

Chapter 4

Data Analysis and Interpretation

In this chapter research has tabulated primary data collected from the survey and done percentage analysis. Frequencies used in the columns and percentage are set within the bracket. This chapter representing the facts and figures found in the field. Beneath the each tables researcher has described the contents and drawn inferences from the tables to give a clear picture for better understanding.

Table : 1.1 First source of information on MGNREGS and sex wise distribution of respondents

Gender	1.Friends	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Men	266 (44.33%)	156 (26%)	76 (12.67%)	15 (2.5%)	513	85.5
Women	75 (12.5%)	12 (2%)	0	0	87	14.5
Total	341 (56.83%)	168 (28%)	76 (12.67%)	15 (2.5%)	600	100

In table 1.1, data reveals that 266 (44.33%) men and 75 (12.5%) women with a total of 341 (56.83%) beneficiaries identify 'friends' as their first source of information and 156 (26%) men and 12 (2%) women and a total of 168 that is 28% beneficiaries identify 'gaon sabha' while 76 (12.67%) men with a total of 76 (12.67%) beneficiaries identify 'newspaper' and 15 (2.5%) men representing (2.5 %) beneficiaries of the scheme identified 'radio' as their first source of information about MGNREGS.

Inference: From the analysis of the data collected, it can be safely assumed that interpersonal communication is preferred more by both men and women beneficiaries as their first source of information followed by group communication (gaonsabha). Print (newspaper) was in the third position while radio had a negligible preference.

Table : 1.2 Community wise preference of information source

Community	1.Friends	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Hindu	87 (14.5%)	65 (10.83%)	36 (6%)	6 (1%)	194	32.33
Muslim	254 (42.33%)	103 (17.17%)	40 (6.67%)	9 (1.5%)	406	67.67
Total	341 (56.83%)	168 (28%)	76 (12.67%)	15 (2.5%)	600	100

In table 1.2, data reveals that 87 (14.5%) Hindus and 254 (42.33%) Muslims totalling 341 (56.83%) beneficiaries identify ‘friends’ as their first source of information, 65 (10.83%) Hindus and 103(17.17%) Muslims with a total of 168 (28%) beneficiaries identify ‘gaon sabha’ while 36 (6%) Hindus and 40 (6.67) Muslims with a total of 76 (12.67%) beneficiaries identify ‘newspaper’, 6 (1%) Hindus and 9 (1.5%) Muslims totalling (2.5 %) beneficiaries of the scheme identify ‘radio’ as their first source of information about MGNREGS.

Inference: From the analysis of the collected data, it is clear that interpersonal communication is preferred more by both Hindu and Muslim communities as the first source of information followed by group communication (gaonsabha). Print (newspaper) was in the third position while radio had a negligible preference.

Table : 1.3 Source of information language wise

Mother tongue	1.Friends	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Bengali	341 (56.83%)	168 (28%)	76 (12.67%)	15 (2.5%)	600	100

Hindi	-	-	-	-	-	0
Manipuri	-	-	-	-	-	0
Total	341 (56.83%)	168 (28%)	76 (12.67%)	15 (2.5%)	600	100

In table 1.3, data reveals that 341 (56.83%) Bengali speaking beneficiaries identify ‘friends’ as their first source of information, 168 (28%) beneficiaries identify ‘gaon sabha’ while 76 (12.67%) beneficiaries identify ‘newspaper’ and 15 (2.5%) beneficiaries of the scheme identify ‘radio’ as their first source of information about MGNREGS.

Inference: From the analysis of the data collected, on the basis of mother tongue, it can be said that interpersonal communication is preferred more by the beneficiaries as the first source of information followed by group communication (gaonsabha). Print (newspaper) was in the third position while radio had a negligible preference.

Table : 1.4 Source of information and marital status of respondents

Marital status	1.Friends	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Married	285 (47.5%)	146 (24.33%)	42 (7%)	10 (1.67%)	483	80.5
Unmarried	56 (9.33%)	22 (3.67%)	34 (5.67)	5 (0.83%)	117	19.5
Total	341 (56.83%)	168 (28%)	76 (12.67)	15 (2.5%)	600	100

Table 1.4 reveals that 285 (47.5%) married and 56 (9.33%) unmarried respondents with a total of 341 (56.83%) beneficiaries identify ‘friends’ as their first source of information and 146 (24.33%) married and 22 (3.67%) unmarried with a total of 168 (28%) beneficiaries identify ‘gaon sabha’ while 42 (7%) married and 34 (5.67%) unmarried respondents with a total of 76 (12.67%) beneficiaries identify ‘newspaper’ and 10 (1.67%)

married and 5 (0.83%) unmarried respondents with a total of 15 (2.5 %) beneficiaries of the scheme identify 'radio' as their first source of information about MGNREGS.

Inference: From the data analysis, it is understood that interpersonal communication is preferred more by both married and unmarried beneficiaries as the first source of information followed by group communication (gaonsabha). Print (newspaper) was in the third position while radio had the least preference.

Table : 1.5 Education of respondents and source of information

Educational qualification	1.Friends	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Standard I-IV	203(33.83%)	54 (9%)	8 (1.33%)	8(1.34%)	273	45.5
Standard V-VIII	129 (21.5%)	110 18.33%)	17 (2.84)	5(0.83%)	261	43.5
Standard IX-XII	9 (1.5%)	4 (0.67%)	49 (8.17)	2(0.33%)	64	10.67
BA-MA	-	-	2 (0.33)	-	2	0.33
Total	341(56.83%)	168 (28%)	76 (12.67%)	15(2.5%)	600	100

According to table 1.5, 203 (33.83%) respondents with standard I-IV and 129 (21.5%) of standard V-VIII and 9 (1.5%) of standard X-XII education with a total of 341 (56.83%) beneficiaries identify 'friends' as their first source of information, 54 (9%) of standard I-IV and 110 (18.33%) of standard V-VIII and 4 (0.67%) of standard IX-XII education with a total of 168 (28%) beneficiaries identify 'gaon sabha' while 8 (1.33%) of standard I-IV and 17 (2.84%) of standard V-VIII and 49 (8.17%) of standard IX-XII and 2 (0.33%) of BA-MA educational level with a total of 76 (12.67%) beneficiaries identify 'newspaper' and 8 (1.34%) of standard I-IV and 5 (0.83%) of standard V-VIII and 2 (0.33%) of standard IX-XII education with a total of 15 (2.5%) beneficiaries of the scheme identify 'radio' as their first source of information about MGNREGS.

Inference : From the analysis of the collected data, on the basis of educational qualification we can safely believe that interpersonal communication is preferred more by standard I-IV and V-VIII educational group of respondents followed by group

communication (gaonsabha) and then newspaper and radio as the first source of information . But in the case of standard IX-XII and BA-MA qualification groups it is seen that print (newspaper) is preferred more as the first source of information followed by inter personal communication and then group communication (gaonsabha) and radio. In an average it is presumed that inter personal communication was the leading source of information followed by group communication (gaonsabha). And print (newspaper) was in the third position while radio was a very minor source of information.

Table : 1.6 Source of information and occupation wise distribution of respondents

Occupation	1.Friends	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Skilled labourers	308 (51.33%)	105 (17.5%)	45 (7.5%)	8(1.34%)	466	77.67
Unskilled labourers	33 (5.5%)	63 (10.5%)	31 (5.17%)	7 (1.16)	134	22.33
Total	341 6.83%)	168 (28%)	76 (12.67%)	15(2.5%)	600	100

Table 1.6, reveals that 308 (51.33%) skilled labourers and 33 (5.5%) unskilled labourers forming a total of 341 (56.83%) beneficiaries identify ‘friends’ as their first source of information and 105 (17.5%) skilled and 63 (10.5%) unskilled with a total of 168 (28%) beneficiaries identify ‘gaon sabha’ while 45 (7.5%) skilled and 31(5.17%) unskilled labourers with a total of 76 (12.67%) beneficiaries identify ‘newspaper’ and 8 (1.34%) skilled and 7 (1.16%) unskilled labourers with a total of 15 (2.5%) beneficiaries of the scheme identify ‘radio’ as their first source of information about MGNREGS.

Inference : From the analysis of the collected data, on the basis of occupation, it can be safely assumed that interpersonal communication is preferred more by skilled labourers followed by group communication (gaonsabha) and then newspaper and radio as the first source of information . But in the case of unskilled labourers it is seen that gaonsabha is preferred more as the first source of information followed by interpersonal communication and then newspaper and radio. On an average, it is presumed that inter personal

communication is the leading first source of information followed by group communication (gaonsabha). Print (newspaper) is in the third position while radio is a negligible source of information.

