

Chapter 5

SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

BENEFICIARIES

. In present chapter, an attempt has been made to explore socio-economic background of the NREGA beneficiaries i.e. Age Group, Sex, Marital Status, Religion, Caste category, Language known, Educational qualification, types of family, occupation, Monthly income, total land, domestic animals and bank accounts. For present study, Komar Khatowal Gaon indicates village 1, Dulia Gaon Village 2 and Gohain Pather Village 3.

Locality of the Beneficiaries

The Locality of all the three villages NREGA beneficiaries are distributed in the table no. 5.1

Table No. 5.1
Locality of the Beneficiaries

Locality	Frequency	Percentage
Village No 1	180	64.99
Village No 2	51	18.41
Village No 3	46	16.60
Total	277	100.00

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The above table shows the locality of NREGA beneficiaries in three villages. The data indicate that majority of beneficiaries consisting 64.99 % belong to Village no. 1, followed by 18.41 % in village no. 2. The remaining 16.60 % of beneficiaries belongs to the village No. 3. Thus, majority of the NREGA beneficiaries belongs to the village no. 1.

Age Group

On the basis of age, the beneficiaries are classified into nine categories i.e. 11-15 age group, 16-20 age group, 21-25 age group, 26-30 age group, 31-35 age group, 36-40 age group, 41-45 age group, 46-50 age group and Above 50 years group. The distributions of NREGA beneficiaries into these nine categories of age group are shown in table no. 5.2

Table No. 5.2

Age wise Distribution of the Beneficiaries

Age Group	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village 1	Village 2	Village 3	
16-20 Years	5 (2.78)	3 (5.88)	2 (4.34)	10 (3.62)
21-25 Years	15 (8.33)	4 (7.85)	3 (6.52)	22 (7.95)
26-30 Years	26 (14.44)	5 (9.80)	7 (15.21)	38 (13.72)
31-35 Years	30 (16.67)	8 (15.69)	5 (10.87)	43 (15.52)
36-40 Years	34 (18.89)	14 (27.45)	10 (21.73)	58 (20.93)
41-45 Years	40 (22.22)	10 (19.60)	9 (19.56)	59 (21.29)
46-50 Years	18 (10.0)	4 (7.85)	6 (13.04)	28 (10.10)
Above 50	12 (6.67)	3 (5.88)	4 (8.69)	19 (6.86)
Total	180 (100.0)	51 (100.0)	46 (100.0)	277 (100.00)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The data show that in Village no. 1, more than two-tenth (22.22 percent) of the beneficiaries belong to the category of 41- 45 year of age; a little less than two-tenth (18.89) belong to the age group of 36-40 year, while 16.67 percent belong to 31-35 year, 14.44 percent belong to the age group of 26-30 year and 10.00 percent belong to 46-50 age group category. The remaining groups like as, 16-20 years, 21-25 year and above 50 year age group are less than one-tenth of the respondents whereas no respondent is belong to the age group of 11-15 year.

In the context of village no. 2, a little more than one-fourth (27.45 percent) of the beneficiaries are in the age group of 36-40 years, followed by 41-45 years and 31-35 years age group with the percentage of 19.60 and 15.69 percent respectively. The remaining age group like 11-15 years, 16-20 years, 21-25 years, 26-30 years, 46-50 years and above 50 years of age group are less than one-tenth of the beneficiaries in village no. 2.

The above table also indicates that in village no. 3, a little more than one-fifth (21.73 percent) of the beneficiaries are in the age group of 36-40 years, followed by 19.56 % in the age group 41-45 years. The number of beneficiaries in the age group, 26-30 years, 46-50 years and 31-35 years are 13.04 %, 15.21 %, and 10.87 % respectively. The percentage of beneficiaries less than one-tenth in the age group 21-25 years and above 50 years, whereas there are no beneficiaries in the age group of 11-15 years.

The overall percentage drawn from the three villages that majority 21.29 % beneficiaries are in the age group of 41-45. They are followed by 20.58 % beneficiaries are in the age group of 35-40.

Sex

The sex ratio is considered as an important variable in sociological analysis. The sex wise distribution of the beneficiaries is shown in table no. 5.3

Table No. 5.3

Sex wise distribution of the Beneficiaries

Sex	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village No-1	Village No-2	Village No-3	
Male	173 (96.11)	47 (92.15)	44 (95.66)	264 (95.30)
Female	07 (3.89)	04 (7.85)	02 (4.34)	13 (4.70)
Total	180 (100.0)	51 (100.0)	46 (100.0)	277 (100.0)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The above data reveal sex wise distribution of the NREGA beneficiaries in three villages. The data indicate in the context of village no. 1 that out of 180 beneficiaries, 173 beneficiaries consisting 96.11 % is male beneficiaries and remaining only 3.89 % is female beneficiaries. In village no. 2, there are 92.15 % male NREGA beneficiaries, followed by 7.85 % who are female beneficiaries in the village.

The data also show in case of village no. 3 that majority of the beneficiaries (95.66 %) are male, while the rest 4.34% are female beneficiaries. Thus, in all the three villages, majority of the NREGA beneficiaries are male and there is no significant difference in the three villages.

The overall percentage drawn from three villages show that just 4.70% beneficiaries are female, followed by 95.30 % male beneficiaries. It is noticed during the observations that female beneficiaries have not been able to get the job under this Act in spite of poor economic condition.

Religion

Religion refers to the men belief in supernatural or superhuman power. As Durkheim said the concepts of sacred or holy and profane or unholy are central to religion. On the other hand, every human being is their own religion. In order to analyze the religion of the beneficiaries, their views are classified into four categories: (1) Hindu, (2) Islam, (3) Christian and (4) other. The distribution of the beneficiaries into these four categories is shown in the table no.5.4

Table No. 5.4

Religion of the Beneficiaries

Religion of the Beneficiaries	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Hindu	169 (93.89)	51 (100.0)	46 (100.0)	266 (96.03)
Islam	11 (6.11)	-	-	11 (3.97)
Christian	-	-	-	-
Others	-	-	-	-
Total	180 (100.0)	51 (100.0)	46 (100.0)	277 (100.0)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The above table reveals the religion wise distribution of the beneficiaries of three villages. In the context of village no. 1, majority of beneficiaries consisting 93.89 % are Hindu religion, followed by only 6.11 % are Islam religion. On the other hand, all the beneficiaries of village no. 2 and village no. 3 belong to Hindu religion. The overall data of three villages reveal that majority beneficiaries (96.03 %) are Hindu religion, followed by 3.97 % who are Islam. There are no other beneficiaries in the entire three villages except Hindu and Islam.

Mother Tongue

All the beneficiaries of the three study villages belong to Assamese linguistic community.

Category of the Beneficiaries

In the study, the whole NREGA beneficiaries classified in to four different categories viz. Schedule caste (SC), Schedule Tribe (ST), Other Backward Caste (OBC) and General Caste category. The distributions of different caste group categories are given in the table no. 5.5

Table No. 5.5

Category of the Beneficiaries

Category of the Beneficiaries	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
SC	-	-	-	-
ST	-	-	5 (10.87)	5 (1.81)
OBC	67 (37.22)	31 (60.79)	30 (65.21)	128 (46.20)
General	113 (62.78)	20 (39.21)	11 (23.92)	144 (51.99)
Total	180 (100.0)	51 (100.0)	46 (100.0)	277 (100)

(* SC = Scheduled Caste, *ST= Scheduled Tribes, *OBC = Other Backward Caste)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The above table shows caste category wise distribution of NREGA beneficiaries in three villages. Out of 180 beneficiaries in village no. 1, 113 beneficiaries consisting with 62.78 % belongs to General Caste category, followed by 37.22 % who are OBC. There are no ST and SC people in the village. The data indicate in the village no. 2, a little more than three-fifth consisting 60.79 % are OBC people of the village while a little less than two-fifth (39.21 %) of the beneficiaries are General people of the village.

In the context of village no. 3, majority of the people i.e. 65.21 % are OBC and the 23.92 % of total people of the village are General. The remaining 10.87 % belongs to the Scheduled Tribes (ST). The overall data of three villages reveal that more than half percent (51.99 %) of total beneficiaries belongs to general caste. On the other hand, there is not found Scheduled Caste (SC) people in three villages.

Marital Status of Beneficiaries

Marriage is an important social institution of human society. It is a socially approved way of establishing a family of procreation. The beneficiaries' responses regarding married and unmarried are shown in the table no. 5.6

Table No. 5.6

Marital Status of the Beneficiaries

Marital Status	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Married	82 (45.56)	27 (52.95)	31 (67.39)	140 (50.55)
Unmarried	98 (54.44)	24 (47.05)	15 (32.61)	137 (49.45)
Total	180 (100.0)	51 (100.0)	46 (100.00)	277 (100.00)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The above data indicate that 45.56 % beneficiaries are married in the context of village no. 1 where remaining 54.44 % are not married. In the context of village No. 2, more than half (52.95 percent) beneficiaries are married, followed by 47.05 %

beneficiaries are unmarried. The above data also reveal that out of 46 beneficiaries in village no. 3, 31 beneficiaries (67.39 %) are married, while 15 beneficiaries (32.61 %) are unmarried.

From the field data of three villages reveal that almost a little more than half percent (50.55 %) are married while a little less than half percent (49.45 %) are unmarried beneficiaries.

Language Known

Language is an important way to communicate each other in a society. On the basis of language known by the beneficiaries, the distributions of beneficiaries' responses are classified in to five different categories: (1) Assamese, (2) Assamese + English, (3) Assamese + Hindi and (4) Assamese + Hindi + English. The distribution of the beneficiaries into these four categories of languages is presented in table no. 5.7

Table No. 5.7

Language Known by the Beneficiaries

Language Known	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Assamese	62 (34.44)	22 (43.13)	19 (41.30)	103 (37.18)
Assamese +English	24 (13.33)	5 (9.81)	05 (10.88)	34 (12.27)
Assamese + Hindi	31 (17.22)	8 (15.69)	11 (23.92)	50 (18.08)
Assamese + Hindi + English	60 (33.33)	15 (29.41)	09 (19.56)	84 (30.32)
Other Combination	03 (1.67)	1 (1.96)	02 (4.34)	6 (2.16)
Total	180 (100.0)	51 (100.0)	46 (100.0)	277 (100)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

From the above table, in village no. 1 a little more than one-third is having 34.44 % know only Assamese language; followed by about one-third (33.33 %) know Assamese, Hindi and English language. Among the remaining, a little more than one-tenth know both Assamese and English, 17.22 % of total beneficiaries know both Assamese & Hindi language and only 1.67 % knows other combination of languages.

In the context of village no. 2, majority 22 beneficiaries consisting 43.13 % knows mother language while 29.41 % of beneficiaries know Hindi, Assamese and

English language. The numbers of beneficiaries who know Assamese + English and Assamese and Hindi languages are respectively 9.81% and 15.69% and only one beneficiary (1.96 %) knows other combination of languages.

The above table shows in the context of village no. 3 that majority of the beneficiaries (41.30) know only Assamese language followed by 23.92 % who know both Assamese and Hindi language. The number of beneficiaries knowing the English and Assamese language is 10.87 %. On the other hand, 19.57% know Assamese, Hindi and English language. The rest 4.34 % is known Assamese, Hindi, English and Bangla language.

Educational Qualification of the beneficiaries

The educational qualification is an important indicator of socio-economic background of the respondents. The educational qualifications of the beneficiaries are classified into eight categories: i) Illiterate, ii) Primary, iii) High School, iv) Higher Secondary, v) Graduate, vi) Post graduate, vii) Technical viii) Other. The distribution of beneficiaries on the basis of Educational Qualification is shown in table no. 5.8

Table No. 5.8

Educational qualification of Beneficiaries

Educational Qualification	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Illiterate	10 (5.56)	4 (7.85)	3 (6.53)	17 (5.78)
Primary	96 (53.33)	24 (47.05)	19 (41.30)	139 5(50.18)
High School	30 (16.67)	10 (19.61)	10 (21.74)	50 (18.08)
Higher Secondary	27 (15.00)	7 (13.73)	8 (17.39)	42 (15.16)
Graduate	13 (7.22)	5 (9.80)	5 (10.87)	23 (8.30)
Post Graduate	02 (1.11)	-	1 (2.17)	3 (1.07)
Technical	02 (1.11)	1 (1.96)	-	3 (1.07)
Professional	-	-	-	-
Total	180 (100.0)	51 (100.0)	46 (100.0)	277 (100)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The above data reveal the educational qualification of the beneficiaries. In case of village no. 1, majority of the beneficiaries with 53.33 % are educated up to primary level, followed by 16.67 % who are educated up to high school level. Remaining, 15 % are educated up to Higher Secondary, 7.22 % up to Graduate level while the 1.11 % each of total beneficiaries educated up to Post Graduate & Technical level. The rest 5.56 % of total beneficiaries do not have any formal education.

