series-Institute of Social studies. 347:22.
- Kulkarni, S. (1997). Dependence on agricultural employment in rural India. In *India's demographic transition : a reassessment* (edited by Irudaya Rajan, S.). M.D. Publications Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
- Nimbalkar (1993). A study of educational and occupational aspiration of rural youth and their vocational development. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, M.P.K.V., Rahuri District, Ahmednagar, (M.S.).
- Pant, K.C. (2000). Planning for Agriculture : Challenges and opportunities. *Yojana*, 44 (9) : 8.
- Rajuladevi, A.K. (2001). Food poverty and consumption among landless labour household. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 36 (28) : 2656-2664.
- Reddy, P.L.S. (1998). Looking again at Rural Development -50 years of achievement. *Gramin Vikas*, 14 (1) : 11.
- Singh, A.K. and Sharma, J.S. (1987). A comparative study of seasonal variations in employment in different farming systems on small farms in Mid-Western Region of U.P. *Man power Journal*. 23(1) : 23-44.
- Suryanarayana, P. and Chiranjeevulu, P. (1985). A study of utilization of farm credit. *Indian Co-operative Review*. 22 (4) : 425.
- Winters, P. Davis, B. and Corral, L. (2002). Assets, activities and income generation in rural India-what would it cost and how much would it reduce poverty? *Economic and Political Weekly*. 40 (31) : 3450-3455.