Table : 1. 7 Source of information and age wise distribution of respondents

Age	1.Friends	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
20-30 years	93 (15.5%)	39 (6.5%)	15 (2.5%)	1 (0.17%)	148	24.67
30-40 years	174 (29%)	52 (8.67%)	38 (6.33)	4 (0.67%)	268	44.67
40-50	62 (10.33%)	43 (7.17%)	15 (2.5%)	7 (1.16)	127	21.16
50 years and above	12 (2%)	34 (5.67)	8 (1.34%)	3 (0.5%)	57	9.5
Total	341 (56.83%)	168 (28%)	76 (12.67%)	15 (2.5%)	600	100

Table 1.7 reveals that 93 (15.5%) from 20-30 years age group and 174 (29%) from 30-40 years and 62 (10.33%) from 40-50 years and 12 (2%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 341 (56.83%) beneficiaries identify 'friends' as their first source of information, 39 (6.5%) from years 20-30 years age group and 52 (8.67%) from 30-40 years and 43 (7.17%) from 40-50 years and 34 (5.67%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 168 (28%) beneficiaries identify 'gaon sabha' while 15 (2.5%) from 20-30 years age group and 38 (6.33%) from 30-40 years and 15 (2.5%) from 40-50 years and 8 (1.34%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 76 (12.67%) beneficiaries identify 'newspaper' and 1 (0.17%) from 20-30 years age group, 4 (0.67%) from 30-40 years and 7 (1.16%) from 40-50 years and 3 (0.5%) from 50 years and above age group totaling 15 (2.5 %) beneficiaries of the scheme identify 'radio' as their first source of information about MGNREGS.

Inference: From the analysis of the collected data, on the basis of age it can be seen that interpersonal communication is preferred more by 20-30 and 30-40 and 40-50 years age group respondents followed by group communication (gaonsabha) and then newspaper and radio as the first source of information . But in the case of 50 years and above age group it is seen that gaonsabha is preferred more as the first source of information followed by interpersonal communication and then newspaper and radio. On an average, it is presumed that interpersonal communication is the leading first source of information followed by group communication (gaonsabha). And print (newspaper) is in the third position while radio is a minor source of information.

Table : 1. 8 Source of information and distribution of respondents income wise

Monthly family income	1.Friends	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Rs Rs 3000-4000	301 (50.16%)	125 (20.83%)	27 (4.5%)	5 (0.83%)	458	76.33
Rs 4000-6000	29 (4.83%)	37 (6.17%)	43 (7.17%)	7 (1.16%)	116	19.33
Rs 6000-10000	8 (1.34%)	6 (1%)	5 (0.83%)	3 (0.5%)	22	3.67
Rs 10000 and above	3 (0.5%)	-	1 (0.17%)	-	4	0.67
Total	341 (56.83%)	168 (28%)	76 (12.67%)	15 (2.5%)	600	100

Table 1.8, reveals that 301 (50.16%) from Rs 3000-4000 income groups and 29 (4.83%) from Rs 4000-6000 and 8 (1.34%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 3 (0.5%) from Rs 10000 and above income groups making a total of 341 (56.83%) beneficiaries identify ‘friends’ as their first source of information, 125 (20.83%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group and 37 (6.17%) from Rs 4000-6000 and 6 (1%) from Rs 6000-10000 income group with a total of

168 (28%) beneficiaries identify 'gaonsabha' while 27 (4.5%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group and 43 (7.17%) from Rs 4000-6000 and 5 (0.83%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group making a total of 76 (12.67%) beneficiaries identify 'newspaper', 5 (0.83%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group and 7 (1.16%) from Rs 4000-6000 and 3(0.5%) from Rs 6000-10000 income group with a total of 15 that is 2.5 % beneficiaries of the scheme identify 'radio' as their first source of information about MGNREGS.

Inference: From the analysis of the collected data, on the basis of income, we can safely believe that interpersonal communication is preferred more by Rs 3000-4000 and Rs 6000-10000 and Rs 10000 and above income group respondents followed by group communication (gaonsabha) and then newspaper and radio as the first source of information. But in the case of Rs 4000-6000 income groups it is seen that print (newspaper) is preferred more as the first source of information followed by group communication (gaonsabha) and then interpersonal communication and radio. On an average, it is presumed that inter personal communication is the leading first source of information followed by group communication (gaonsabha). And print (newspaper) is in the third position while radio is a minor source of information.

Table : 2.1 Identification of media used by government and sexwise distribution of respondents

Gender	1.Print	2.Electronic	3.Both	4.Can't say	Total	%
Men	56 (9.33%)	18 (3%)	40 (6.67%)	399 (66.5%)	513	85.5
Women	2 (0.33%)	-	23 (3.83%)	62 (10.33%)	87	14.5
Total	58 (9.66%)	18 (3%)	63 (10.5)	461 (76.83%)	600	100

Table 2.1, reveals that 56 (9.33%) men and 2 (0.33%) women constituting a total of 58 (9.66%) beneficiaries identify that the government mostly uses 'print media' to implement

the program and 18 (3%) men beneficiaries identify ‘electronic media’ while 40 (6.67%) men and 23 (3.83%) women forming a total of 63 (10.5%) beneficiaries identify ‘both’ and 399 (66.5%) men and 62 (10.33%) women with a total of 461 (76.83%) beneficiaries of the scheme are unable to identify the media mostly used by the government to implement the MGNREGS

Inference: From the analysis of the collected data, on the basis of gender, we can assume that majority of the respondents, both men and women, are unaware of the government use of media followed by negligible number of them identifying both (print and electronic media) and then print and electronic media respectively.

Table : 2.2 Identification of media used by government and community wise distribution of respondents

Community	1.Print	2.Electronic	3.Both	4.Can't say	Total	%
Hindu	22 (3.66%)	10 (1.66%)	27 (4.5%)	135 22.5%)	194	32.33
Muslim	36 (6%)	8 (1.34%)	36 (6%)	326 (54.33%)	406	67.67
Total	58 (9.66%)	18 (3%)	63 (10.5%)	461 (76.83%)	600	100

Table 2.2, shows that 22 (3.66%) Hindus and 36 (6%) Muslims with a total of 58 (9.66%) beneficiaries identify that the government mostly uses ‘print media’ to implement the program and 10 (1.66%) Hindus and 8 (1.34%) Muslims having a total of 18 (3%) beneficiaries identify ‘electronic media’. 27 (4.5%) Hindus and 36 (6%) Muslims with a total of 63 (10.5%) beneficiaries identify ‘both’ and 135 (22.5%) Hindus and 326 (54.33%) Muslims with a total of 461 (76.83%) beneficiaries of the scheme cannot say which media the government mostly uses to implement the MGNREGS.

Inference: From the analysis of the collected data, on the basis of community, we can assume that majority of the respondents from both communities are unaware of the government media usage followed by both (print and electronic media) and then print and then electronic media.

Table : 2.3 Identification of media used by government and language wise distribution of respondents

Mother tongue	1.Print	2.Electronic	3.Both	4.Can't say	Total	%
Bengali	58 (9.66%)	18 (3%)	63 (10.5%)	461 (76.83%)	600	100
Hindi	-	-	-	-	-	0
Manipuri	-	-	-	-	-	0
Total	58 (9.66%)	18 (3%)	63 (10.5%)	461 (76.83%)	600	100

In table 2.3, the distribution shows that 58 (9.66%) Bengali speaking respondents identify that the government mostly uses 'print media' to implement the program and 18 (3%) beneficiaries identify 'electronic media' while 63 (10.5%) beneficiaries identify 'both' and 461 (76.83%) beneficiaries of the scheme cannot say which media government mostly uses to implement the MGNREGS.

Inference: From the analysis of the data, on the basis of mother tongue, it can be safely assumed that majority of the respondents are unaware of the government media usage followed by both (print and electronic media) and then print and then electronic media. It can be said that very little awareness of the beneficiaries about government media practice is the leading cause for the issues related with the programme implementation followed by both (print and electronic media). Print media was in the third position while electronic media had a negligible following.