Out of 51 total beneficiaries in village no. 2, a little less than half consisting 47.05 % having up to primary level of education while 10 beneficiaries (19.61 %) educated up to high school level, 7 beneficiaries consisting 13.73 % have Higher Secondary Level of education, 5 beneficiaries (9.80 %) educated up to Graduate level of education and only 1 beneficiary have Technical level of education. There are 4 beneficiaries with 7.85 % have no formal education in the context of village no. 2.

The data indicate in the context of village no. 3 that a little more than two-fifth beneficiaries (41.30%) are educated up to Primary level, followed by High School level (21.74%) and Higher Secondary (17.39%). The percentage of illiterate beneficiaries is 6.52 % and only 10.87 % are educated up to graduate. Out of 46 NREGA beneficiaries, the number of post graduate is only 1 (2.17 %). The data reveal that majority of the beneficiaries in three villages' attained education up to Primary level.

Father's Education

The fathers' education is one of the important variables to understand the socio-economic profile of the beneficiaries. In that purpose, the fathers' educations are classified in to following categories: i) Illiterate, ii) Primary, iii) High School, iv) Higher Secondary, v) Graduate, vi) Post graduate, vii) Technical viii) Other. The distribution of father's Educational Qualification is shown in table no. 5.9

Table No. 5.9**Educational qualification of Beneficiaries father**

Educational Qualification	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Illiterate	17 (9.44)	5 (9.80)	4 (8.70)	26 (9.38)
Primary	112 (62.22)	37 (72.54)	31 (67.39)	180 (64.98)
High School	32 (17.78)	5 (9.80)	6 (13.04)	43 (15.52)
Higher Secondary	10 (5.55)	3 (5.88)	3 (6.52)	16 (5.78)
Graduate	8 (4.44)	1 (1.96)	1 (2.17)	10 (3.61)
Post Graduate	-	-	-	-
Technical	1 (0.56)	-	1 (2.17)	2 (0.73)
Professional	-	-	-	-
Total	180 (100.0)	51 (100.0)	46 (100.0)	277 (100)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The table 5.9 indicates the beneficiaries' fathers' education in three villages. The data show in the context of village no. 1 that most of the beneficiaries' fathers (62.22 %) are educated up to primary level, followed by 17.78 % who attain up to High School level of education. The numbers of beneficiaries is very less in Technical Education with the percentage of only 0.56 %. The numbers of beneficiaries educated up to Higher Secondary level is 5.55 % and 4.44 % beneficiaries' father attain education up to Graduate level. On the other hand, a little less than one-tenth consisting 9.44 % of total beneficiaries' fathers have not attained any formal education.

The data also reveal in the context of village no. 2 that majority of beneficiaries father consisting with the percentage of 72.54 % are educated up to Primary level, followed by High School Level & 7.85 % without Formal Education. The percentage of Higher Secondary level of education of beneficiaries' father is 3.92 %. Out of 51 beneficiaries in village no. 2, only one beneficiary father consisting 1.96 % attain up to Graduate level of Education in where there are no representative of Post Graduate, Technical and Professional level of education.

Out of 46 NREGA beneficiaries in village no. 3, majority 31 beneficiaries' fathers (67.39 %) have attained education up to Primary level. The data also indicate

that more than one-tenth (13.04 %) beneficiaries' fathers have attained education up to high school level, followed by Higher School level with 6.52 % while only 2.17 % each of the beneficiaries fathers have attained education up to graduate and technical level. Remaining 8.70 % beneficiaries have not any formal education.

The overall data of three villages reveal that more than three-fifth (64.98 %) of total beneficiaries' fathers have attained Primary Level of education, followed by 15.52 % who have attained High School level of education in three villages.

Mothers Education

The levels of educational qualification of the beneficiaries' mothers are analyzed into eight different educational categories. The levels are: i) Illiterate, ii) Primary, iii) High School, iv) Higher Secondary, v) Graduate, vi) Post graduate, vii) Technical viii) Other. The distribution of beneficiaries' mothers on the basis of educational qualification is shown in table no. 5.10

Table No. 5.10

Educational Qualification of Beneficiaries Mother

Educational Qualification	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Illiterate	10 (5.55)	3 (5.88)	4 (8.70)	17 (6.13)
Primary	134 (74.44)	40 (78.43)	33 (71.74)	207 (74.72)
High School	30 (16.67)	5 (9.81)	6 (13.04)	41 (14.80)
Higher Secondary	13 (7.22)	2 (3.92)	2 (4.34)	14 (5.05)
Graduate	3 (1.67)	1 (1.96)	-	4 (1.44)
Post Graduate	-	-	-	-
Technical	-	-	-	-
Professional	-	-	-	-
Total	180 (100.0)	51 (100.0)	46 (100.0)	277 (100)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The following table shows that majority of the beneficiaries' mother (74.44 %) in village 1 are primarily educated, followed by 5.55 % illiterate, 7.22 % is having High School level of Education, 5.56 having Higher Secondary, and only 1.67 % are Graduate level of education.

Out of 51 beneficiaries in village no.2, a little less than four-fifth (78.43 %) beneficiaries have attained Primary Education. The percentage of illiterate beneficiaries' mother is 5.88 % in where 9.81 % High School level of education, 3.92 % Higher Secondary and only 1.96 % having Graduate level of education. The table (5.10) shows that majority of the beneficiaries' mothers (71.74 %) in village 3 have Primary level education, followed by High School 13.04 % and 4.34 % Higher Secondary Education. The percentage of beneficiaries' mothers' who have not attained formal education is 8.70 %. The table shows clearly regarding mother education that a little less than three-fourth (71.74 %) beneficiaries from three villages have the primary level of education. They are followed by 14.80 % High School Education, 5.05 % have attained Higher Secondary level of education and only 1.44 % mothers educated up to Graduate Level. The illiterate percent of three villages is 6.13 %. The data also indicate from three villages that no beneficiaries' mothers have graduate, Post-graduate, Technical level of education.

Occupation of the Beneficiaries

Occupation determines the economic security of a particular family. The beneficiaries' opinion regarding occupation can be shown in the table no. 5.11

Table No. 5.11**Occupation of the beneficiaries**

Occupation	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Housewife/student/Unemployed Person	45 (25.0)	13 (25.49)	13 (28.26)	94 (25.64)
Government Jobs	2 (1.11)	-	-	2 (.72)
White-collar: clericals, salesman, teachers	4 (2.22)	02 (3.92)	2 (4.34)	8 (2.88)
Petty Business: Shopkeepers	10 (5.56)	02 (3.92)	1 (2.17)	13 (4.70)
Agriculturalist	96 (55.0)	27 (52.94)	25(54.34)	148(53.42)
Skilled Workers	2 (1.11)	1 (1.96)	-	3 (1.08)
Unskilled Workers	21 (11.67)	06 (11.77)	5 (10.87)	32 (11.56)
Retired Person	-	-	-	-
Total	180(100.0)	51 (100.0)	46(100.0)	277 (100.0)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The table has cleared that out of 180 beneficiaries in village no. 1, majority of the beneficiaries (55.0 %) are agriculturalist, followed by one-fourth (25.0 percent) of the beneficiaries are house wives/ students/ Unemployed Person, a little more than one-tenth (11.67 %) are unskilled workers, while 5.56 % of the beneficiaries are petty business, 2.22 % white color workers and 1.11 % each of the beneficiaries are skilled workers and govt. jobs.

In the context of village no. 2, majority of the beneficiaries (52.94 %) having agriculture as a main occupation; followed by a little more than one-fourth (25.49 %) are house wives/ students/ unemployed Person, 11.77 % unskilled workers. Among the remaining, 3.92 % each of the beneficiaries are white collar and petty business as a main occupation, and only 1.96 % having skilled workers.

The above table also reveals that more than half percent (54.34 %) depends on agriculture as a main occupation, followed by more than one-fourth (28.26 %) of the

beneficiaries are housewives, student and unemployed persons. Among the remaining, 10.87 % are unskilled worker, 4.34 % white collars, and 2.17 % are engage in business sector. From the above table, it is noticed that majority of the beneficiaries depends on agricultural activities. From the following data, it is reflected that out of 277 total NREGA beneficiaries; more than half 53.42 % have taken agriculture as a main occupation.

Subsidiary Occupation of the Beneficiaries

The subsidiary occupation has an important variable for analyzing the social background of a person. The subsidiary occupations of the beneficiaries are classified in to following categories: i) Nil/ No responses, ii) Agriculture, iii) Fishery, iv) Private Tuition, v) Unskilled Worker. The distributions of the beneficiaries on the basis of subsidiary occupation are shown in table no. 5.12

Table No. 5.12

Subsidiary Occupation of the Beneficiaries

Subsidiary Occupation	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Nil/ No Response	149 (82.78)	40 (78.43)	27 (58.70)	216 (77.98)
Agriculture	16 (8.88)	7 (13.73)	3 ((6.52)	26 (9.38)
Fishery	-	-	-	-
Private Tuition	5 (2.78)	1 (1.96)	6 (13.04)	12 (4.33)
Unskilled Worker	10 (5.56)	3 (5.88)	10 (21.74)	23 (8.30)
Total	180 (100.0)	51 (100.0)	46 (100.0)	277(100.0)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

Regarding subsidiary occupation of beneficiaries is concerned; more than eight-tenth 82.78 % are not reported about subsidiary occupation where 8.88 % are agriculture, 5.56 % unskilled worker and remaining 2.78 % beneficiaries having private tuition as a subsidiary occupation. In the context of village 2, a little less than eight-tenth (78.43 %) are not reported about subsidiary occupation.

The above data about village no. 3 indicate that the majority of the beneficiaries (58.70 %) have no responses regarding their subsidiary occupation. The remaining beneficiaries, 6.52% are agriculture as subsidiary occupation, 13.04 % depends on private tuition, and 21.74 % are physical labour categories as their subsidiary occupation.

The overall observation which can be drawn of the above data that out of 277 total NREGA beneficiaries of three villages, total 216 NREGA beneficiaries (77.98 %) have no responses regarding their subsidiary occupation. Among the remaining, 9.38 % agriculture, 8.30 % unskilled worker and only 4.33 % private tuition depends as a subsidiary occupation.

Occupation of the Beneficiaries Father

The fathers' occupation indicates the economic security of his son/daughter or his family economic security. The distributions of beneficiaries' fathers main occupation is shown in table no. 5.13

Table No. 5.13

Occupation of the Beneficiaries Father

Occupation of Respondent Father	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Unemployed Person	105(58.33)	22(43.13)	17 (36.95)	144 (51.98)
Government Jobs	6 (3.33)	1 (1.96)	4 (8.70)	11 (3.98)
White-collar: clericals, salesman, teachers	4 (2.22)	2 (3.92)	4 (8.70)	10 (3.62)
Petty Business : Shopkeepers	1 (.56)	3 (5.89)	3 (6.52)	7 (2.52)
Agriculturalist	49 (27.22)	10(31.37)	14 (30.43)	79 (28.52)
Skilled Workers	1 (.56)	1 (1.96)	-	2 (.72)
Unskilled Workers	12 (6.66)	5 (9.80)	4 (8.70)	21 (7.58)
Retired Person	2 (1.11)	1 (1.96)	-	3 (1.08)
Total	180 (100.0)	51(100.0)	46 (100.0)	277 (100)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The above table shows the occupation of the beneficiaries' father in three villages. In the village no. 1, out of 180 total beneficiaries, 105 beneficiaries' fathers consisting 58.33 % have un-employed persons, followed by 27.22 % who are agriculturalist. The numbers of beneficiaries' fathers who have government jobs are 3.33 % while 6.66 % of beneficiaries' father engaged unskilled works as a main occupation. Among the remaining, 2.22 % beneficiaries father have engaged White color work, 1.11 % of total beneficiaries fathers are retired person and a few 0.56 % each of the beneficiaries fathers have skilled works and petty business as a main occupation.

The above table also reveals in case of village no. 2 that most of the beneficiaries fathers (43.13 %) are unemployed, followed by 31.37 % agriculture as a main occupation, 9.80 % unskilled worker, 5.89 % have engaged in petty business while 3.92 % in white colors worker. On the other hand, one each of beneficiaries' father (1.96 %) depends on respectively Government Jobs, Skilled works and retired person.

