

Impact of SGRY on Beneficiaries and Non-Beneficiaries in Dimapur District of Nagaland

I. WALLING, A. SHARMA*

Received 16.12.2013, Revised 12.4.2014, Accepted 4.5.2014

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 has a literacy of 86.60 per cent and 86.28 per cent for non-beneficiary family. Agriculture was found to have the highest impact on occupation for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries (56.45 per cent and 55.43 per cent respectively). The highest land use was for crop production (53.25 per cent and 49.4 per cent respectively). The beneficiary families had a total income of Rs. 97156.66/- per annum compared to Rs. 81903.33/- per annum for non-beneficiaries. The total output of cropping per annum was Rs. 19016.66/- for beneficiaries and Rs. 16920/- for non-beneficiaries. The amount of savings was 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.

INTRODUCTION

From the 8th plans onwards the Rural Development Departments' 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 (Census 2001). 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 villages based on proportionate random sampling procedure. Education, family size, occupation, working force, land uses pattern, live 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 were classified, tabulated and subjected to statistical analysis using appropriate statistical tools.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

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

As Table 1 reveals, the educational qualification of the respondent beneficiaries, the sample respondent family had an illiteracy of only 13.4%. The proportion of literacy across various groups did not show much variation in the study area for the sample population of beneficiaries. The male

and female literacy was 54.84% and 45.16%, respectively. For non-beneficiaries, the sample respondent family had 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.

The overall literacy of the sample population was found out to be 86.43%. The study area had high literacy percent because there were several educational institutions in and around it. Also, good transportation facility around the study area contributed to high literacy percentage.

Table 2 highlights the distribution of occupation of the sample population for both beneficiaries and

Table 1: Family size of the respondents and their educational status (*in numbers*)

Sl. Groups No.		Beneficiaries		Non-Beneficiaries		Total		Average
		Numbers	Percentage	Numbers	Percentage	Numbers	Percentage	
1. Illiterate	Male	11	5.91	11	6.29	22	6.09	Illiterate 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	Literate 86.43
	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	
	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 families (*in numbers*)

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

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 for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries the largest share of available area (51.58%) is used for crop production. 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. Poultry was the most preferred farming among the animals.

The 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 is more for beneficiaries families than 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 3: Working force of the sample respondents

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

Table 4: Land use pattern of the sample respondents

Sl. No.	Groups	Beneficiaries		Non-Beneficiaries		Total	
		Area	Percentage	Area	Percentage	Area	Percentage
1.	Crops	32.40	53.25	24.15	49.50	56.55	51.58
2.	Livestock	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 and poultry reared among the respondents

Sl. No.	Groups	Beneficiaries		Non-Beneficiaries	
		Numbers	Percentage	Numbers	Percentage
1.	Dairy	22	9.24	20	9.48
2.	Poultry	130	54.62	117	55.45
3.	Piggery	68	28.57	62	29.38

Table 6: Cost of crop production of the sample respondents

Sl. No.	Groups	Beneficiaries		Non-Beneficiaries		Total	
		Amounts	Percentage	Amounts	Percentage	Amounts	Percentage
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	4.77
4.	Intercultural operation	67600	20.96	58900	20.78	126500	20.88
5.	Earthing up	20200	6.26	17500	6.18	37700	6.22
6.	Transportation	52400	16.25	45950	16.22	98350	16.23
7.	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 respondents

Groups	Beneficiaries			Non-Beneficiaries		
	Cost incurred (Rs.)	Percentage	Average cost per family	Cost incurred (Rs.)	Percentage	Average cost per family
Total cost	607700	100.00	20256.66	580900	100.00	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	46.11	8930
Fishery	98400	16.19	3280	96700	16.64	3223.33

Table 8 depicts the distribution of income from various sources of both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. On an average a beneficiary family had a total income of Rs. 97156.66/- per annum but for a non-beneficiary it was found out to be Rs. 81903.33/- per annum. The given table reveal that

beneficiaries had better income compared to non-beneficiaries in the entire sector which makes beneficiaries better off than the non-beneficiaries.

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-

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

Groups	Beneficiaries			Non-Beneficiaries		
	Income (Rs)	(%)	Family income per year	Income (Rs)	(%)	Family income per year
Total income	2871500	100.00	95716.66	2457100	100.00	81903.33
Agriculture	570500	19.86	19016.66	507600	20.65	16920.00
Livestock	716000	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	35000.00
Business	154000	5.36	5133.33	125000	5.08	4166.66

Table 9: Crop output of the sample respondents

Groups	Beneficiaries			Non-Beneficiaries		
	Output (Rs)	(%)	Average	Output (Rs)	(%)	Average
Total output (Rs)	570500	100.00	19016.66	507600	100.00	16920.00
Main products	534000	93.60	17800	462000	91.01	15400.00
By-products	33000	5.78	1100	29600	5.83	986.66

beneficiaries. This reveals that there is difference in income from cropping for beneficiaries than non-beneficiaries.