Table : 2.4 Media use of government and marital status wise distribution of respondents

Marital status	1.Print	2.Electronic	3.Both	4.Can't say	Total	%
Married	26 (4.33%)	7 (1.17%)	37 (6.17%)	413 (68.83%)	483	80.5
Unmarried	32 (5.33)	11 (1.83%)	26 (4.33%)	48 (8%)	117	19.5
Total	58 (9.66%)	18 (3%)	63 (10.5%)	461 (76.83%)	600	100

In table 2.4, the distribution explains that 26 (4.33%) married and 32 (5.33%) unmarried with a total of 58 (9.66%) beneficiaries identify that the government mostly uses 'print media' to implement the program and 7 (1.17%) married and 11 (1.83%) unmarried with a total of 18 (3%) beneficiaries identify 'electronic media'. 37 (6.17%) married and 26 (4.33%) unmarried forming a total of 63 (10.5%) beneficiaries identify 'both' and 413 (68.83%) married and 48 (8%) unmarried with a total of 461 (76.83%) beneficiaries of the scheme cannot say which media government mostly uses to implement the MGNREGS.

Inference: From the analysis of the data, on the basis of marital status, we can assume that majority of the respondents, both married and unmarried, are unaware of the use of media by the government followed by both (print and electronic media) and then print and then electronic media. On an average, it is presumed that absence of awareness among the beneficiaries about government media practice was the leading cause for the issues related with the programme implementation followed by both (print and electronic media). Print media was in the third position while electronic media had a negligible place.

Table : 2.5 Media use of government and education wise distribution of respondents

Educational qualification	1.Print	2.Electronic	3.Both	4.Can't say	Total	%
Standard I-IV	8 (1.33%)	7 (1.17%)	23 (3.83%)	235 (39.16%)	273	45.5
Standard V-VIII	19 (3.16%)	6 (1%)	28 (4.67%)	208 (34.67%)	261	43.5
Standard IX-XII	31 (5.17%)	5 (0.83)	11 (1.83%)	17 (2.83%)	64	10.67
BA-MA	-	-	1 (0.17%)	1 (0.17)	2	0.33
Total	58 (9.66%)	18 (3%)	63 (10.5%)	461 (76.83%)	600	100

As per table 2.5, 8 (1.33%) of standard I-IV and 19 (3.16%) of standard V-VIII and 31 (5.17%) of standard X-XII with a total of 58 (9.66%) beneficiaries say that the government mostly uses 'print media' to implement the program and 7 (1.17%) of standard I-IV and 6 (1%) of standard V-VIII and 5 (0.83%) of standard IX-XII with a total of 18 (3%) beneficiaries identify 'electronic media' while 23 (3.83%) of standard I-IV and 28 (4.67%) of standard V-VIII and 11 (1.83%) of standard IX-XII and 1 (0.17%) of BA-MA constituting a total of 63 (10.5%) beneficiaries identify 'both' and 235 (39.16%) of standard I-IV and 208(34.67%) of standard V-VIII and 17 (2.83%) of standard IX-XII and 1 (0.17%) of BA-MA with a total of 461 (76.83 %) beneficiaries of the scheme cannot identify which media government mostly uses to implement the MGNREGS.

Inference: From the analysis, on the basis of educational qualification, we can believe that the majority of the respondents of standard I-IV and V-VIII group are not aware of the government use of media followed by both (print and electronic media) and then print and then electronic media. But in the case of standard IX-XII group it is identified that

government mostly uses print media followed by the majority respondents that they cannot say and then both (print and electronic) and only electronic, and in BA-MA group both (print and electronic media) and absence of awareness are equal in number. On an average, it is presumed that most beneficiaries are unaware of the government media practice followed by both (print and electronic media). Print media was in the third position while electronic media had a negligible role.

Table : 2. 6 Identification of media used by government and occupation wise distribution of respondents

Occupation	1.Print	2.Electronic	3.Both	4.Can't say	Total	%
Skilled labourers	52 (8.66%)	13 (2.17%)	42 (7%)	359 (59.83%)	466	77.67
Unskilled labourers	6 (1%)	5 (0.83%)	21 (3.5%)	102 (17%)	134	22.33
Total	58 (9.66%)	18 (3%)	63 (10.5%)	461 (76.83%)	600	100

According to table 2.6, 52 (8.66%) skilled labourers and 6 (1%) unskilled labourers with a total of 58 (9.66%) beneficiaries say that the government mostly uses 'print media' to implement the program and 13 (2.17%) skilled and 5 (0.83%) unskilled with a total of 18 (3%) beneficiaries say 'electronic media' while 42 (7%) skilled and 21 (3.5%) unskilled labourers with a total of 63 (10.5%) beneficiaries identify 'both' and 359 (59.83%) skilled and 102 (17%) unskilled labourers totalling 461 (76.83%) beneficiaries of the scheme cannot say which media the government mostly uses to implement the MGNREGS.

Inference: On the basis of occupation, we can say that the majority of the respondents of skilled labourers group are unaware of the government media use followed by print media and then both (print and electronic media) and electronic media and in the case of unskilled labourers groups, respondents are unaware of government use of media followed by both (print and electronic media) and then print and electronic

Table : 2.7 Identification media used by government and age wise distribution of respondents

Age	1.Print	2.Electronic	3.Both	4.Can't say	Total	%
20-30 years	12 (2%)	7 (1.17%)	3 (0.5%)	126 (21%)	148	24.67
30-40 years	23 (3.83%)	2 (0.33%)	26 (4.33)	217 (36.17%)	268	44.67
40-50	16 (2.66)	6 (1%)	18 (3%)	87 (14.5%)	127	21.16
50 &above	7 (1.17)	3 (0.5%)	16 (2.66%)	31 (5.17)	57	9.5
Total	58 (9.66%)	18 (3%)	63 (10.5%)	461 (76.83%)	600	100

In table 2.7, the distribution reveals that 12 (2%) from 20-30 years age group and 23 (3.83%) from 30-40 years and 16 (2.66%) from 40-50 years and 7 (1.17%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 58 (9.66%) beneficiaries identify that the government mostly uses 'print media' to implement the program and 7 (1.17%) from 20-30 years age group and 2 (0.33%) from 30-40 years and 6 (1%) from 40-50 years and 3 (0.5%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 18 (3%) beneficiaries identify 'electronic media' while 3 (0.5%) from 20-30 years age group and 26 (4.33%) from 30-40 years and 18 (3%) from 40-50 years and 16 (2.66%) from 50 years and above age group forming a total of 63 (10.5%) beneficiaries identify 'both' and 126 (21%) from 20-30 years age group and 217 (36.17%) from 30-40 years and 87 (14.5%) from 40-50 years and 31 (5.17%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 461 (76.83%) beneficiaries of the scheme can't say anything .

Inference: On the basis of age we can say that the majority of the respondents of each age group are unaware of media use by the government followed by both (print and electronic media) and then print and then electronic media. But in the case of 20-30 years age group,

not being aware is followed by print media and then electronic and followed both (print and electronic).

Table : 2.8 Identification of media used by government and income wise distribution of respondents

Monthly family income	1.Print	2.Electronic	3.Both	4.Can't say	Total	%
Rs 3000-4000	28 (4.66%)	7 (1.17%)	43 (7.17%)	380 (63.33%)	458	76.33
Rs 4000-6000	24 (4%)	8 (1.33%)	16 (2.66%)	68 (11.33%)	116	19.33
Rs 6000-10000	5 (0.83%)	3 (0.5%)	3 (0.5%)	11 (1.83%)	22	3.67
Rs 10000 and above	1 (0.17%)	-	1 (0.17%)	2 (0.33%)	4	0.67
Total	58 (9.66%)	18 (3%)	63 (10.5%)	461 (76.83%)	600	100

In table 2.8, the distribution explains that 28 (4.66%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 24 (4%) from Rs 4000-6000, 5 (0.83%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income groups with a total of 58 (9.66%) beneficiaries say that the government mostly uses 'print media' to implement the program and 7 (1.17%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 8 (1.33%) from Rs 4000-6000 and 3 (0.5%) from Rs 6000-10000 income group with a total of 18 (3%) beneficiaries say 'electronic media' while 43 (7.17%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 16 (2.66%) from Rs 4000-6000 and 3 (0.5%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 63 (10.5%) beneficiaries identify 'both', 380 (63.33%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 68 (11.33%) from Rs 4000-6000, 11 (1.83%) from Rs 6000-10000 income group and 2

(0.33%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 461 (76.83 %) beneficiaries of the scheme cannot say anything .

Inference: On the basis of income, we can believe that the majority respondents from each income group are unaware of the media use by the government. In the case of Rs 3000-4000 income group being unaware is followed by both (electronic and print media) and then print and then electronic and in the case of Rs 4000-6000 income group, ignorance is followed by print and then both print and electronic and then electronic. While in the case of Rs 6000-10000 income group being unaware is followed by print and then both (electronic and print) and electronic are on same point and in the case of Rs 10000 and above group, being unaware is equally followed by print and both (electronic and print). The majority of the respondents of each income groups are unaware of the government media use followed by both (electronic and print media) and then print and then electronic. And print (newspaper) was in the third position while the electronic had a negligible preference.