The above table also shows in case of village no. 3 that more than one-third (36.95 %) of the beneficiaries father are unemployed as well as not applicable regarding main occupation, followed by 30.43 % who are depend on agriculture. Among the remaining, 8.70 % are government worker, 8.70 % white collars, 8.70 % unskilled worker. There are no representatives of skilled workers as a fathers' main occupation. From the above table, it is noticed that majority of the beneficiaries father in village 3 is depends on agricultural activities.

From the three villages overall data indicates that majority beneficiaries father having 51.98 % are Unemployed persons, followed by 28.52 % who are engaged in agriculture.

Father's Subsidiary Occupation

On the basis of the beneficiaries' fathers' subsidiary occupation, the distributions of beneficiaries' views regarding subsidiary occupation are given in the table no. 5.14

Table No. 5.14

Subsidiary Occupation of the beneficiaries' father

Subsidiary Occupation	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Nil/ No Response	160 (88.89)	41 (80.39)	35(76.09)	236 (85.19)
Agriculture	17 (9.44)	6 (11.76)	7 (15.21)	30 (10.83)
Fishery	-	1 (1.96)	-	1 (.36)
Private Tuition	-	-	-	-
Unskilled Worker	3 (1.67)	3 (5.88)	4 (8.70)	10 (3.62)
Total	180 (100.0)	46 (100.0)	46(100.0)	277(100)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The above table indicates that 88.89 % of village no. 1 NREGA beneficiaries' fathers have no response about subsidiary occupation, followed by 9.44 % responses agriculture as a subsidiary occupation and only 1.67 % beneficiaries father having unskilled worker. The data also show about village No. 2 that 80.39 % beneficiaries have not responded about the secondary occupation. Among the remaining in village 2, 11.76 percent has agriculture as subsidiary occupation, while 5.88 Percent had unskilled workers as subsidiary occupation and only a few (1.96 percent) of the respondents' father have fishery as subsidiary occupation. No beneficiaries' father had private tuition as subsidiary occupation.

The data indicate in the context of village no. 3 that most of the beneficiaries' fathers (76.09 %) have no subsidiary occupation. Among the remaining, 15.21 % have agriculture as a subsidiary occupation, 8.70 % have labors (unskilled works) as a

subsidiary occupation. From the overall data of three villages' regarding fathers' subsidiary occupation that majority of the beneficiaries' father consisting 86.28 % have no subsidiary occupation.

Beneficiaries' mothers' occupation

The beneficiaries' mothers' occupations are analyzed into four alternative criterions: 1. Housewife/ No, 2. Service, 3. Business, 4. Retired Person. The distributions of beneficiaries' views regarding mothers occupation is shown table no. 5.15

Table No. 5.15

Occupation of the beneficiaries' mother

Subsidiary Occupation	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Housewife/No	176 (97.78)	50 (98.04)	43 (93.47)	269 (97.11)
Service	2 (1.11)	-	-	2 (.73)
Business	2 (1.11)	1 (1.96)	3 (6.53)	6 (2.16)
Retired Persons	-	-	-	-
Total	180 (100)	51 (100)	46 (100)	277 (100)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

From the above table it is clear that, out of 180 total beneficiaries in village no.1, 176 beneficiaries i.e. 97.78 % are housewives, while 1.11 % each beneficiaries mother are in service and business as a occupation. On the other hand, in the context of village no. 2 almost cent percent (98.04 %) are housewives, followed by only 1.96 % beneficiaries mother have business as an occupation. The above table also reveals about village 3 that majority of the beneficiaries mother (93.43 %) are house wife. The remaining 6.53 % beneficiaries' mother depends on business as a main occupation. The data indicates from three villages that the majority mothers (97.11 %) have taken housewife as a main occupation.

Size of Family

Family is one of the most important institutions in human society. Family is a group of people united by ties of marriage, blood, or is a group of persons united by the ties of marriage, blood, or adaptation; constituting a single household, interacting and intercommunicating with each other as a role of husband and wife, mother and father, brother and sister; whose creating a common culture. The beneficiaries size of the family are classified following three categories: i) Small (1-5 members), ii) Medium (6-10 members), iii) Large (above 10). The family size distributions of beneficiaries are shown in the table no. 5.16

Table No. 5.16

Size of Family

Family Size	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Small (1-5 members)	74(41.11)	20 (39.21)	14(30.43)	108 (38.99)
Medium (6-10 Members)	90(50.0)	24 (47.05)	28(60.87)	142 (51.26)
Large (above 10)	16 (8.89)	07 (13.73)	04 (8.70)	27 (9.75)
Total	180 (100)	51 (100)	46 (100)	277 (100)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The following data indicate about the size of the family of three villages. In the context of village no. 1, half percent (50 %) of beneficiaries have medium size of family, followed by 41.11 % have small size of family and 8.89 % beneficiaries have large size of family.

In Village no. 2, a little less than half percent (47.05 %) have medium size of family. There are 39.21 % beneficiaries have small sizes of family while the remaining 13.73 % have large size of family. The above table also reveals in the context of village no. 3 that most of beneficiaries have medium (60.87 %) size of family, followed by small family with 30.43 %. The percentage of large family is only 8.70 %.

The overall data which can be drawn from the table no. 5.16 that a little more than half percent (51.26 %) have medium size of family, 38.99 % belongs to small size of family, while a little less than one-tenth (9.75 %) of the beneficiaries have large size of family. The data indicate that there are large numbers of medium and small size family existing in the village and joint family is very less.

Beneficiaries' Monthly Income

The monthly income of the beneficiaries indicates the economic status in society. To observe the economic status of beneficiaries, the distributions of beneficiaries views are classified into five categories: 1) Within Rs 1000, 2) Rs 1000-2500, 3) Rs 2500-4000, 4) Rs 4000-5500, 5) Above Rs 5500. The table 5.17 shows monthly income of the beneficiaries.

Table No. 5.17

Monthly Income of the beneficiaries

Monthly Income	Frequency and Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Within 1000 Rs.	60(33.33)	15 (29.41)	18(39.13)	93 (33.57)
1001- 2500 Rs	83 (46.11)	25 (49.02)	19(41.30)	127 (45.84)
2500- 4000	25 (13.89)	6 (11.76)	5 (10.87)	36 (13.0)
4000- 5500	7 (3.89)	3 (5.88)	3 (6.52)	13 (4.70)
Above 5500	5 (2.78)	2 (3.92)	1 (2.17)	8 (2.89)
Total	180 (100.0)	51 (100.0)	46(100.0)	277 (100)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The above table indicates the total monthly income among the beneficiaries in three villages. In village no. 1, majority of beneficiaries consisting 46.11 percentage having monthly income within Rs. 1000- 2500 while one-third of total beneficiaries (33.33 %) monthly income is within Rs. 1000. The monthly income within Rs. 2500-4000 is 13.89 %, followed by 3.89 % who monthly income category is Rs. 4000-5500. The remaining 2.78 % income is more than Rs. 5500 per month.

It is noticed from the table in case of village no. 2 that the highest 25 beneficiaries consisting 49.02 % have monthly income level of Rs. 1000- 2500/-. The

number of beneficiaries between the income level within 1000 are 29.41 %, within the Rs. 2500-4000 Monthly Category income group are 6 (11.76 %), 3 (5.88 %) beneficiaries has monthly income Rs. between 4000-5500, only 2 (3.92 %) beneficiaries monthly income has more than Rs. 5500.

The data show in case of village no. 3 that a little more two-fifth (41.30 %) percent of the beneficiaries have within Rs. 1000-2500 monthly income categories, followed by 39.13 % who have within Rs. 1000 monthly income. The percentage of Rs. 2500-4000 monthly income is only 10.87 %. Among the remaining, 6.52 % beneficiaries have Rs. 4000-5500 monthly income and other only one beneficiary (2.17 %) has more than Rs. 5500 monthly income categories.

Beneficiaries' Families Monthly Income

Family income of a person has an important bearing on socio-economic background of a person's and it identified as an instrument of a person economic settlement. Here monthly income of beneficiaries are classified into seven categories: i) up to Rs. 1000, ii) Rs. 1000-2500, iii) Rs. 2500-4000, iv) Rs. 4000-5500, v) Rs. 5500-7000, vi) Rs. 7000-9000, vii) above Rs. 9000. The distributions of family monthly income are shown in the table no. 5.18

Table No. 5.18

Monthly Income of beneficiaries Family

Family Monthly Income	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
1000 Rs.	44 (24.44)	6 (11.77)	17 (36.96)	67 (24.18)
1000-2500 Rs.	72 (40.0)	28 (54.90)	14 (30.44)	114 (41.15)
2500-4000 Rs.	34 (18.89)	12 (23.53)	4 (8.70)	50 (18.05)
4000-5500 Rs.	16 (8.89)	2 (3.92)	4 (8.70)	22 (7.95)
5500-7000 Rs.	6 (3.33)	-	2 (4.34)	8 (2.89)
7000-9000 Rs.	4 (2.22)	2 (3.92)	3 (6.52)	9 (3.24)
Above 9000 Rs	4 (2.22)	1 (1.96)	2 (4.34)	7 (2.53)
Total	18 (100.0)	51 (100.0)	46 (100.0)	277 (100)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The above table reveals the monthly income of the beneficiaries' family. It is noticed from the table no. 5.18 in the context of village no. 1 that two-fifth of the beneficiaries consisting 40 % have monthly income Rs 1000- 2500/-. The number of beneficiaries between the income level within Rs. 1000 are 24.44 %, within the Rs. 2500-4000 Monthly Category income group are 18.89 %, 5.89 % beneficiaries has monthly income Rs. between 4000-5500, 3.33 % beneficiaries have between Rs. 5500-7000 while only 2 (2.22 %) each of the beneficiaries monthly income have respectively between Rs. 7000-9000 and more than Rs. 9000.

The table reveals in case of village 2, more than half percent (54.90 %) of beneficiaries family monthly income level is between Rs. 1000-2500, followed by a little less than one-fourth (23.53 %) of the beneficiaries family who have income of between Rs. 2500-4000, 11.77 % beneficiaries family have income within Rs. 1000, 1.96 % beneficiaries families have more than Rs. 9000 of monthly income while 2 (3.92 %) each of the beneficiaries family monthly income have respectively between Rs. 4000-5500 and between Rs. 7000-9000. In the context of village No. 3, the table No. 5.18 shows that majority beneficiaries families consisting 36.96 % have within Rs. 1000 monthly income, followed by 30.44 % having families income is between Rs. 1000-2500. The incomes between Rs. 2500-4000 & 4000-5500 are respectively 8.70 % each of families. Among the remaining, 6.52 % have Rs. 7000-9000 families' income while the 4.34 % each of the families have Rs. between 5500-7000 & above Rs. 9000 per month income. The overall assessment of three villages reveals that a little more than two-fifth having 41.15 % of three villages have between Rs. 1000-2500 s monthly income, followed by 24.18 % having within 1000 monthly family income.

House Pattern of the Beneficiaries

On the basis of the house pattern of the beneficiaries, the beneficiaries views are classified into four alternative criterion: 1) Kuccha House, 2) Assam Type, 3) 'L'

Pattern, 4) RCC. The table no. 5.19 shows the views of beneficiaries about the housing pattern.

Table No. 5.19

House Pattern of the Beneficiaries

House Pattern	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-1	Village-1	
Kuccha House	107 (59.44)	33 (64.71)	23 (50.0)	163 (58.85)
Assam Type	37 (20.56)	07 (13.72)	05(10.87)	49 (17.69)
‘L’ Pattern	12 (6.67)	04 (7.85)	3 (6.52)	19 (6.86)
RCC	2 (1.11)	-	-	2 (.72)
Semi Pacca	22 (12.22)	07 (13.72)	15 (32.61)	44 (15.89)
Total	180 (100.0)	46 (100.0)	46 (100.0)	100

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The table has clarified about the house pattern of the beneficiaries. In village no. 1, a little less than three-fifth (59.44 %) beneficiaries have ‘Kuccha House’, 20.56 % belongs to the beneficiaries who have ‘Assam Type’ house, 6.67 % beneficiaries have ‘L’ Pattern, 12.22 % beneficiaries ‘Semi Pacca’ houses and remaining 1.11 % have RCC Type of house.

In village no. 2, majority (64.71 %) of beneficiaries have ‘Kuccha House’, 13.72 % each belongs to the category of ‘Assam Type’ and ‘Semi Pacca’. The remaining 7.85 % beneficiaries belong to the category of ‘L’ Pattern of houses.