Table 10 reveals that on an average a beneficiary family spends Rs. 84233.33/- per annum as expenditure whereas in case of non-beneficiary family they spend Rs.81771.66/- per annum.

Table 11 reveals that on an average a beneficiary family saves Rs.11,483.33/- per year and non-beneficiary family saves Rs.7255/- per year. More savings are done in beneficiary family. Thus, it shows that there is more surplus for beneficiaries which show more sustainability within the family than the non-beneficiaries.

REFERENCES

- Agarwal NL, Kumawat RK (1974). Potentialities of increasing farm income through credit in the district of Jaipur (Rajasthan). *Agricultural Situation in India*. 29(7): 489
- Arif GM (2000). Recent rise in poverty and its implication for poor household in Pakistan. *Pakistan Development Review*. 39 {4(2)}: 115-117
- Geda A, De Jong N, Mwaba G, Kimenzi MS (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: IS Ranjan (ed) *India's demographic transition: a reassessment*. MD 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 (MS)
- Pant KC (2000). Planning for Agriculture : Challenges and opportunities. *Yojana* 44(9): 8
- Rajuladevi AK (2001). Food poverty and consumption among landless labour household. *Economic and Political Weekly* 36(28): 2656-2664
- Reddy PLS (1998). Looking again at Rural Development - 50 years of achievement. *Gramin Vikas* 14(1): 11
- Singh AK, Sharma JS (1987). A comparative study of seasonal variations in employment in different farming systems on small farms in Mid-Western Region of UP. *Manpower J* 23(1): 23-44
- Suryanarayana P, Chiranjeevulu P (1985). A study of utilization of farm credit. *Indian Co-operative Review* 22(4): 425
- Winters P, Davis B, 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

Table 10: Expenditure of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries

Particulars	Beneficiaries			Non-Beneficiaries		
	Expenditure	%	Av. expenditure	Expenditure	%	Av. expenditure
Total expen.	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
Servants	31000	1.23	1033.33	38700	1.57	1290
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	2483.34
Others	165200	6.53	5506.66	146500	5.97	4883.33

Table 11: Saving of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries

Sl. No. Groups	Beneficiaries		Non-Beneficiaries		Increase in saving amount	
	Amount	Percentage	Amount	Percentage	Amount	Percentage
1. Total expen.	2527000	88.00	2453150	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

Table 12: Different activities of beneficiaries under SGRY scheme

Sl. No.	Name of the village	Activities	When started	Remark
1.	Jharnapani village	Construction of approach road.	2001-02	Completed
		Ground levelling.	2002-03	Completed
		Construction of water reserve tank.	2003-04	Completed
		School compound levelling.	2004-05	Completed
2.	Medziphema village	Construction of marketing shed.	2001-02	Completed
		Horticultural farm.	2002-03	Completed
		Village link road.	2003-04	Completed
		Road widening.	2004-05	Completed
3.	Pherima village	Horticultural farm.	2005-06	Completed
		Construction of multipurpose building.	2001-02	Completed
		Construction of water tank.	2002-03	Completed
		Construction of kitchen shed at L.P. school	2003-04	Completed
4.	Sirhima village	Construction of kitchen shed at L.P. school	2004-05	Completed
		Fishery pond excavation.	2005-06	Completed
		Construction of pigsty.	2001-02	Completed
		Rural housing.	2001-02	Completed
5.	New Sochonoma village	Fishery pond excavation.	2002-03	Completed
		Construction of kitchen shed at L.P. school	2003-04	Completed
		Construction of kitchen shed at L.P. school	2004-05	Completed
		Construction of approach road.	2005-06	Completed
6.	Khaibong village	Fishery pond excavation.	2001-02	Completed
		Construction of community latrine.	2002-03	Completed
		Construction of community latrine.	2003-04	Completed
		Construction of kitchen shed at L.P. school	2004-05	Completed
7.	Chumukedima village	Ring well.	2005-06	Completed
		Construction of approach road.	2001-02	Completed
		Construction of culvert.	2002-03	Completed
		Fishery pond excavation	2003-04	Completed
		Construction of kitchen shed at L.P. school	2004-05	Completed
		Construction of approach road.	2001-02	Completed
		School compound levelling.	2002-03	Completed
		Construction of kitchen shed at L.P. school	2003-04	Completed
		Construction of community latrine.	2004-05	Completed