Table : 3.1 The authentic source of information about MGNREGS and sex wise distribution of respondents

Gender	1.Friends	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Men	230 (38.33%)	236 (39.33%)	38 (6.33%)	9 (1.5%)	513	85.5
women	42 (7%)	45 (7.5%)	-	-	87	14.5
Total	272 (45.33%)	281 (46.83%)	38 (6.33%)	9 (1.5%)	600	100

Table 3.1, provides the information that 230 (38.33%) men and 42 (7%) women with a total of 272 (45.33%) beneficiaries identify 'friends' as their authentic source of information about the employment scheme and 236 (39.33%) men and 45 (7.5%) women totalling of 281 (46.83%) beneficiaries identify 'gaon sabha' while 38 (6.33%) men

beneficiaries identify ‘newspaper’ and 9 (1.5%) men beneficiaries of the scheme identify ‘radio’ as their authentic source of information about MGNREGS.

Inference: From the analysis of the data, it can be assumed that group communication (gaonsabha) is preferred more by both men and women beneficiaries as their authentic source of information followed by interpersonal communication (friends). Print (newspaper) was in the third position while radio had a negligible preference.

Table : 3. 2 Authentic source of information and religion wise distribution of respondents

Community	1.Friends	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Hindu	96 (16%)	78 (13%)	16 (2.67%)	4 (0.67%)	194	32.33
Muslim	176 (29.33%)	203 (33.83%)	22 (3.66)	5 (0.83%)	406	67.67
Total	272 (45.33%)	281 (46.83%)	38 (6.33%)	9 (1.5%)	600	100

Table 3.2, details that 96(16%) Hindus and 176 (29.33%) Muslims with a total of 272 (45.33%) beneficiaries identify ‘friends’ as their authentic source of information about the employment scheme, 78 (13%) Hindus and 203(33.83%) Muslims totalling of 281 (46.83%) beneficiaries identify ‘gaon sabha’ while 16 (2.67%) Hindus and 22 (3.66) Muslims forming 38 (6.33%) beneficiaries identify ‘newspaper’ and 4 (0.67%) Hindus and 5 (0.83%) Muslims totalling 9 (1.5 %) beneficiaries of the scheme identify ‘radio’ as their authentic source of information about MGNREGS.

Inference: From the analysis of the data collected, it can be said that group communication (gaonsabha) is preferred more by both Hindu and Muslim communities as their authentic source of information followed by interpersonal communication (friends). Print (newspaper) was in the third position while radio (electronic) had a negligible preference.

Table : 3.3 Authentic source of information and language wise distribution of respondents

Mother tongue	1.Friends	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Bengali	272 (45.33%)	281 (46.83%)	38 (6.33%)	9 (1.5%)	600	100
Hindi	-	-	-	-	-	0
Manipuri	-	-	-	-	-	0
Total	272 (45.33%)	281 (46.83%)	38 (6.33%)	9 (1.5%)	600	100

In table 3.3, the statistics reveal that 272 (45.33%) Bengali speaking beneficiaries identify ‘friends’ as their authentic source of information about employment scheme and 281 (46.83%) beneficiaries identify ‘gaon sabha’ while 38 (6.33%) beneficiaries identify ‘newspaper’ and 9 (1.5%) beneficiaries of the scheme identify ‘radio’ as their authentic source of information about MGNREGS.

Inference: From the analysis, on the basis of mother tongue, it can be assumed that group communication (gaonsabha) is preferred more by the beneficiaries as their authentic source of information followed by interpersonal communication. Print (newspaper) was in the third position while radio (electronic) did not have much preference.

Table : 3. 4 Authentic source of information and distribution of respondents according to marital status

Marital status	1.Friends	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4. Radio	total	%
Married	209 (34.83%)	242 (40.33%)	25 (4.17%)	7 (1.17%)	483	80.5

Unmarried	63 (10.5%)	39 (6.5%)	13 (2.16%)	2 (0.33%)	117	19.5
total	272 (45.33%)	281 (46.83%)	38 (6.33%)	9 (1.5%)	600	100

In table 3.4, the matrix reveals that 209 (34.83%) married and 63 (10.5%) unmarried with a total of 272 (45.33%) beneficiaries identify 'friends' as their authentic source of information about employment scheme, 242 (40.33%) married and 39 (6.5%) unmarried having a total of 281 (46.83%) beneficiaries identify 'gaon sabha' while 25 (4.17%) married and 13 (2.16%) unmarried with a total of 38 (6.33%) beneficiaries identify 'newspaper' and 7 (1.17%) married and 2 (0.33%) unmarried totalling 9 (1.5 %) beneficiaries of the scheme say 'radio' as their authentic source of information about MGNREGS.

Inference: From this, it can be inferred that group communication (gaonsabha) is preferred by both married and unmarried beneficiaries as their authentic source of information followed by interpersonal communication.

Table : 3.5 Authentic source of information and age wise distribution of respondents

Educational qualification	1.Friends	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Standard I-IV	143 (23.83%)	118 (19.67%)	7 (1.17%)	5 (0.83%)	273	45.5
Standard V-VIII	112 (18.67%)	133 (22.17%)	13 (2.16%)	3 (0.5%)	261	43.5
Standard IX-XII	16 (2.66%)	29 (4.83%)	18 (3%)	1 (0.17%)	64	10.67
BA-MA	1 (0.17%)	1 (0.16%)	-	-	2	0.33

Total	272 (45.33%)	281 (46.83%)	38 (6.33%)	9 (1.5%)	600	100
-------	-----------------	-----------------	---------------	-------------	-----	-----

In table 3.5, the data reveals that 143 (23.83%) of standard I-IV, 112 (18.67%) of standard V-VIII, 16 (2.66%) of standard X-XII, 1 (0.17%) of BA-MA with a total of 272 (45.33%) beneficiaries identify 'friends' as their authentic source of information about employment scheme. 118 (19.67%) of standard I-IV, 133 (22.17%) of standard V-VIII, 29 (4.83%) of standard IX-XII, 1 (0.16%) of BA-MA having a total of 281 (46.83%) beneficiaries identify 'gaon sabha' while 7 (1.17%) of standard I-IV, 13 (2.16%) of standard V-VIII, 18 (3%) of standard IX-XII with a total of 38 (6.33%) beneficiaries identify 'newspaper' and 5 (0.83%) of standard I-IV and 3 (0.5%) of standard V-VIII and 1 (0.17%) of standard IX-XII with a total of 9 (1.5%) beneficiaries of the scheme identify 'radio' as their authentic source of information about MGNREGS.

Inference : On the basis of educational qualification, it can be seen that interpersonal communication is preferred more by standard I-IV and BA-MA group respondents followed by group communication (gaonsabha) and then newspaper and radio as their authentic source of information . But in the case of standard V-VIII and IX-XII educational groups it is seen that group communication (gaonsabha) is preferred more than others as their authentic source of information followed by inter personal communication , print (newspaper) and radio.

Table : 3.6 Authentic source of information and occupation wise distribution of respondents

Occupation	1.Friends	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Skilled labourers	238 (39.67%)	204 (34%)	21 (3.5%)	3 (0.5%)	466	77.67
Unskilled labourers	34 (5.66%)	77 (12.83%)	17 (2.83%)	6 (1%)	134	22.33

Total	272 (45.33%)	281 (46.83%)	38 (6.33%)	9 (1.5%)	600	100
-------	-----------------	-----------------	---------------	-------------	-----	-----

Table 3.6 reveals that 238 (39.67%) skilled labourers and 34 (5.66%) unskilled labourers totalling 272 (45.33%) beneficiaries identify 'friends' as their authentic source of information about the employment scheme, 204 (34%) skilled and 77 (12.83%) unskilled with a total of 281 (46.83%) beneficiaries identify 'gaon sabha' while 21 (3.5%) skilled and 17 (2.83%) unskilled with a total of 38 (6.33%) beneficiaries identify 'newspaper' and 3 (0.5%) skilled and 6 (1%) unskilled totalling 9 (1.5 %) beneficiaries of the scheme identify 'radio' as their authentic source of information about MGNREGS.

Inference : From the analysis of the data, on the basis of occupation, it can be inferred that interpersonal communication is preferred more by skilled labourers followed by group communication (gaonsabha) and then newspaper and radio as their authentic source of information . But in the case of unskilled labourers it is seen that group communication (gaonsabha) is preferred more as their authentic source of information followed by interpersonal communication and then newspaper and then radio.