The above table also shows about the village no. 3 that half percent of the beneficiaries have ‘Kuccha House’, followed by 32.61 % beneficiaries have ‘Semi Pacca’, 10.87 % belongs to the beneficiaries who have ‘Assam Type’ of house pattern and rest 6.62 % beneficiaries have ‘L’ Pattern of house.

Out of 277 NREGA beneficiaries of three villages, 163 beneficiaries (58.85 %) have ‘Kacca’ Type of house. Among the remaining, 17.69 % have ‘Assam Type’,

15.89 % ‘Semi Pacca’, 6.86 % ‘L’ Pattern and just a few .72 % has RCC Type of house.

Electric Facility of the beneficiaries

The electric facilities of the beneficiaries are classified in to two categories: 1) Those that have electric facility, 2) Those that are not electric facility. The following table shows the distributions of electric facilities among the NREGA beneficiaries.

Table No. 5.20

Electric facility of the Beneficiaries

Electric Facility	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Yes	136 (75.56)	37 (72.55)	12 (26.08)	185 (66.79)
No	44 (24.44)	14(27.45)	34 (73.92)	92 (33.21)
Total	180 (100.0)	51 (100.0)	46 (100.0)	277 (100)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

Regarding the beneficiaries Electric Facility, it is clear from the table that more than three-fourth 75.56 % beneficiaries of village no. 1 have their electric facility, followed by 24.44 % beneficiaries who have not their electric facility.

In Village no.2, majority of the beneficiaries consisting 72.55 % have their electric facility while 27.45 % have not electric facility due to poor economic condition. In the context of Village no. 3, it reveals that a little less than three-fourth (73.92 %) beneficiaries have not electric facility in while the remaining 26.08 % beneficiaries have their electric facility. In this regard, it is better to say that during the study some of the parts of the village have not electric connection due to broken of electric post.

The overall data of three villages, it is noticed that 66.79 % of total beneficiaries have their electric connection, followed by 33.21 % beneficiaries who have not their electric facility.

Beneficiaries' Native place

Native Place represents of the original place of the beneficiaries. The native place of the beneficiaries are distributed in the table no. 5.21

Table No. 5.21

Beneficiaries' Native place

Beneficiaries Native Place	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Jorhat	178 (98.89)	51 (100)	45 (97.83)	274 (98.92)
Sivsagar	-	-	-	-
Golaghat	-	-	1 (2.17)	1 (.36)
Other	02 (1.11)	-	-	2 (.72)
Total	180 (100.0)	51 (100.0)	46 (100.0)	277 (100)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The following table shows the native place of the NREGA beneficiaries. In the context of village no. 1, 98.89 % of the beneficiaries' native place is Jorhat, followed by 1.11 % beneficiaries which native place is Tinsukia.

Out of 51 beneficiaries of village no. 2, all the beneficiaries' native place Jorhat. As native place in village no. 3 is concerned, 97.83 % of beneficiaries' native place belongs to Jorhat district. The remaining only 2.17 % beneficiaries' native place is Golaghat district. It is noticed from the above table that more than nine tenth (98.92 %) beneficiary's native place is their birth place that is Jorhat.

Length of Residence

The length of residence shows that for how many years the beneficiaries are in villages. The distribution of beneficiaries views about length of residence are classified into six categories: 1. Since birth, 2. 1-5 Years, 3. 6-10 Years, 4. 11-15 Years, 5. 16-20 Years, 6. Above 20 Years. The beneficiaries' views are shown in the table no. 5.22

Table No. 5.22

Length of Residence

Length of Residence	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Since Birth	178 (98.89)	51 (100)	40 (86.96)	267 (96.38)
1-5 Years	-	-	1 (2.17)	1 (0.36)
6-10 Years	-	-	5 (10.87)	5 (1.81)
11-15 Years	-	-	-	1 (0.36)
16-20 Years	-	-	-	-
Above 20 Years	02 (1.11)	-	-	1 (0.36)
Total	180 (100.0)	51(100.0)	46 (100.0)	277 (100)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The data show that in village no. 1, out of 180 NREGA beneficiaries, 178 beneficiaries consisting with the percentage of 98.89 % are residing in the village since birth. The remaining a few having (1.11 %) beneficiaries are residing in the village for last twenty years.

In the context of village no. 2, all the beneficiaries are residing in the village since birth. In the context of village no. 3, it is noticed during our field study that 5 beneficiaries (10.87 %) are migrated in the village due to flood problem in their own village. It is seen from the above data that the majority of the beneficiaries of three villages are residing in their own villages since birth.

Land Ownership of Beneficiaries

The ownership of land among the NREGA beneficiaries of three villages are classified into two categories: 1) those who have land, 2) Those who have not land. The beneficiaries' views regarding ownership of land are shown in the table no. 5.23

Table No. 5.23

Land Ownership of Beneficiaries

Own Land	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Yes	180 (100)	51 (100)	45 (97.83)	276 (99.64)
No	-	-	1 (2.17)	1 (0.36)
Total	180 (100.0)	51 (100.0)	46 (100)	277 (100)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The above table shows the land ownership of the beneficiaries. The data indicate that cent percent of total beneficiaries of village no. 1 and village no. 2 have ownership of land. Only one beneficiary of village no. 3 has not their own land in the village and stay in relative home. The overall data about ownership of land of three villages indicates that, out of 277 NREGA beneficiaries of three villages, 276 beneficiaries (99.64 %) have ownership of land while only one beneficiary covering 0.36 % has not their own land in the village.

Total Size of Land

The total size of land among the NREGA beneficiaries are classified into six categories: 1) 0-5 bighas, 2) 6-10 Bighas, 3)11-15 Bighas, 4) 16-20 Bighas, 5) 21-25 Bighas, 6) Above 25 Bighas. The distribution of beneficiaries' views on the basis of total size of land is shown the table no. 5.24.

Table No. 5.24

Total Size of land among the beneficiaries

Total Size of Land	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
0-5 Bighas	46 (25.56)	25 (49.02)	26 (56.53)	97 (35.01)
6- 10 Bighas	103 (57.22)	20 (39.21)	7 (15.21)	130 (46.94)
11- 15 Bighas	24 (13.33)	3 (5.88)	9 (19.57)	36 (13.0)
16- 20 Bighas	6 (3.33)	3 (5.88)	3 (6.52)	12 (4.33)
21- 25 Bighas	1 (0.56)	-	1 (2.17)	2 (.72)
Above 25 Bighas	-	-	-	-
Total	180 (100.0)	51 (100.0)	46 (100.0)	277 (100.00)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The above table reveals the total land holding among the NREGA beneficiaries in three villages. The data indicate that in the village no. 1, majority of the beneficiaries (57.22 %) own 6-10 bighas of land, followed by a little more than one fifth (25.56 %) of the beneficiaries who own within 5 Bighas of land, 13.33 % beneficiaries having 11-15 Bighas of land, 3.33 % of the beneficiaries own 16-20 bighas of land while remaining .56 % beneficiaries own 21-25 bighas of land.

In the village no. 2, out of 51 beneficiaries, 25 beneficiaries consisting of 49.02 % own 0-5 Bighas of land, 20 beneficiaries having 39.21 % own 6-10 Bighas of own land while 5.88 % each beneficiaries having 11-15 Bighas of own land and 16-20 Bighas of land. The data reveal that in the village No. 3, majority of the beneficiaries 56.53 % having ½ - 5 bighas of land, followed by 19.57 % who own 11-15 bighas of total size of land, 15.21 % beneficiaries having 6-10 Bighas of land while 6.52 % beneficiaries own 16-20 Bighas of land. The remaining 2.17 % beneficiaries own 21-25 Bighas of total size of land.

The overall data of three villages reveal that majority of beneficiaries consisting 46.94 % own 6-10 Bighas of land, followed by 35.01 % beneficiaries who own 0-5 Bighas of land, 13.0 % & 4.33 % of total beneficiaries of three villages own 11-15 Bighas % 16-20 Bighas of total size of land respectively. The remaining a few 0.72 % beneficiaries own more than 21 Bighas of own land.

Household land of the Beneficiaries

The household lands of the beneficiaries are classified into five categories: 1) Nil/ No Response, 2) ½ -5 bighas, 3) 6-10 Bighas, 4)11-15 Bighas, 5) Above 15 Bighas. The distribution of beneficiaries' views regarding total size of household land is shown the table no. 5.25

Table No. 5.25

Total Size of Household Land

Total Size of household Land	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Nil/ No Response	-	-	1 (2.17)	1 (.36)
½ - 5 Bighas	172 (95.56)	51(100)	44 (95.66)	267 (96.38)
6- 10 Bighas	08 (4.44)	-	1 (2.17)	9 (3.24)
11- 15 Bighas	-	-	-	-
Above 15 Bighas	-	-	-	-
Total	180 (100.0)	51 (100.0)	46 (100.0)	277 (100)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The above table shows the household land of the beneficiaries. The data indicate that in case of village no. 1, maximum numbers of beneficiaries consisting with the percentage of 95.56 % having ½ - 5 bighas of household land, followed by 4.44 % who own 6-10 bighas of household land. In the context of village no. 2, all the beneficiaries (100 %) own ½-5 bighas of household land. The data also indicates that more than nine-tenth (95.66 %) beneficiaries of village No. 3 own ½ - 5 bighas of household land where 2.17 % beneficiaries have 6-10 bighas of household land. There is one beneficiary (2.17 %) who does not have household land in the village. It is noticed from the above data that majority of the beneficiaries of three villages own ½ - 5 bighas of household land in the village.

Total Size of Agricultural Land

The land ownership has been further classified into agricultural and non agricultural land. The rural economy is basically agro based economy. Thus, the agricultural lands of the beneficiaries give a clear picture about the economic status of the beneficiaries. The total size of agricultural land among the three villages NREGA beneficiaries are classified into six categories: 1) Nil/ No Response, 2) ½ -5 bighas, 3) 6-10 Bighas, 4)11-15 Bighas, 5) 16-20 Bighas, 6) Above 20 Bighas. The distribution of beneficiaries' views regarding total size of agricultural land is shown the table no. 5.26

Table No. 5.26

Total Size of Agricultural Land

Total Size of Land	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Nil/ No Response	4 (2.22)	5 (9.80)	07 (15.21)	16 (5.77)
½ - 5 Bighas	97 (53.88)	36(70.60)	22 (47.82)	155 (55.96)
6- 10 Bighas	50 (27.78)	5 (9.80)	10 (21.73)	65 (23.46)
11- 15 Bighas	28 (15.56)	4 (7.84)	4 (8.70)	36 (13.0)
16- 20 Bighas	01 (.56)	1 (1.96)	2 (4.34)	4 (1.44)
Above 20 Bighas	0	0	1 (2.17)	1 (.36)
Total	180(100.0)	51(100.0)	46 (100.0)	277 (100.0)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The table shows the total size of agricultural land. As total agricultural land in village no. 1 is concerned, more than half percent (53.88 %) of total beneficiaries own ½ -5 Bighas of agricultural land. The numbers of beneficiaries between 6-10 bighas of agricultural land are 27.78 %, between the 11-15 bighas are 15.56 %, between 16-20 Bighas are .56 % while 2.22 % beneficiaries do not have own agricultural land and while there are no beneficiaries who own 20 bighas of agricultural land.

In the context of village no. 2, more than seven tenth (70.60 %) beneficiaries having ½ - 5 Bighas of agricultural land, followed by 1.96 % beneficiaries own 16-20 Bighas of agricultural land. There are 9.80 % each of beneficiaries having 6-10 Bighas of agricultural land and no responses about the agricultural land.

The table reveals in case of village no. 3 that 47.82 % beneficiaries own ½ - 5 Bighas of agricultural land, followed by a little more than two-fifth having 21.73 % of the beneficiaries who owns 6-10 Bighas of agricultural land, 8.70 % beneficiaries own 11-15 bighas of agricultural land, 4.34 % own 16-20 bighas while only 2.17 % own more than 20 bighas of agricultural land. Out of 46 NREGA beneficiaries in village 3, 07 beneficiaries having 15.21 % have no responses regarding the agricultural land. The overall data of three villages reveal that majority beneficiaries (55.96 %) of three villages own 6-10 bighas of agricultural land.