Table : 3.7 Authentic source of information and age wise distribution of respondents

Age	1.Friends	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
20-30 years	55 (9.17%)	85 (14.16%)	7 (1.17%)	1 (0.17%)	148	24.67
30-40 years	136 (22.67%)	113 (18.83%)	16 (2.66%)	3 (0.5%)	268	44.67
40-50 years	64 (10.67)	49 (8.17%)	10 (1.66%)	4 (0.66%)	127	21.16
50 years and above	17 (2.83%)	34 (5.67%)	5 (0.83%)	1 (0.17%)	57	9.5

Total	272 (45.33%)	281 (46.83%)	38 (6.33%)	9 (1.5%)	600	100
-------	-----------------	-----------------	---------------	-------------	-----	-----

As per table 3.7, 55 (9.17%) from 20-30 years age group, 136 (22.67%) from 30-40 years, 64 (10.67%) from 40-50 years and 17 (2.83%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 272 (45.33%) beneficiaries identify 'friends' as their authentic source of information about employment scheme. 85 (14.16%) from 20-30 years age group, 113 (18.83%) from 30-40 years, 49 (8.17) from 40-50 years and 34 (5.67%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 281 (46.83%) beneficiaries identify 'gaon sabha' while 7 (1.17%) from 20-30 years age group, 16 (2.66%) from 30-40 years, 10 (1.66%) from 40-50 years, 5 (0.83%) from 50 years and above age group totalling 38 (6.33%) beneficiaries identify 'newspaper', 1 (0.17%) from 20-30 years age group, 3 (0.5%) from 30-40 years, 4 (0.66%) from 40-50 years, 1 (0.17%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 9 (1.5 %) beneficiaries of the scheme identify 'radio' as their authentic source of information about MGNREGS.

Inference: On the basis of age, it can be inferred that group communication (gaonsabha) is preferred more by 20-30 years and 50 years and above age group respondents followed by inter personal communication and then newspaper and radio as the first source of information . But in the case of 30-40 years and 40-50 years age group. it is seen that inter personal communication is preferred more as their authentic source of information followed by group communication (gaonsabha) and then newspaper and radio. On an average, it can be presumed that group communication (gaonsabha) was the leading authentic source of information followed by interpersonal communication. Print (newspaper) was in the third position while radio (electronic) was in fourth in terms of authenticity.

Table : 3.8 Authentic source of information and income wise distribution of respondents

Monthly family income	1.Friends	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Rs 3000-4000	206 (34.33%)	231 (38.5%)	17 (2.83%)	4 (0.66%)	458	76.33
Rs 4000-6000	56 (9.33%)	42 (7%)	16 (2.66%)	2 (0.33%)	116	19.33
Rs 6000-10000	9 (1.5%)	6 (1%)	4 (0.66%)	3 (0.5%)	22	3.67
Rs 10000 and above	1 (0.17%)	2 (0.33%)	1 (0.17%)	-	4	0.67
Total	272 (45.33%)	281 (46.83%)	38 (6.33%)	9 (1.5%)	600	100

From table 3.8, it is found out that 206 (34.33%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 56 (9.33%) from Rs 4000-6000, 9 (1.5%) from Rs 6000-10000, 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 272 (45.33%) beneficiaries identify ‘friends’ as their authentic source of information about the employment scheme. 231 (38.5%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 42 (7%) from Rs 4000-6000, 6 (1%) from Rs 6000-10000, 2 (0.33%) from Rs 10000 and above income group comprising 281 (46.83%) beneficiaries identify ‘gaon sabha’ while 17 (2.83%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 16 (2.66%) from Rs 4000-6000, 4 (0.66%) from Rs 6000-10000, 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 38 (6.33%) beneficiaries identify ‘newspaper’. 4 (0.66%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 2 (0.33%) from Rs 4000-6000, 3(0.5%) from Rs 6000-10000 income group totalling 9 (1.5 %) beneficiaries of the scheme identify ‘radio’ as their authentic source of information about MGNREGS.

Inference: From the analysis of the data, on the basis of income, it can be inferred that group communication (gaonsabha) is preferred more by Rs 3000-4000 and Rs 10000 and above income group respondents followed by inter personal communication and then newspaper and radio as their authentic source of information. But in the case of Rs 4000-6000 and Rs 6000-10000 income groups, it is seen that inter personal communication is preferred more as their authentic source of information followed by group communication (gaonsabha), print (newspaper) and radio.

Table : 4.1 Source of help for work payment and sex wise distribution of respondents

Gender	1.Friends	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Men	262 (43.67%)	251 (41.83%)	-	-	513	85.5
Women	66 (11%)	21 (3.5%)	-	-	87	14.5
Total	328 (54.67%)	272 (45.33%)	-	-	600	100

From table 4.1, it can be discerned that 262 (43.67%) men and 66 (11%) women with a total of 328 (54.67%) beneficiaries identify ‘friends’ as their source of information about work payment and 251 (41.83%) men and 21 (3.5%) women with a total of 272 (45.33%) beneficiaries identify ‘gaon sabha’.

Inference: From the analysis of the data collected, it can be understood that inter personal communication is preferred by both men and women beneficiaries as the helping source of information of payment followed by group communication (gaonsabha). Print (newspaper) and radio (electronic) had no role in the case of payment.

Table : 4. 2 Source of help for work payment and religion wise distribution of respondents

Community	1.Friends	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Hindu	107 (17.83%)	87 (14.5%)	-	-	194	32.33
Muslim	221 (36.83%)	185 (30.83%)	-	-	406	67.67
Total	328 (54.67%)	272 (45.33%)	-	-	600	100

As per table 4.2, 107 (17.83%) Hindus and 221 (36.83%) Muslims with a total of 328 (54.67%) beneficiaries identify ‘friends’ as their source of information about work payment and 87 (14.5%) Hindus and 185(30.83%) Muslims comprising 272 (45.33%) beneficiaries identify ‘gaon sabha’.

Inference: The analysis reveals that interpersonal communication is preferred more by both Hindu and Muslim communities as the helping source of information of payment followed by group communication (gaonsabha). Print (newspaper) and radio (electronic) had no place whatsoever in this regard.

Table : 4.3 Source of help for work payment and language wise distribution of respondents

Mother tongue	1.Friends	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Bengali	328 (54.67%)	272 (45.33%)	-	-	600	100
Hindi	-	-	-	-	-	0
Manipuri	-	-	-	-	-	0

Total	328 54.67%)	272 (45.33%)	-	-	600	100
-------	----------------	-----------------	---	---	-----	-----

Table 4.3, shows that 328 (54.67%) beneficiaries identify ‘friends’ as their source of information about work payment and 272 (45.33%) beneficiaries identify ‘gaon sabha’.

Inference: From the analysis of the data collected, on the basis of mother tongue, it is found that interpersonal communication is preferred by the beneficiaries as the helping source of information of payment followed by group communication (gaonsabha). Print (newspaper) and radio (electronic) did not have any role in this regard.

Table : 4. 4 Source of help for work payment and distribution of respondents according to marital status

Marital status	1.Friends	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Married	242 (40.33%)	241 (40.17)	-	-	483	80.5
Unmarried	86 (14.33%)	31 (5.17)	-	-	117	19.5
Total	328 54.67%)	272 (45.33%)	-	-	600	100

Table 4.4, reveals that 242 (47.33%) married and 86 (14.33%) unmarried with a total of 328 (54.67%) beneficiaries identify ‘friends’ as their source of information about work payment and 241 (40.17%) married and 31 (5.17%) unmarried with a total of 272 (45.33%) beneficiaries identify ‘gaon sabha’ for this purpose .

Inference: From the data, it is found out that interpersonal communication is preferred more by both married and unmarried beneficiaries as the helping source of information of payment followed by group communication (gaonsabha).

Table : 4.5 Source of help for work payment and distribution of respondents according to educational qualification wise

Educational qualification	1.Friends	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Standard I-IV	161 (26.83%)	112 18.67%)	-	-	273	45.5
Standard V-VIII	116 (19.33%)	145 (24.17%)	-	-	261	43.5
Standard IX-XII	49 (8.17%)	15 (2.5%)	-	-	64	10.67
BA-MA	2 (0.33%)	-	-	-	2	0.33
Total	328 54.67%)	272 45.33%)	-	-	600	100

Table 4.5, explains that 161 (26.83%) of standard I-IV, 116 (19.33%) of standard V-VIII, 49 (8.17%) of standard X-XII, 2 (0.33%) of BA-MA educational groups with a total of 328 (54.67%) beneficiaries identify ‘friends’ as their source of information about work payment. 112 (18.67%) of standard I-IV, 145 (24.17%) of standard V-VIII, 15 (2.5%) of standard IX-XII with a total of 272 (45.33%) beneficiaries identify ‘gaon sabha’ in this purpose.

Inference: The analysis on the basis of educational qualification shows that interpersonal communication is preferred by standard I-IV and IX-XII and BA-MA groups as the helping source of information of payment followed by group communication (gaonsabha).

Table : 4.6 Source of help for work payment and occupation wise distribution of respondents

Occupation	1.Friends	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Skilled labourers	265 (44.17%)	201 (33.5%)	-	-	466	77.67
Unskilled labourers	63 (10.5%)	71 (11.83%)	-	-	134	22.33
Total	328 (54.67%)	272 (45.33%)	-	-	600	100

In table 4.6, the data reveals that 265 (44.17%) skilled labourers and 63 (10.5%) unskilled labourers with a total of 328 (54.67%) beneficiaries identify 'friends' as their source of information about work payment and 201 (33.5%) skilled and 71 (11.83%) unskilled with a total of 272 (45.33%) beneficiaries identify 'gaon sabha'.

Inference : From the analysis, on the basis of occupation, it is seen that interpersonal communication is preferred by skilled labourers as the helping source of information of payment followed by group communication (gaonsabha). But in the case of unskilled labourers, it is seen that group communication (gaonsabha) is preferred more as the helping source of information of payment followed by interpersonal communication.

Table : 4.7 Source of help for work payment and age wise distribution of respondents

Age	1.Friends	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
20-30 years	111 (18.5%)	37 (6.17%)	-	-	148	24.67
30-40 years	149 (24.83%)	119 (19.83%)	-	-	268	44.67

40-50 years	49 (8.17%)	78 (13%)	-	-	127	21.16
50 years and above	19 (3.17)	38 (6.33%)	-	-	57	9.5
Total	328 (54.67%)	272 (45.33%)	-	-	600	100

In table 4.7, the figures show that 111 (18.5%) from 20-30 years age group, 149 (24.83%) from 30-40 years, 49 (8.17%) from 40-50 years, 19 (3.17%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 328 (54.67%) beneficiaries identify 'friends' as their source of information about work payment. 37 (6.17%) from 20-30 years age group, 119 (19.83%) from 30-40 years, 78 (13%) from 40-50 years and 38 (6.33%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 272 (45.33%) beneficiaries identify 'gaon sabha'.

Inference: From the analysis of the collected data, on the basis of age, it can be seen interpersonal communication is preferred more by 20-30 years and 30-40 years age group respondents as the helping source of information on payment followed by group communication (gaonsabha). But in the case of 40-50 years and 50 years and above age group, group communication (gaonsabha) is preferred as the helping source of information on payment followed by interpersonal communication.

Table : 4.8 Source of help for work payment and income wise distribution of respondents

Monthly family income	1.Friends	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Rs 3000- 4000	275 (45.83%)	183 (30.5%)	-	-	458	76.33
Rs 4000- 6000	40 (6.67%)	76 (12.66%)	-	-	116	19.33

Rs 6000-10000	10 (1.67%)	12 (2%)	-	-	22	3.67
Rs 10000 and above	3 (0.5%)	1 (0.17%)	-	-	4	0.67
Total	328 (54.67%)	272 (45.33%)	-	-	600	100

Table 4.8, reveals that 275 (45.83%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 40 (6.67%) from Rs 4000-6000, 10 (1.67%) from Rs 6000-10000, 3 (0.5%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 328 (54.67%) beneficiaries identify 'friends' as their source of information about work payment. 183 (30.5%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 76 (12.66%) from Rs 4000-6000, 12 (2%) from Rs 6000-10000 income group, 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 272 (45.33%) beneficiaries identify 'gaon sabha'.

Inference: From the analysis based on income, it is clear that inter personal communication is preferred by Rs 3000-4000 and Rs 10000 and above income group respondents as the helping source of information of payment followed by group communication (gaonsabha). But in the case of Rs 4000-6000 and Rs 6000-10000 income groups it is seen that group communication (gaonsabha) is preferred as the helping source of information of payment followed by inter personal communication.

Table : 5.1 Opinion on governmental strategies of communication towards MGNREGS and sex wise distribution of respondents

Gender	1.Happy	2.Unhappy	3.Can't say	Total	%
Men	75 (12.5%)	240 (40%)	198 (33%)	513	85.5
Women	16 (2.66%)	28 (4.67%)	43 (7.17%)	87	14.5

Total	91 (15.16%)	268 (44.67%)	241 (40.17%)	600	100
-------	----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----	-----

In table 5.1, we find that 75 (12.5%) men and 16 (2.66%) women with a total of 91 (15.16%) beneficiaries are ‘happy’ with the system and strategies of communication followed by the concerned authority of MGNREGS at their village. 240 (40%) men and 28 (4.67%) women with a total of 268 (44.67%) beneficiaries are ‘unhappy’ while 198 (33%) men and 43 (7.17) women with a total of 241 (40.17%) beneficiaries cannot say anything.

Inference: From the analysis of data, on the basis of sex we can assume that majority of the respondents both men and women are unhappy with the system and strategies of communication followed by the concerned authority of MGNREGS at their village followed by unawareness and then happiness .

Table : 5.2 Opinion on governmental strategies of communication towards MGNREGS and community wise distribution of respondents

Community	1.Happy	2.Unhappy	3.Can'tsay	Total	%
Hindu	35 (5.83%)	87 (14.5%)	72 (12%)	194	32.33
Muslim	56 (9.33%)	181 (30.17%)	169 (28.17%)	406	67.67
Total	91 (15.16%)	268 (44.67%)	241 (40.17%)	600	100

In table 5.2, the data reveals that 35 (5.83%) Hindus and 56 (9.33%) Muslims with a total of 91 (15.16%) beneficiaries are ‘happy’ with the system and strategies of communication followed by the concerned authority of MGNREGS at their village. 87 (14.5%) Hindus and 181(30.17%) Muslims totaling 268 (44.67%) beneficiaries are ‘unhappy’ while 72 (12%) Hindus and 169 (28.17%) Muslims with a total of 241 (40.17%) beneficiaries cannot say anything.

Inference: From the analysis, on the basis of community, it can be said that the majority of respondents from both communities are unhappy with the system and strategies of communication followed by the concerned authority of MGNREGS at their village.

Table : 5.3 Opinion on governmental strategies of communication towards MGNREGS and language wise distribution of respondents

Mother tongue	1.Happy	2.Unhappy	3.Can'tsay	Total	%
Bengali	91 (15.16%)	268 (44.67%)	241 (40.17%)	600	100
Hindi	-	-	-	-	0
Manipuri	-	-	-	-	0
Total	91 (15.16%)	268 (44.67%)	241 (40.17%)	600	100

In table 5.3, the data reveals that 91 (15.16%) beneficiaries are 'happy' with the system and strategies of communication which are being followed by the concerned authority of MGNREGS at their village. 268 (44.67%) beneficiaries are 'unhappy' while 241 (40.17%) do not have any opinion.

Inference: On the basis of mother tongue, it can be safely assumed that majority of the respondents are unhappy with the system and strategies of communication followed by the concerned authority of MGNREGS at their village.

Table : 5.4 Opinion on governmental strategies of communication towards MGNREGS and distribution of respondents according to marital status

Marital status	1.Happy	2.Unhappy	3.Can'tsay	Total	%
Married	65 (10.83%)	211 (35.17%)	207 (34.5%)	483	80.5

Unmarried	26 (4.33%)	57 (9.5%)	34 (5.67%)	117	19.5
Total	91 (15.16%)	268 (44.67%)	241 (40.17%)	600	100

Table 5.4 shows that 65 (10.83%) married and 26 (4.33%) unmarried with a total of 91 (15.16%) beneficiaries are 'happy' with the system and strategies of communication followed by the concerned authority of MGNREGS at their village and 211 (35.17%) married and 57 (9.5%) beneficiaries are unhappy while 207 (34.5%) married and 34 (5.67%) unmarried totalling 241 (40.17%) beneficiaries cannot say anything.

Inference: From the analysis of the data, on the basis of marital status, it can be said that the majority of respondents, both married and unmarried, are unhappy with the system and strategies of communication adopted by the concerned authority of MGNREGS at their village.