Cultivated land of the Beneficiaries

The beneficiaries who have agricultural land are further classified into two categories: 1) Cultivated Land, 2) Un-cultivated land. The cultivated lands of the beneficiaries are classified into five alternative criterions: 1) Nil/ No Response, 2) ½ - 5 bighas, 3) 6-10 Bighas, 4)11-15 Bighas, 5) Above 15 Bighas. The distribution of beneficiaries' views regarding total size of household land is shown the table no. 5.27

Table No. 5.27**Total Size of Cultivated Land**

Total Size of cultivated Land	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Nil/No Response	7 (3.89)	5 (9.80)	7 (15.21)	19 (6.85)
½ - 5 Bighas	143 (79.44)	43(84.31)	28(60.87)	214 (77.25)
6- 10 Bighas	22 (12.22)	6 (11.76)	9 (19.57)	37 (13.35)
11- 15 Bighas	5 (2.78)	1(1.96)	2 (4.34)	8 (2.88)
Above 15 Bighas	3 (1.67)	-	-	3 (1.08)
Total	180 (100.0)	51(100.0)	46(100.0)	277 (100.0)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The following table indicates the total size of cultivated land among the NREGA beneficiaries in three villages. In the context of village no. 1, a little less than four-fifth (79.44 %) own ½ - 5 bighas of cultivated land, followed by 12.22 % who have 6-10 bighas of cultivated land, 2.78 % own 11-15 bighas cultivated land, 1.67 % having more than 15 bighas of cultivated land where the remaining 3.89 % have no responses regarding the cultivated land.

Out of 51 beneficiaries in village no.2, it is found that more than four-fifth (84.31 %) beneficiaries have ½ - 5 bighas of cultivated land. They are followed by 11.76 % who own 6-10 bighas while the 1.96 % of total beneficiaries have 11-15 bighas of cultivated land. The remaining 9.80 % have no responses about the cultivated land in the village.

In the context of village no. 3, out of 46 NREGA beneficiaries, 28 beneficiaries consisting with 60.87 % own ½ -5 bighas of cultivated land, 9 beneficiaries (19.57 %) have 6-10 bighas, 2 beneficiaries (4.34 %) own 11-15 bighas of cultivated land. On the other hand, 7 beneficiaries having 15.21 % have no responses regarding the cultivated land.

The overall data drawn from the above table that a little less than three fourth (77.25 %) beneficiaries own ½ - 5 bighas of cultivated land in three villages while only 1.08 % beneficiaries have more than 15 bighas of cultivated land.

Un-cultivated land of the Beneficiaries

The Un-cultivated lands of the beneficiaries are classified into five alternative criterions: 1) Nil/ No Response, 2) ½ -5 bighas, 3) 6-10 Bighas, 4)11-15 Bighas, 5) Above 15 Bighas. The following table shows the un-cultivated land distributions of the beneficiaries.

Table No. 5.28

Total Size of Un-cultivated Land

Total Size of Uncultivated Land	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Nil/ No Response	35(19.44)	8 (15.69)	40(86.96)	83 (29.97)
½ - 5 Bighas	92(51.11)	40(78.43)	5 (10.87)	137 (49.45)
6- 10 Bighas	51(28.33)	3 (5.88)	1 (2.17)	55 (19.85)
11- 15 Bighas	02 (1.11)	-	-	2 (.72)
Above 15 Bighas	-	-	-	-
Total	180(100.0)	51(100.0)	46(100.0)	277 (100)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The above table reveals the un-cultivated land distributions among the NREGA beneficiaries in three villages. The data indicate that in the village no. 1, more than half percent beneficiaries (51.11%) own ½ - 5 bighas of total size of uncultivated land, followed by a little less than three tenth (28.33 %) of the beneficiaries who own 6-10 Bighas of uncultivated land, only 1.11 % beneficiaries having 11-15 Bighas of uncultivated land. On the other hand, a little less two-fifth 19.44 % have no responses regarding the uncultivated land.

In the village no. 2, out of 51 beneficiaries, 40 beneficiaries consisting more than three-fourth (78.43 %) own ½ -5 Bighas of uncultivated land, 3 beneficiaries

having percentage of 5.88 % own 6-10 Bighas of own uncultivated land while remaining 15.69 % beneficiaries have no responses about the uncultivated own land.

The data reveal that in the village no. 3, majority of the beneficiaries (86.96 %) having ½ - 5 bighas of un-cultivated land, followed by 10.87 % who own 6-10 bighas of un-cultivated land while the remaining 28.26 % have no uncultivated land in the village.

The overall data of three villages reveal that majority of beneficiaries consisting 5 have no responses regarding uncultivated land, followed by 10.87 % who have ½-5 bighas of uncultivated land. The rest 2.17 beneficiaries have 6-10 bighas of uncultivated land.

Crops Grown By the Beneficiaries

On the basis of the crops grown, the beneficiaries' views are classified into eight categories: 1) Nil / No Response, 2) Sali, 3) Ahu, 4) Rabi, 5) Sali + Ahu, 6) Sali + Rabi, 7) Ahu + Rabi, 8) Sali + Ahu + Rabi. The distributions of beneficiaries under these categories are shown in the table no. 5.29

Table No. 5.29

Crops Grown By the Beneficiaries

Crops Grown	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
No/ No Response	11 (6.11)	4 (7.85)	3 (6.53)	18 (6.50)
Sali	70 (38.88)	22 (43.13)	8 (17.59)	100 (36.10)
Ahu	-	-	-	-
Rabi	3 (1.67)	2 (3.92)	2 (4.34)	7 (2.53)
Sali + Ahu	-	-	4 (8.70)	4 (1.44)
Sali + Rabi	82 (45.56)	21 (41.17)	17 (36.96)	120 (43.32)
Ahu + Rabi	4 (2.22)	-	-	4 (1.44)
Sali + Ahu + Rabi	10 (5.56)	2 (3.92)	12 (26.08)	24(8.67)
Total	180(100.0)	51 (100.0)	46 (100.0)	277 (100)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The above table reveals the crops grown by the beneficiaries in three villages. In the case of village no. 1, majority of the beneficiaries 45.56 % have grown both Sali and Rabi Crops, followed by 38.88 % who have only grown Sali crops, 1.67 % have grown Rabi Crops, 5.56 % have grown Sali + Ahu + Rabi crops while 2.22 % grows both Ahu & Rabi Crops. The remaining 6.11 % beneficiaries have no responses about the crops grown. In the village no. 2, majority of the beneficiaries (43.13 %) have grown only Sali Crops. The numbers of beneficiaries which are grown both Sali & Rabi crops are 21 with 41.17 percentages. On the other hand, 3.92 % each of the beneficiaries have grown the respectively only Rabi and Sali + Ahu + Rabi crops in where 7.85 % have no responses regarding the crops grown.

The above data also reveal in village no. 3 that out of 46 NREGA beneficiaries, 17 beneficiaries consisting 36.96 % have grown both Sali and Rabi crops, 12 beneficiaries consisting 26.08 percentages grow Sali + Ahu + Rabi Crops, while 17.59 % have grown only Sali Crops while other 8.70 % have grown both Sali + Ahu, 4.34 % grows Rabi Crops. The remaining 6.53 % have no responses about the crops grown.

The overall data of three villages indicate that majority of three villages beneficiaries (43.32 %) have grown Sali + Rabi crops. Thus, the data reveals that Sali and Rabi are the main crops which are produced mostly by the beneficiaries of three villages.

Machine Used by the Beneficiaries

The beneficiaries views regarding machine used (use or not) in agricultural sectors are distributed in the table no. 5.30

Table No. 5.30

Machine Used by the Beneficiaries

Machine Used	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Nil/ No Response	160 (88.89)	48(94.11)	40(86.96)	248 (89.54)
Yes	20 (11.11)	3 (5.89)	06(13.04)	29 (10.46)
Total	180(100.0)	51(100.0)	46 (100.0)	277(100.0)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The above table shows among the three villages NREGA beneficiaries that whether they used machines in agricultural purpose or not. In the context of village no.1, a little less than nine tenth (88.89 %) beneficiaries are not used machine for agriculture, 1.11% beneficiaries use machine in agricultural sector.

Out of 51 beneficiaries in village no. 2, only 3 beneficiaries having 5.89 % use machine in agricultural sector, while a more than nine-tenth 94.11 % beneficiaries have not used machine. In the context of village No. 3, majority of the beneficiaries consisting 86.96 % have no responses regarding machine used in agriculture, followed by 13.04 who use machine in agricultural sector.

The overall data of three villages indicate that a little less than nine-tenth (89.54 %) have not used machine in agricultural sector due to poor economic conditions and unavailability of land in the village. They have basically used domestic animals in agricultural purpose.

Fertilizer Used by the Beneficiaries

The beneficiaries' views regarding uses of fertilizer in agricultural are classified into some alternative criterions: 1) Nil/ No Responses, 2) Bio-composed, 3) Bio-chemical, 4) Both. The table 5.31 shows the Fertilizer Used by the Beneficiaries

Table No. 5.31

Fertilizer Used by the Beneficiaries

Fertilizer Used	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Nil/ No Response	92 (51.11)	23 (45.10)	22 (47.83)	137 (49.45)
Bio-composed	17 (9.44)	9 (17.65)	11 (23.92)	37 (13.35)
Bio-chemical	11 (6.11)	1 (1.96)	7 (15.21)	19 (6.86)
Both	60 (33.34)	18 (35.29)	6 (13.04)	84 (30.32)
Total	180(100.0)	51 (100.0)	46 (100.0)	277 (100)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The above table reveals the uses of fertilizer in the agricultural sectors by the beneficiaries. Out of 180 NREGA beneficiaries in village no. 1, majority 92 beneficiaries i.e. 51.11 % have not used fertilizer in agricultural purpose. They are followed by 33.34 % who uses both Bio-composed and Bio-chemical in agriculture. Apart from this, 9.44 % uses Bio-composed while the remaining 6.11 % uses Bio-chemical in their agricultural purpose.

The data indicate in the village no. 2 that majority 45.10 % beneficiaries have no responses about the uses of fertilizer in agricultural sector, followed by 35.29 % uses both Bio-chemical & Bio-composed, 17.65 % uses Bio-composed in where the remaining only 1.96 % uses Bio-chemical.

As per uses of fertilizer in agricultural sector is concerned in the context of village no. 3, majority of them have no responses about fertilizer uses, followed by 23.92 % who uses Bio-chemical. 15.21 % beneficiaries have uses Bio-chemical while the other 13.03 % have uses both Bio- chemical & Bio-composed in agricultural sectors. From the overall data of three villages reveals that almost half percent (49.45 %) of total beneficiaries have no responses as well as no uses in agricultural sectors.

Seeds Used by the Beneficiaries

On the basis of seeds used, the beneficiaries' views are classified into four categories: 1) Nil/ No Responses, 2) Hi-breed, 3) Local, 4) Both. The distribution of beneficiaries views regarding Seeds Used are shown in table No. 5.32

Table No. 5.32

Seeds Used by the Beneficiaries

Seeds Used	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Nil/ No Response	26 (14.44)	15(29.41)	22 (47.83)	63 (22.75)
Hi-Breed	7 (3.89)	6 (11.77)	04 (8.70)	17 (6.13)
Local	47 (26.11)	7 (13.72)	7 (15.21)	61 (22.02)
Both	100(55.56)	23(45.10)	13 (28.26)	136 (49.10)
Total	180(100.0)	51(100.0)	46 (100.0)	277 (100)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The above table indicates in the context of village no. 1, more than half percent of total beneficiaries having the percentage of 55.56 % are used both Hi-breed and local seeds in their agriculture, followed by 26.11 % who use local, 3.89 % has used Hi-breed in their agriculture. The remaining 14.44 % have no responses about the seeds used.

In village no. 2, out of 51 NREGA beneficiaries, 45.10 % have used both Hi-breed and Local seeds in agriculture, followed by 13.72 % who use the local seeds. The percentage of not responding and uses of Hi-breed in agriculture are respectively 29.41 % & 11.77 %. From the data of village no. 3, it is clear that majority beneficiaries (47.83 %) have no responded about the uses of seeds. Apart from this, 28.26 % uses both hi-breed & local seeds, 15.21 % uses local and remaining 8.70 % has used Hi-breed seeds in their agriculture.

From the above data of three villages, it is clear that almost half percent (49.10 %) of total beneficiaries have used both hi-breed & local seeds.

Information received by the Beneficiaries

The beneficiaries' views regarding how can receive information about agriculture are distributed into table no. 5.33

Table No. 5.33

Information received by the Beneficiaries

Information Received	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Nil/ No response	67 (37.22)	30 (58.83)	30 (65.21)	127 (45.85)
Self	85 (47.22)	18 (35.29)	11 (23.91)	114 (41.15)
Agri Deptt/ Gram Sevek	28 (15.56)	3 (5.88)	05 (10.86)	36 (13.0)
Total	180 (100.0)	51 (100.0)	46 (100.0)	277 (100.0)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The above table reveals the information received by the beneficiaries for agriculture. The data indicates in case of village no. 1, a little less than half percent (47.22 %) do not receive information about agriculture, 15.56 % of beneficiaries have received about agriculture (Seeds/ fertilizer etc) from Agri. dept/ Gram Sevek and the remaining 37.22 % have no responses regarding receiving information about agriculture.

In the context of village no. 2, 35.29 % have not received any information about agriculture, followed by 5.88 % who have received information from Agri. Deptt/ Gram Sevek. The remaining 58.83 % beneficiaries have not responded regarding information receive about agriculture.

In the context of village no. 3, majority of them consisting 65.21 % have no responses regarding receiving of information about agricultural seeds & fertilizers, followed by 23.91 who are not receiving information about agriculture while the remaining 10.86 % have received information through Gram Sevek/ Agri. Dept.

Domestic Animal

Domestic animal is an important variable for socio-economic analysis of the beneficiaries. The beneficiaries' views are classified on the basis of number of domestic animals they have.

Cows of Beneficiaries

On the basis of cows, they possessed the beneficiaries are classified into five categories. The beneficiaries' views regarding numbers of cows are shown in the table no. 5.34

Table No. 5.34

Cows of Beneficiaries

Cow	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Nil/ No Response	41 (22.78)	11 (21.57)	13(28.26)	65 (23.46)
One	14 (7.78)	3 (5.88)	1 (2.17)	18 (6.50)
Two	27 (15.0)	12 (23.53)	4 (8.70)	43 (15.53)
Three	39 (21.66)	5 (9.81)	9 (19.56)	53 (19.13)
Above three	59 (32.78)	20 (39.21)	19(41.30)	98 (35.37)
Total	180(100.0)	51(100.0)	46(100.0)	277 (100.0)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The data indicate that in village no. 1, more than three-tenth (32.78 %) beneficiaries have more than three numbers of cows, followed by 21.66 % having three number of cows, 15 % have two cows while the 7.78 % have only one cow. The remaining 22.78 % have no cows.

In the context of village no. 2, a little less than two-fifth (39.21 %) have more than two cows, while a little than two-fifth (39.21 %) have more than two number of cows and less than one-tenth percentage including 5.88 % & 9.88 % having one and

three numbers of cows respectively. On the other hand, more than one-fifth (21.57) percentages of the village have no cows.

Out of 46 beneficiaries in case of village no. 3, 19 beneficiaries consisting with the 41.30 % have more than three numbers of cows while the other 4 beneficiaries i.e. 8.70 % having the two number of cows, 19.56 % beneficiaries have three numbers of cows, only one beneficiary has one cow.

Buffalo of Beneficiaries

The distributions of beneficiaries' views regarding the numbers of buffalos are shown in table no. 5.35

Table No. 5.35

Buffalo of Beneficiaries

Buffalo	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Nil/ No Response	124 (68.89)	46 (90.19)	33 (71.74)	203 (73.28)
One	7 (3.890)	03 (5.88)	3 (6.520)	13 (4.70)
Two	6 (3.33)	0	1 (2.170)	7 (2.52)
Three	7 (3.89)	1 (1.960)	4 (8.70)	12 (4.33)
Above three	36 (20.0)	1 (1.96)	2 (4.340)	39 (14.10)
Total	180 (100.0)	51 (100.0)	46 (100.0)	277 (100.0)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The above table shows the total numbers of buffalos among the beneficiaries of three villages. In the village no. 1, a little less than seven-tenth (68.89 %) beneficiaries have not buffalos, followed by 20 % who have more than three numbers of buffalos, 3.33 % beneficiaries of the village have two buffalos while 3.89 % each beneficiaries of the village have one and three number of buffalos.

The data also reveal in case of village no. 2 that more than nine-tenth (90.19 %) beneficiaries have no responses as well as no buffalos. They are followed by 5.88

% having one buffalos, 1.96 % each having three and more than three numbers of buffalos.

Regarding the number of buffalos in village no. 3, it reveals that more than seven-tenth (71.74 %) beneficiaries have no responses and no buffalos in where 6.52 % beneficiaries have one buffalos, 8.70 % beneficiaries have three no's of buffalos and 4.34 % having more than three number of buffalos in the village. On the other hand, the remaining 2.17 % beneficiaries have only two number of own buffalos. The overall data of three villages reveals that majority of the beneficiaries of the entire three villages have no responses as well as no buffalos.

Goat of Beneficiaries

The distribution of beneficiaries' on the basis of numbers of numbers of goat possessed is shown in table no. 5.36

Table No 5.36

Goat of Beneficiaries

Goat	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Nil/ No Response	142(78.89)	39(76.47)	31(67.39)	212 (76.54)
One	2 (1.11)	1 (1.96)	3 (6.52)	6 (2.16)
Two	4 (2.22)	2 (3.92)	2 (4.34)	8 (2.89)
Three	8 (4.44)	2 (3.92)	2 (4.340)	12 (4.33)
Above three	24 (13.33)	7 (13.73)	8 (17.39)	39 (14.09)
Total	180 (100.0)	51(100.0)	46(100.0)	277 (100.0)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The above table 5.36 indicates that most of the beneficiaries consisting 78.89 % have no responses about having goat, followed by 13.33 % have more three goats. The number of beneficiaries is very less with the percentage of 1.11 which has only one buffalo, two and three goats which constitutes only 2.22% and 4.44 % respectively.

In the context of village no. 2, more than three-fourth (76.47 %) have no goat followed by 13.73 % who have more than three numbers of goat, 3.92 % each beneficiaries have two and three number of goats while the remaining only 1.96 % beneficiaries have only one number of goat. The data also reveal regarding number of beneficiaries in case of village no. 3 that majority of the beneficiaries consisting 67.39 % have no goat while 17.39 % beneficiaries have more than three numbers of goat, 6.52 % beneficiaries has only one number of goat. On the other hand, 4.34 % each beneficiaries of the village have two and three number of goats. The above data of the three villages reveals that majority of the beneficiaries of all the three villages have no responses as well as no goat in the village.

Hen of Beneficiaries

The beneficiaries views regarding having hen are distributed through some alternative criterion in to the table no. 5.37

Table No. 5.37

Hen of Beneficiaries

Hen	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Nil/ No Response	172 (95.56)	49(96.07)	46(100.0)	267 (96.38)
One	-	-	-	-
Two	-	-	-	-
Three	2 (1.11)	-	-	2 (0.72)
Above three	6 (3.33)	02 (3.92)	-	8 (2.89)
Total	180 (100.0)	51(100.0)	46(100.00)	277 (100)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The above data reveal the numbers of hen among the beneficiaries in three villages. The data indicates in case of village no. 1 that more than ninety five percent (95.56) beneficiaries have no hen, followed by 3.33 % beneficiaries who have more

than three numbers of hens. The remaining the few 1.11 % beneficiaries have only two numbers of own hen in the village.

Regarding hen among the beneficiaries in the village no. 2 is concerned, out of 51 beneficiaries' majority 49 beneficiaries consisting 96.07 % have no responses and no hen while the other rest only 3.92 % beneficiaries have more than three numbers of village. In the context of village No. 3, all the beneficiaries have no hens in the village. The overall data of three villages indicates that the all the three villages have not given the preferences to possesses the hen.

Pigeons of Beneficiaries

On the basis of numbers of pigeons, the beneficiaries' views are distributed in the table no. 5.38

Table No. 5.38

Pigeons of Beneficiaries

Pigeon	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Nil/ No Response	141(78.33)	40 (78.43)	26(56.52)	207 (74.73)
One	-	01 (1.96)	-	1 (.36)
Two	8 (4.44)	01 (1.96)	4 (8.70)	13 (4.70)
Three	11 (6.11)	02 (3.92)	4 (8.70)	17 (6.13)
Above three	20 (11.11)	07 (13.73)	12(26.08)	39 (14.08)
Total	180(100.0)	51(100.0)	46(100.0)	277 (100)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The above table shows the pigeons of beneficiaries in the three villages. In the context of village no. 1, the above data indicates that majority of the beneficiaries i.e. 78.33 % have no pigeons, followed by 11.11 % having more than three pigeons, 6.11 % have three villages while the other 4.44 % beneficiaries only two pigeons.

The above table also shows in the context of village no. 2 that out of 51 beneficiaries, majority 40 beneficiaries consisting a little less than four-fifth (78.43) percentage have no pigeons. The numbers of beneficiaries who have own pigeons in the context of one & two pigeons is 1.96 % each, 13.73 % have more than three pigeons while the remaining 3.92 % have two numbers of pigeons.

The data also indicates in the village no. 3, out of 46 beneficiaries, 26 beneficiaries (56.52 %) have no responses regarding this. The numbers of beneficiaries who have more than three pigeons are 26.08 % while the 8.70 % each of the beneficiaries two and three numbers of pigeons in the village. The overall data of three villages indicate that more than seven-tenth (74.73) percentage of beneficiaries of three villages have no own pigeons.

Sources of Drinking Water of Beneficiaries

The beneficiaries views on the basis of sources of drinking water are classified into seven different categories: 1) Pond, 2) Tube well, 3) Supply Water, 4) Pond + Tube well, 5) Pond + Supply Water, 6) Tube well + Supply Water, 7) Pond + Tube well + Supply Water. The distribution of beneficiaries' views regarding the drinking water facility is shown in the table no. 5.39

Table No. 5.39

Sources of Drinking Water of Beneficiaries

Drinking water source	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Pond	60 (33.33)	12 (23.53)	19(41.30)	91 (32.86)
Tube well	38 (21.11)	14 (27.45)	12(26.08)	64 (23.10)
Supply Water	-	3 (5.88)	-	3 (1.08)
Pond + tube well	82 (45.56)	2 (3.92)	15(32.60)	99 (35.74)
Pond + Supply	-	3 (5.88)	-	3 (1.08)
Tube well + supply Water	-	10 (19.61)	-	10 (3.62)
Pond + Tube well + Supply Water	-	7 (13.73)	-	7 (2.53)
Total	180(100.0)	51 (100.0)	46(100.0)	277 (100.0)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The above table shows the sources of drinking water among the beneficiaries in three villages. Out of 180 beneficiaries in village no. 1, majority of beneficiaries consisting 45.56 % depend on pond and tube well as a drinking water while one-third beneficiaries (33.33) uses pond as a drinking water. The remaining a little more than one-fifth 21.11 % beneficiaries depend on tube well for drinking water.

In the context of village no. 2, majority of them having 27.45 % uses tube well as a drinking water, 23.53 % uses pond for drinking water followed by 19.61 % which are used both tube well and supply water while 13.73 % uses pond, tube well and supply water for drinking. The numbers of beneficiaries who are used Supply water & both supply water and pond are 5.88 % each. The other 3.92 % of total beneficiaries have used both pond and tube well for drinking water.

The data also reveal in case of village no. 3 that a little more than two-fifth (41.30 %) uses pond for their drinking water followed by a little less than one-third having 32.60 % who are used both pond and tube well as a drinking water. The remaining a little more than one-fourth (26.08 %) beneficiary's uses tube well for drinking water. It is noticed during the field study that the government has unable to provide water supply in the context of village no 3 and disconnected in the village no. 3.

Beneficiaries Bank Account

A bank is a financial institutions and a financial intermediary that help the mobilization of saving and providing credit for productive purposes. On the other hand, Bank is recognized as a basic indicator of economic development. The beneficiaries' view about the bank account is having or not is shown in the table no. 5.40

Table No. 5.40**Beneficiaries Bank Account**

Bank Account	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Nil/No Response	12 (6.67)	7 (13.73)	33 (71.73)	52 (18.78)
Yes	168 (93.33)	44 (86.27)	13 (28.26)	225 (81.22)
Total	180 (100.0)	51 (100.0)	46 (100.0)	277 (100)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The data show in the village no. 1, more than nine-tenth (93.33 %) beneficiaries have own bank accounts while the remaining 6.67 % have not bank account. Out of 51 beneficiaries in village no. 2, majority 44 beneficiaries consisting 86.27 % have own bank account, followed by 13.73 % who have not any bank account. The above table also indicates in the village no. 3 that more than seven tenth (71.73 %) have no bank account while the rest 28.26 % of total beneficiaries have bank account.