Table : 5.5 Opinion on governmental strategies of communication towards MGNREGS and distribution of respondents according to educational qualification

Educational qualification	1.Happy	2.Unhappy	3.Can'tsay	Total	%
Standard I-IV	13 (2.17%)	95 (15.83%)	165 (27.5%)	273	45.5
Standard V-VIII	49 (8.17%)	141 (23.5%)	71 (11.83%)	261	43.5
Standard IX-XII	28 (4.67%)	31 (5.17%)	5 (0.83%)	64	10.67
BA-MA	1 (0.16%)	1 (0.17%)	-	2	0.33
Total	91 (15.16%)	268 (44.67%)	241 (40.17%)	600	100

Table 5.5, shows that 13 (2.17%) of standard I-IV, 49 (8.17%) of standard V-VIII, 28 (4.67%) of standard IX-XII, 1 (0.16%) of BA-MA totalling 91 (15.16%) beneficiaries are 'happy' with the system and strategies of communication followed by the concerned authority of MGNREGS at their village. 95 (15.83%) of standard I-IV, 141 (23.5%) of standard V-VIII, 31 (5.17%) of standard IX-XII and 1 (0.17%) of BA-MA with a total of 268 (44.67%) beneficiaries are unhappy while 165 (27.5%) of standard I-IV, 71 (11.83%) of standard V-VIII, 5 (0.83%) of standard IX-XII beneficiaries cannot say anything.

Inference: From the analysis of the data, on the basis of educational qualification, it can be understood that the majority of respondents of standard I-IV are unaware of the system and strategies of communication followed by the concerned authority of MGNREGS at their village.

Table : 5.6 Opinion on governmental strategies of communication towards MGNREGS and occupation wise distribution of respondents

Occupation	1.Happy	2.Unhappy	3.Can'tsay	Total	%
Skilled labourers	33 (5.5%)	239 (39.83%)	194 (32.33%)	466	77.67
Unskilled labourers	58 (9.66%)	29 (4.83%)	47 (7.83%)	134	22.33
Total	91 (15.16%)	268 (44.67%)	241 (40.17%)	600	100

In table 5.6, the data reveals that 33 (5.5%) skilled labourers and 58 (9.66%) unskilled labourers with a total of 91 (15.16%) beneficiaries are 'happy' with the system and strategies of communication being followed by the authority of MGNREGS at their village and 239 (39.83%) skilled and 29 (4.83%) unskilled and a total of 268 (44.67%) beneficiaries 'unhappy' while 194 (32.33%) skilled and 47(7.83%) unskilled, totalling 241 (40.17%) beneficiaries cannot say anything.

Inference: From the analysis of the collected data, on the basis of occupation, we can assume that the majority of respondents of skilled labour groups are unhappy with the system and strategies of communication followed by the authority of MGNREGS at their village.

Table : 5.7 Opinion on governmental strategies of communication towards MGNREGS and age wise distribution of respondents

Age	1.Happy	2.Unhappy	3.Can'tsay	Total	%
20-30 years	15 (2.5%)	82 (13.67%)	51 (8.5%)	148	24.67
30-40 years	27 (4.5%)	119 (19.83%)	122 (20.33%)	268	44.67
40-50	28 (4.67%)	49 (8.17%)	52 (8.67%)	127	21.16
50 years and above	21 (3.5%)	18 (3%)	16 (2.67%)	57	9.5
Total	91 (15.16%)	268 (44.67%)	241 (40.17%)	600	100

In table 5.7, the data reveals that 15 (2.5%) from 20-30 years age group, 27 (4.5%) from 30-40 years, 28 (4.67%) from 40-50 years, 21 (3.5%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 91 (15.16%) beneficiaries are 'happy' with the system and strategies of communication followed by the authority of MGNREGS at their village. 82 (13.67%) from 20-30 years age group, 119 (19.83%) from 30-40 years, 49 (8.17) from 40-50 years, 18 (3%) from 50 years and above age group totalling 268 (44.67%) beneficiaries 'unhappy' while 51 (8.5%) from 20-30 years age group, 122 (20.33%) from 30-40 years, 52 (8.67%) from 40-50 years, 16 (2.67%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 241 (40.17%) beneficiaries do not have any opinion.

Inference: From the analysis of the data, on the basis of age, it can be said that the majority of respondents of 20-30 years age group are unhappy with the system and strategies of communication followed by the authority of MGNREGS at their village.

Table : 5.8 Opinion on governmental strategies of communication towards MGNREGS and income wise distribution of respondents

Monthly family income	1.Happy	2.Unhappy	3.Can'tsay	Total	%
Rs 3000-4000	17 (2.83%)	235 (39.17%)	206 (34.33%)	458	76.33
Rs 4000-6000	56 (9.33%)	27 (4.5%)	33 (5.5%)	116	19.33
Rs 6000-10000	16 (2.67%)	4 (0.67%)	2 (0.33%)	22	3.67
Rs 10000 and above	2 (0.33%)	2 (0.33%)	-	4	0.67
Total	91 (15.16%)	268 (44.67%)	241 (40.17%)	600	100

In table 5.8, data reveals that 17 (2.83%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 56 (9.33%) from Rs 4000-6000, 16 (2.67%) from Rs 6000-10000, 2 (0.33%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 91 (15.16%) beneficiaries are 'happy' with the system and strategies of communication being followed by the authority of MGNREGS at their village. 235 (39.17%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 27 (4.5%) from Rs 4000-6000, 4 (0.67%) from Rs 6000-10000, 2 (0.33%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 268 (44.67%) beneficiaries are unhappy while 206 (34.33%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 33 (5.5%) from Rs 4000-6000, 2 (0.33%) from Rs 6000-10000 with a total of 241 (40.17 %) beneficiaries of the scheme cannot say anything.

Inference: From the analysis of the data, on the basis of income, we can consider that the majority of the respondents of Rs 3000-4000 income groups are unhappy with the system and strategies of communication followed by the authority of MGNREGS in their village.

Table : 6.1 Preferred communication mode suggested for government and sex wise distribution of respondents

Gender	1.Public announcement	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4.Radio	Total	%
Men	245 (40.83%)	256 (42.67%)	8 (1.33%)	4 (0.67%)	513	85.5
Women	61 (10.17%)	26 (4.33%)	-	-	87	14.5
Total	306 (51%)	282 (47%)	8 (1.33%)	4 (0.67%)	600	100

According to table 6.1, 245 (40.83%) men and 61 (10.17%) women with a total of 306 (51%) beneficiaries prefer 'public announcement' to be adopted by the government to disseminate information to the beneficiaries of MGNREGS. 256 (42.67%) men and 26 (4.33%) women constituting 282 (47%) beneficiaries identify 'gaon sabha' while 8(1.33%) men with a total of 8 (1.33%) beneficiaries identify ' newspaper' and 4 (0.67%) men with a total of 4 (0.67%) prefer 'radio' .

Inference: From the data analysis, it can safely be assumed that group communication (gaonsabha) method is preferred more by men respondents for disseminating information to the beneficiaries of MGNREGS followed by public announcement.

Table : 6.2 Preferred communication mode suggested for government and community wise distribution of respondents

Community	1.Public announcement	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4.Radio	total	%
Hindu	108 (18%)	82 (13.67%)	3 (0.5%)	1 (0.17%)	194	32.33
Muslim	198 (33%)	200 (33.33%)	5 (0.83%)	3 (0.5%)	406	67.67
Total	306 (51%)	282 (47%)	8 (1.33%)	4 (0.67%)	600	100

In table 6.2, data reveals that 108 (18%) Hindus and 198 (33%) Muslims with a total of 306 (51%) beneficiaries prefer ‘Public announcement’ which should be adopted by the government to disseminate information to the beneficiaries of MGNREGS. 82 (13.67%) Hindus and 200(33.33%) Muslims with a total of 282 (47%) beneficiaries identify ‘gaon sabha’ while 3 (0.5%) Hindus and 5 (0.83%) Muslims with a total of 8 (1.33%) beneficiaries identify ‘newspaper’ and 1(0.17%) Hindus and 3 (0.5%) Muslims with a total of 4 (0.67 %) beneficiaries of the scheme prefer ‘radio’.

Inference: From the analysis, it can be said that public announcement is preferred more by Hindus for disseminating information to the beneficiaries of MGNREGS followed by group communication (gaonsabha) and then newspaper and then radio. But in the case of Muslims, it is seen that group communication (gaonsabha) method is preferred more.

Table : 6.3 Preferred communication mode suggested for government and language wise distribution of respondents

Mother tongue	1.Public announcement	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4.Radio	Total	%
Bengali	306 (51%)	282 (47%)	8 (1.33%)	4 (0.67%)	600	100
Hindi	-	-	-	-	-	0
Manipuri	-	-	-	-	-	0
Total	306 (51%)	282 (47%)	8 (1.33%)	4 (0.67%)	600	100

Table 6.3, reveals that 306 (51%) Bengali speaking beneficiaries say that ‘public announcement’ should be adopted by the government to disseminate information to the beneficiaries of MGNREGS and 282 (47%) beneficiaries identify ‘gaon sabha’ while 8 (1.33%) beneficiaries identify ‘newspaper’ and 4 (0.67%) beneficiaries of the scheme identify ‘radio’.