Name of the Bank of Beneficiaries'

The beneficiaries views regarding name of the Bank Account which have individual bank account. The following table shows the name of the bank having the bank account

Table No. 5.41**Name of the Bank of Beneficiaries'**

Bank Name	Frequency & Percentage			Total & Percentage
	Village-1	Village-2	Village-3	
Nil/ No Response	12 (6.67)	7 (13.73)	13 (28.26)	32 (11.56)
SBI	7 (3.88)	1 (1.96)	4 (8.70)	12 (4.33)
UBI	163 (90.55)	41 (80.39)	23 (50.0)	227 (81.95)
AGVB	0	2 (3.92)	4 (8.70)	6 (2.16)
Other	0	0	2 (4.34)	2 (.72)
Total	180 (100.0)	51 (100.0)	46 (100.0)	277 (100)

Source: Field survey conducted during 3rd February – 3rd August 2011

The table reveals the three villages beneficiaries views of three villages regarding name of the bank. In the context of village no. 1, more than nine-tenth consisting 90.55 % have UBI account, followed by a few (3.88 %) who have SBI account. The remaining 6.67 % have not their own bank account. Out of 46 beneficiaries, 41 beneficiaries (80.39 %) have UBI account while 13.73 % of beneficiaries have not their individual bank account. Among the remaining, 3.92 % of total beneficiaries have AGVB account and only one beneficiary have SBI account.

The data also indicate in the village no. 3, out of 46 beneficiaries, 23 beneficiaries consisting half percent of total beneficiaries (50 %) have UBI Account. The numbers of beneficiaries who have no accounts as well as responses are 28.26 % while the 8.70 % each of the beneficiaries have LGB and SBI account. There are 4.34 % beneficiaries who have other bank account. The overall data of three villages indicate that more than four fifth (81.95 %) percentage of three villages' beneficiaries have UBI account.

Major Findings

The socio-economic background of the beneficiaries may now be summarized are as follows:

1. Maximum numbers of beneficiaries belong to village no. 1 (64.99 %), followed by village no. 2 consisting of (18.41 %), while remaining (16.60 %) beneficiaries are in village no 3.
2. The overall assessment regarding demographic character of NREGA beneficiaries in three villages reveals that majority of the beneficiaries belong to the village no. 1
3. As sex of the beneficiaries in three village is concerned, in all the three study villages, village no. 1, village no. 2 and village no. 3 more than nine-tenth each of the beneficiaries (96.11%, 92.15%, 95.66 % respectively) male beneficiaries, while less than one-tenth of the beneficiaries are female in all the three villages. The

- overall data of three villages reveal that majority of the beneficiaries (95.30 %) are male, while only a few (4.70 %) are female beneficiaries in three villages.
4. All the beneficiaries in two villages (Village no. 2 & Village no 3) belong to Hindu religion, while in case of village No.1 out of 180 beneficiaries only 11 beneficiaries consisting 6.11 % are Islam beneficiaries. The overall data of three villages indicate that majority of the beneficiaries (96.03 %) are Hindu religion.
 5. Assamese is the mother tongue of all the beneficiaries in three study villages.
 6. Regarding caste group among the NREGA beneficiaries in three villages is concerned, majority of the beneficiaries (62.78 %) in village no. 1 are belong to General Caste, while 37.22 % belong to OBC. In the context of village no. 2, more than three-fifth consisting 60.79 % beneficiaries are OBC, while 39.21 beneficiaries are in General Caste. In case of village no. 3, majority (65.21 %) are OBC, 23.92 % General Caste, while the rest 10.87 % belongs to ST. The overall data reveal that in all the three villages more than half (65.21 %) are General Caste; followed by 46.20% are OBC. On the other hand, except village no 1, majority beneficiaries belong to the OBC categories.
 7. Regarding marital status of the beneficiaries in the three study villages, majority of the beneficiaries in the context of village no. 2 and village no. 3 are married people with the percentage of respectively 52.95 % and 67.39 %. On the other hand, in case of village no 1, more than half (54.44%) are unmarried people. Out of 277 beneficiaries in the three villages, 140 beneficiaries having 50.55 % are married, while 137 (49.45%) beneficiaries are unmarried.
 8. Regarding language known by the beneficiaries is concerned; in all the three study villages i.e. village no. 1, village no. 2 and village no. 3, majority of the NREGA beneficiaries (34.44%, 43.13% and 41.30% respectively) only know Assamese language. The overall assessment regarding language known by the NREGA beneficiaries in the three villages reveal that majority of the beneficiaries with 37.18

- % have known Assamese language, followed by 30.32 % who have known Assamese, Hindi and English language. Among the remaining 12.27% know both Assamese and English language, 18.08 % know Hindi & Assamese language and 2.16 % of three villages know other combination of languages.
9. As educational qualification among the beneficiaries is concerned, most of the beneficiaries consisting 53.33 % in village no. 1 studies up to Primary level, while 16.67 % have attained education up to High School Level, 15.0 % beneficiaries have attained Higher Secondary, and 5.56 % have not any formal education, 7.22 % Graduate level and 1.11 % each of the beneficiaries have Post Graduate and Technical level of education. In village no 2, educational qualification of most of the beneficiaries is up to Primary Level (47.05 %), while 19.61 % have High School level of education, 13.73 % beneficiaries have educated up to Higher Secondary level, 9.80 % have Graduate level, 7.85 % total beneficiaries have not any formal education and the rest 1.96 % beneficiaries have Technical level of education. The data reveal in the context of village no 3 that a little more than two-fifth having 41.30 % are educated up to Primary level, followed by High School level (21.74%) and Higher Secondary (17.39%). The percentage of illiterate beneficiaries is 6.52 % and graduate 10.87 % only and rest a few (2.17 %) beneficiaries have Graduate Level of education. The overall data of three villages indicates that more than half percent having (50.18 %) beneficiaries have educated up to Primary level.
10. It also reveals regarding fathers' educational level is relatively low in three villages with village no. 1 having 62.22 %, village no. 2 having 72.54 % and village no. 3 having 67.39 % who are educated up to Primary Level. On the other hand, the illiterate percentage of the three villages respectively village no. 1 is 9.44 %, village No. 2 is 9.80 % and village No. 3 is 8.70 %. In the context of village no. 1, 17.78 % beneficiaries' fathers educated up to High School level, 5.55 % beneficiaries father are studied up to Higher Secondary level, 4.44 % have educated up to Graduate and

- rest 0.56 % have studied up to Technical level. In village no. 2, 9.80 % beneficiaries father educated up to High School level, 5.88 % beneficiaries father have attained education up to Higher Secondary and rest 1.96 % have studied up to Technical level of education. The study also reveals in the case of village no. 3 that 13.04 % beneficiaries have attained education up to High School, followed by 6.52 % who have attained education up to higher Secondary level and 2.17 % each of the beneficiaries' father have attained education up to Graduate and Technical level.
11. Regarding beneficiaries mother education, majority of the beneficiaries' mothers of all the three villages have educated up to Primary level which constitutes the percentage from Village 1 to 3 are respectively 74.44 %, 78.43 % and 71.74 %. In village no 1, among the remaining, 16.67 % have attained education up to High School, 7.22 % beneficiaries' mothers' studies up to Higher Secondary, 1.67 % studies up to Graduate and 5.55 % have not formal education. In village no. 2, 5.88 percent of the beneficiaries' mothers have not any formal education, 9.81 % mothers educated up to high school level, 3.92 percent beneficiaries' mothers has attained education up to higher secondary and 1.96 percent mothers have graduate level of education. In village no. 3, 13.04 percent beneficiaries' mothers have educated up to high school level, only 4.34 percent attains education up to higher secondary level and rest 8.70 percent have no formal education. In all the three villages, there is no beneficiaries' mother who has post-graduate or technical or professional level of education.
12. Regarding monthly income of the beneficiaries is concerned, majority of the beneficiaries in the context of village no. 1, village no. 2 and village no. 3 have within Rs. 1000-2500 of monthly income with 46.11 %, 49.02 % and 41.30 % respectively. In village no. 1, one-third of beneficiaries' monthly income is within Rs. 1000, followed by 13.89 % have Rs. 2500-4000, 3.89 % is Rs. 4000-5500 monthly income and rest 2.78 % is more than Rs 5500 monthly income. In the

context of village no. 2, the number of beneficiaries between the income level within Rs. 1000 are 29.41 %, within the Rs. 2500-4000 monthly category income group is 6 (11.76 %), 3 (5.88 %) beneficiaries' monthly income is between Rs.4000-5500, only 2 (3.92 %) beneficiaries' monthly income is more than Rs 5500. In village no. 3, the study shows that a little less than two-fifth (39.13 %) percent of the beneficiaries is within Rs. 1000, followed by 28.26 % whose income is Rs. 1000-2500 and 10.87 % total beneficiaries' monthly income is Rs. 2500-4000. Among the remaining, 6.52 % is Rs. 4000-5500, and only one beneficiaries' (2.17 %) is more than Rs 5500 monthly income categories.

13. It is found from overall beneficiaries' views regarding monthly income of the beneficiaries' families, majority of the beneficiaries' families' income in the context of village 1 & village 2 within Rs. 1000-2500 with 40% & 54.90 % respectively. In village no. 1, there are 24.44 % beneficiaries whose monthly family income is within Rs 1000, 18.89 % monthly income is between Rs 2500-4000, 8.89 % beneficiaries' belong to the category of Rs 4000-5500, 3.33 % is Rs 5500-7000 and 2.22 % each of the beneficiaries is between Rs 7000-9000 and above Rs 9000. In village no. 2, 11.77 % beneficiaries families have earned Rs 1000 monthly income, 23.53 % have between Rs 1000-2500, 1.96 % have above Rs 9000 and 3.92 % of each of total beneficiaries have Rs 4000-5500 and Rs 7000-9000 of monthly family income. In village no 3, the study shows that majority (36.96 %) beneficiaries families is within 1000 monthly income, followed by 30.44 % who are earned between Rs 1000-2500 monthly income and 8.70 % each of the beneficiaries' family monthly income is between Rs 2500-4000 & Rs 4000-5500. Among the remaining, 6.52 % is between Rs 7000-9000 monthly income and other only two each of the beneficiaries (4.34 %) are between Rs 5500-7000 and more than Rs 9000 monthly family income categories.

14. Regarding occupation of beneficiaries is concerned, out of 180 beneficiaries in village no. 1, majority of the beneficiaries (55.0 %) are agriculturalist, followed by more than one-fourth (25 percent) of the beneficiaries' are house wives/ students/ unemployed person, a little more than one-tenth (11.67 %) unskilled workers, while 5.56 % of the beneficiaries petty business, 2.22 % white color workers and 1.11 percent each of the beneficiaries skilled workers and govt. jobs. In village no. 2, 52.94 % have agriculture as a main occupation while 25.49 % are house wives/ students/ unemployed person, 11.77 % unskilled workers. Among the remaining, 3.92 % each beneficiaries are white collar and petty business as a main occupation, and only 1.96 % is skilled workers. The study also reveals in village no. 3 that more than one-fourth (28.26 %) of the beneficiaries are housewives, students and unemployed persons, followed by almost half percent of total beneficiaries are engage in agricultural sector. Among the remaining, 10.87 % are unskilled workers, 4.34 % are white collars, and 2.17 % are engage in business sector. The overall data of three villages' reveals that more than two-fifth beneficiaries consisting 45.12 % are depended agriculture as a main occupation.
15. In all the three villages, majority of the beneficiaries have no subsidiary occupation having the percentage of village no. 1 is 82.78 %, village no. 2 is 78.43% and village no. 3 is 58.70 %. The overall study of three villages indicates that majority beneficiaries (77.98 %) have no responses regarding subsidiary occupation while 9.38 % beneficiaries have depended on agriculture as subsidiary occupation.
16. As regards beneficiaries' fathers' main occupation is concerned, in village no.1 and village no. 2, majority of the beneficiaries father consisting 58.33 % and 43.13 % respectively are unemployed person. In village no 1, 27.22 % are agriculturalist, 3.33 % have government jobs while 6.66 % o' beneficiaries' father is engaged in unskilled works as a main occupation. Among the remaining, 2.22 % beneficiaries' father have engaged white color work, 1.11 % of total beneficiaries fathers are

retired person and a few 0.56 % each of the beneficiaries fathers have skilled works and petty business as a main occupation. The study also shows in case of village no. 2, 31.37 % have agriculture as a main occupation, 9.80 % are unskilled worker, 5.89 % are engaged in petty business while 3.92 % are white colors workers. On the other hand, one each of beneficiaries' father (1.96 %) are engaged in respectively Government Jobs, Skilled works and retired person.

It is found in case of village 3 that more than one-third (36.95 %) beneficiaries father are agriculturalist, followed by 30.43 % are unemployed persons. Among the remaining, 8.70 % are Government worker, 8.70 % are white collars, and 8.70 % are unskilled worker. There are no representatives of skilled workers as a fathers' main occupation.

17. It is found regarding all the three villages, majority of the beneficiaries' father have no subsidiary occupation. The percentages are respectively village no. 1 is 88.89 %, village no. 2 is 80.39 % and village no. 3 is 76.09 %. The overall data of three villages indicates that majority of beneficiaries father (85.19 %) have no responded regarding subsidiary occupation while 10.83 % beneficiaries' fathers depend on agriculture as subsidiary occupation.

18. Regarding beneficiaries mothers occupation, out of 180 total beneficiaries in village no 1, 176 beneficiaries' mothers (97.78 %) are housewives, while 1.11 % each beneficiary is in service and business as an occupation. In the context of village no. 2 almost cent percent (98.04 %) are housewives; followed by only 1.96 % beneficiaries' mother depends on business as an occupation. The study also reveals about village no. 3 that majority of the beneficiaries' mothers (93.43 %) are housewives. The remaining 6.53 % mothers depend on business as a main occupation. The study indicates from three villages that the majority of beneficiaries' mothers (97.11 %) have taken housewives as a main occupation.

19. As regards family size of the beneficiaries is concerned, it is found from the study that majority of the beneficiaries have medium size of family with the percentage of respectively village no. 1 is 50.0 %, village no. 2 is 47.05 % and village no. 3 is 60.87 %. The overall assessments of all three villages' study reveal that 51.27 % of total families have medium size of family, followed by 38.99% have small families (1-5 members). The remaining 9.75 % of three villages' beneficiaries have large numbers (above 10 members) of families.
20. Majority of the beneficiaries in village no. 1 (59.44 %), village no. 2 (64.71 %) and village No. 3 (50 %) have Kuccha house pattern. In village No. 1, a little more than two-fifth having 20.56 % beneficiaries have Assam Type of house, 12.22 % have Semi Pucca, 6.67 % have 'L' Pattern while only 1.11 % beneficiaries have RCC housing pattern. In the context of village no. 2, 13.72 % each of the beneficiaries have Assam Type and Semi Pucca housing pattern while the rest 7.85 % having 'L' Pattern of house. The study also reveals in village no. 3 that a little less than one-third consisting 32.61 % of beneficiaries have Semi Pucca house, followed by 10.87 % beneficiaries have Assam Type of house and 6.52 % beneficiaries have 'L' Pattern of house.
21. Regarding electric facilities of the beneficiaries is concerned, majority of the beneficiaries in the context of village no. 1 (75.56 %) and village no. 2 (72.55 %) have their own electric facility. In the context of village No. 3, a little less than three-fourth (73.92 %) do not have their electric facility while a little more than one-fourth 26.08 % have electric facility. The overall study of three villages reveals that 66.67 % beneficiaries have electric facility, followed by 33.21 % who have not their electric facility.
22. As beneficiaries' native place is concerned, in the context of village no. 1 and village No.3 more than nine-tenth each of the beneficiaries (respectively 98.89%, 97.82 %)

native place is Jorhat. In the context of village no. 1, 1.11 % beneficiary's native place is other (Dibrugarh). In village 3, 2.17 % beneficiaries' native place is Golaghat.

23. In village No. 1 and village no.3, majority of the beneficiaries in three villages reside in Jorhat since birth with 98.89 % and 86.96 % respectively. In village no. 1, only two beneficiaries consisting 1.11 % reside in the village for last 20 years. In case of village No. 2, all the beneficiaries resides in the village since birth. In village no 3, 10.87 % beneficiaries are residing for last 6-10 years due to the flood problem of the Brahmaputra River while only 2.17 % are residing in the village for 1-5 Years. It is found from the study of three villages that 97.11 % of total beneficiaries are residing in the village since birth.
24. As own land in villages is concerned, cent percent of total beneficiaries in village no 1 and village no. 2 have own land in the village. In the context of village No 3, only one beneficiary consisting 2.17 % do not have their own land in the village and the beneficiaries stay in their relative house.
25. From the overall study regarding total size of land among the beneficiaries, it has been found in the context of village no. 1 that majority of the beneficiaries (57.22 %) own 6-10 Bighas of total size of land, followed by a little more than one-fifth (25.56 %) of the beneficiaries who own within 5 Bighas of land, 13.33 % beneficiaries have 11-15 Bighas of land, 3.33 % of the beneficiaries own 16-20 Bighas of land while only remaining 0.56 % beneficiaries own 21-25 Bighas of land.

In the context of village no. 2 and village no. 3, majority of the beneficiaries have 0-5 Bighas of total land with 49.02 % and 56.53 % respectively. In village no.2, 20 beneficiaries having percentage of 39.21 own 6-10 Bighas of land while 5.88 % each beneficiaries having 11-15 Bighas & 16-20 Bighas of land. In village No 3, a little less than one-fifth consisting 19.57 % beneficiaries own 11-15 Bighas of total size of land, 15.21 % beneficiaries having 6-10 Bighas of land while 6.52 %

beneficiaries own 16-20 Bighas of land. The remaining 2.17 % beneficiaries own 21-25 Bighas of total land.

The overall data of three villages reveals that majority of beneficiaries consisting 46.94 % own 6-10 Bighas of land, followed by 35.01 % beneficiaries who own 0-5 Bighas of land, 13.0 % & 4.33 % of total beneficiaries of three villages own 11-15 Bighas and 16-20 Bighas of total size of land respectively. The remaining a few .72 % beneficiaries own more than 21 Bighas of own land.

26. Regarding agricultural land among the NREGA beneficiaries in three villages is concerned, in village no. 1, 2 and 3 , majority of the beneficiaries have ½ -5 Bighas of own agricultural land with 53.88 percent, 70.60 percent and 47.83 percent respectively. The overall assessment of three villages reveals that more than half percent (55.96 %) of total beneficiaries have ½ - 5 Bighas of land, followed by a little less than one-fourth (23.46 %) of the beneficiaries who owns 6-10 Bighas of agricultural land, 13.0 % beneficiaries of three villages own 11-15 Bighas of agricultural land, 1.44 % own 16-20 Bighas while only .36 % own more than 20 Bighas of agricultural land. Out of 277 NREGA beneficiaries in three villages, 16 beneficiaries having 5.77 % have no responses regarding the agricultural land in the village.

27. The study regarding household land indicates that in case of village no. 1, maximum numbers of beneficiaries consisting with the percentage of 95.56 % have ½ - 5 bighas of household land, followed by 4.44 % who own 6-10 Bighas of household land. In the context of village no 2, all the beneficiaries (100 %) own ½-5 Bighas of household land. The study also indicates that more than nine-tenth (95.66 %) beneficiaries of village no. 3 own ½ - 5 bighas of household land while 2.17 % beneficiaries have 6-10 bighas of household land. There is one beneficiary (2.17 %) who has not household land in the village.

28. As cultivated land among the beneficiaries in three villages is concerned, in village no 1, 2 and 3 , majority of the beneficiaries have ½ -5 Bighas of own cultivated land with 79.44 percent, 84.31 percent and 60.87 percent respectively. The overall assessment of three villages reveals that a little less than three-fifth (77.25 %) of beneficiaries have ½ -5 Bighas of land, followed by a little more than one-tenth (13.35 %) of the three villages beneficiaries who owns 6-10 Bighas, 2.89 % beneficiaries of three villages own 11-15 Bighas of cultivated land, 1.44 % own more than 15 Bighas land while 6.86 % have no responses regarding cultivated land.
29. Regarding uncultivated land among the NREGA beneficiaries in three villages is concerned, majority of the two villages beneficiaries have ½ - 5 Bighas of uncultivated land with percentage of (51.11 %) in village no.1, 78.43 % in village no.2. On the other hand, 86.96 % beneficiaries have not responded regarding the uncultivated land.
30. As regards the overall attitudes towards the crops grown, it has been found that majority of the beneficiaries of all three villages have grown both Sali and Rabi Crops with the percentages of respectively village no.1 is 45.46%, village no.2 is 41.17 % & village no. 3 is 36.96 %. The overall study of three villages reveals that majority of three villages' beneficiaries consisting 43.32 % have grown Sali + Rabi crops, followed by 36.10 % who have grown only Sali crops. Among the remaining of three villages, 2.53 % cultivate Rabi crops, 1.44 % each of beneficiaries cultivate Sali + Ahu and Ahu + Rabi crops while 6.50 % of total beneficiaries of three villages have no responses regarding the crops grown. Thus, the study reveals that Sali and Rabi are the main crops which are produced mostly by the beneficiaries of three villages.
31. Majority of the beneficiaries of village no.1, village no.2 and village no.3 do not used machine (Tractor and Power tiller) for their agricultural purpose with 88.89 %, 94.11 % and 86.96 % respectively. It reveals from the study of three villages that 89.54 % beneficiaries of three villages have no responses and not uses of machine in their

agricultural purpose, followed by only 10.46 % who use machine in their agricultural purpose.

32. Regarding the fertilizer used in the agricultural sector, majority of the beneficiaries of village 1, village 2 and village 3 do not use fertilizers for their agricultural purpose with 51.11 %, 45.10 % and 47.83 % respectively. In village no. 1, 9.44% use Bio-composed, 6.11 % beneficiaries use Bio-chemical and while 33.44 % use both the bio-composed and bio-chemical. In the context of village no. 2, 17.65 % use Bio-composed, 1.96 % beneficiaries use Bio-chemical and while 35.29 % use both the bio-composed and bio-chemical for agricultural purpose. The study also reveals in village no.3 that 23.92 % use Bio-composed, followed by 15.21 % beneficiaries who have used Bio-chemical and while 13.04 % beneficiaries use both the bio-composed and bio-chemical for agricultural sector.
33. Regarding seeds used in the agricultural sector is concerned; majority of the beneficiaries in village no.1 (55.56 %) and village no.2 (45.10 %) use both Hi-breed & Local seeds. In village no.3, majority (47.83 %) beneficiaries have not responded regarding seeds used.
34. As regards the overall attitudes of the all three villages beneficiaries towards the information received regarding seeds and fertilizer, it is found that majority NREGA beneficiaries in three villages (45.85 %) have not responded regarding information received while 41.15 % of total beneficiaries have not received any information about seeds and fertilizers. The remaining 13.0 % of total beneficiaries' of three villages have received information through Agri. Dept. & Gram Sevak.
35. Regarding cows of the beneficiaries, majority of all the three villages' beneficiaries have more than three numbers of cows with 32.78 %, 39.21 and 41.30 % respectively (from village 1 to 3).
36. Majority of the beneficiaries have not goat in the three villages having the percentage of respectively village no.1 is 78.89 %, village no.2 is 76.47 % and village no.3 is

67.39 %. The overall assessment of the three villages reveals that out of 277 beneficiaries, 212 beneficiaries consisting 76.54 % have not goat while the other 39 beneficiaries (14.09) have more than three numbers of own goat. In village no.1, 4.44 % of total beneficiaries have hen while 21.68 % of total beneficiaries have pigeons. In case of village no.2, 3.92 % of total beneficiaries have hen while 21.57 % of total beneficiaries have pigeons. The study also reveals in case of village 3 that cent percent have no hens while 43.48 % of total beneficiaries have own pigeons.

37. As regards the overall attitudes of the beneficiaries towards sources of drinking water, it has been found that more than two-fifth beneficiaries consisting 45.56 % depend on pond and tube well as a drinking water while one-third beneficiaries (33.33%) use pond and 21.11 % beneficiaries' uses tube well as a drinking water. In village no.2, 27.45 % use tube well as a drinking water, 23.53 % use pond for drinking water followed by 19.61 % which have used both tube well and supply water while 13.73 % use pond, tube well and supply water for drinking, 5.88 % each of the beneficiaries use Supply water & both supply water and pond while a little more than one-fifth having 21.11 % beneficiaries depend on tube well for drinking water. In the context of village no.3, a little more than two-fifth (41.30 %) beneficiaries use pond for their drinking water, followed by a little less than one-third having 32.60 % beneficiaries are used both pond and tube well as a drinking water and rest 26.08 % depend on Tube well as drinking water.

38. Regarding beneficiaries bank account, in village no.1, more than nine-tenth (93.33 %) beneficiaries have own bank accounts while the remaining 6.67 % have not bank account. Out of 51 beneficiaries in village no.2, majority 44 beneficiaries consisting 86.27 % have own bank account, followed by 13.73 % who have not any bank account. The study also indicates in the village no. 3 that more than seven-tenth (71.73 %) beneficiaries have no bank account while the rest more than one-fourth (28.26 %) of total beneficiaries have bank account. On the other hand, in village no.1 and 2 majorities of the beneficiaries have UBI bank account with 93.33 % & 86.27 % while 30.43 % in village no. 3 have SBI account.