Inference: From the analysis, on the basis of mother tongue, it can be seen that mass communication (public announcement) is preferred more by the beneficiaries for disseminating information to the beneficiaries of MGNREGS followed by group communication (gaonsabha), newspaper and radio respectively.

Table : 6.4 Preferred communication mode suggested for government and distribution of respondents according to marital status

Marital status	1.Public announcement	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4.Radio	Total	%
Married	223 (37.17%)	255 (42.5%)	3 (0.5%)	2 (0.33%)	483	80.5

Unmarried	83 (13.83%)	27 (4.5%)	5 (0.83%)	2 (0.34%)	117	19.5
Total	306 (51%)	282 (47%)	8 (1.33%)	4 (0.67%)	600	100

In table 6.4, data reveals that 223 (37.17%) married and 83 (13.83%) unmarried with a total of 306 (51%) beneficiaries say that 'public announcement' should be adopted by the government to disseminate information to the beneficiaries of MGNREGS. 255 (42.5%) married and 27 (4.5%) unmarried with a total of 282 (47%) beneficiaries identify 'gaon sabha' while 3 (0.5%) married and 5 (0.83%) unmarried beneficiaries opted for 'newspaper' and 2 (0.33%) married and 2 (0.34%) unmarried beneficiaries of the scheme selected 'radio'.

Inference: From the data analysis, it is clear that group communication (gaonsabha) is preferred by married beneficiaries for disseminating information to the beneficiaries of MGNREGS followed by mass communication (public announcement).

Table : 6.5 Preferred communication mode suggested for government and education wise distribution of respondents

Educational qualification	1.Public announcement	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4.Radio	Total	%
Standard I-IV	129 (21.5%)	142 (23.67%)	-	2 (0.33%)	273	45.5
Standard V-VIII	144 (24%)	115 (19.16%)	1 (0.17%)	1 (0.17%)	261	43.5
Standard IX-XII	33 (5.5%)	24 (4%)	6 (1%)	1 (0.17%)	64	10.67
BA-MA	-	1 (0.17%)	1 (0.16%)	-	2	0.33
Total	306 (51%)	282 (47%)	8 (1.33%)	4 (0.67%)	600	100

In table 6.5, the data reveals that 129 (21.5%) of standard I-IV, 144 (24%) of standard V-VIII, 33 (5.5%) of standard X-XII with a total of 306 (51%) beneficiaries prefer 'public announcement' should be adopted by the government to disseminate information to the beneficiaries of MGNREGS. 142 (23.67%) of standard I-IV, 115 (19.16%) of standard V-VIII, 24 (4%) of standard IX-XII and 1 (0.17%) of standard BA-MA with a total of 282 (47%) beneficiaries opt for 'gaon sabha' while 1 (0.17%) of standard V-VIII and 6 (1%) of standard IX-XII and 1 (0.16%) of BA-MA with a total of 8 (1.33%) beneficiaries prefer 'newspaper'. 2 (0.33%) of standard I-IV and 1 (0.17%) of standard V-VIII and 1 (0.17%) of standard IX-XII with a total of 4 (0.67%) beneficiaries of the scheme prefer 'radio' respectively.

Inference : From the analysis of the collected data, on the basis of educational qualification we can believe that group communication (gaonsabha) is preferred by standard I-IV educational group followed by mass communication (public announcement) and then radio and newspaper for disseminating information to the beneficiaries of MGNREGS. But in the case of standard V-VIII and IX-XII educational groups, it is seen that mass communication (public announcement) is preferred followed by group communication (gaonsabha) and then print (newspaper) and radio. In the case of BA-MA, group communication (gaonsabha) and print (newspaper) are preferred equally.

Table : 6.6 Preferred communication mode suggested for government and occupation wise distribution of respondents

Occupation	1.Public announcement	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4.Radio	Total	%
Skilled labourers	245 (40.83%)	212 (35.33%)	6 (1%)	3 (0.5%)	466	77.67
Unskilled labourers	61 (10.17%)	70 (11.67%)	2 (0.33%)	1 (0.17%)	134	22.33
Total	306 (51%)	282 (47%)	8 (1.33%)	4 (0.67%)	600	100

In table 6.6, the data reveals that 245 (40.83%) skilled labourers and 61 (10.17%) unskilled labourers with a total of 306 (51%) beneficiaries prefer ‘public announcement’ to be adopted by the government to disseminate information to the beneficiaries of MGNREGS. 212 (35.33%) skilled and 70 (11.67%) unskilled with a total of 282 (47%) beneficiaries selected ‘gaon sabha’ while 6 (1%) skilled and 2(0.33%) unskilled labourers with a total of 8 (1.33%) beneficiaries identify ‘newspaper’. 3 (0.5%) skilled and 1 (0.17%) unskilled labourers with a total of 4 (0.67 %) beneficiaries of the scheme opt for ‘radio’.

Inference: From the analysis of the collected data, on the basis of occupation, it can be safely assumed that mass communication (public announcement) is preferred more by skilled labourers followed by group communication (gaonsabha) and newspaper and then radio for disseminating information to the beneficiaries of MGNREGS. But in the case of unskilled labourers it is seen that group communication (gaonsabha) is preferred for disseminating information to the beneficiaries of MGNREGS followed by mass communication (public announcement) and newspaper and radio. Thus mass communication (public announcement) was the leading factor followed by group communication (gaonsabha). Print (newspaper) was in the third position while radio (electronic) was in the fourth for disseminating information.

Table : 6.7 Preferred communication mode suggested for government and sex wise distribution of respondents

Age	1.Public announcement	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4.Radio	Total	%
20-30 years	106 (17.67%)	39 (6.5%)	3 (0.5%)	-	148	24.67
30-40 years	139 (23.17%)	125 (20.83%)	2 (0.33%)	2 (0.33%)	268	44.67
40-50 years	45 (7.5%)	80 (13.33%)	1 (0.17%)	1 (0.17%)	127	21.16

50 years and above	16 (2.67%)	38 (6.33%)	2 (0.33%)	1 (0.17%)	57	9.5
Total	306 (51%)	282 (47%)	8 (1.33%)	4 (0.67%)	600	100

As per table 6.7, 106 (17.67%) from 20-30 years age group, 139 (23.17%) from 30-40 years, 45 (7.5%) from 40-50 years, 16 (2.67%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 306 (51%) beneficiaries opt for ‘public announcement’ to be adopted by the government to disseminate information to the beneficiaries of MGNREGS. 39 (6.5%) from 20-30 years age group, 125 (20.83%) from 30-40 years, 80 (13.33%) from 40-50 years, 38 (6.33%) from 50 years and above age group totalling 282 (47%) beneficiaries selected ‘gaon sabha’ while 3 (0.5%) from 20-30 years age group, 2 (0.33%) from 30-40 years, 1 (0.17%) from 40-50 years and 2 (0.33%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 8 (1.33%) beneficiaries prefer ‘newspaper’. 2 (0.33%) from 30-40 years, 1 (0.17%) from 40-50 years, 1 (0.17%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 4 (0.67 %) beneficiaries of the scheme seek ‘radio’.

Inference: From the analysis of the data, on the basis of age, it can be said that mass communication (public announcement) is preferred by 20-30 years and 40-50 years age group respondents followed by group communication (gaonsabha) and then newspaper and then radio for disseminating information to the beneficiaries of MGNREGS. But in the case of 40-50 years and 50 years and above age group it is seen that group communication (gaonsabha) is preferred followed by mass communication (public announcement) and newspaper and radio. On an average, it is presumed that mass communication (public announcement) was the leading preference followed by group communication (gaonsabha) for disseminating information.

Table : 6.8 Preferred communication mode suggested for government and income wise distribution of respondents

Monthly family income	1.Public announcement	2.Gaon sabha	3.Newspaper	4.Radio	Total	%
Rs 3000-4000	265 (44.17%)	192 (32%)	-	1 (0.17%)	458	76.33
Rs 4000-6000	31 (5.17%)	80 (13.33%)	3 (0.5%)	2 (0.33%)	116	19.33
Rs 6000-10000	8 (1.33%)	10 (1.67%)	3 (0.5%)	1 (0.17%)	22	3.67
Rs 10000 and above	2 (0.33%)	-	2 (0.33%)	-	4	0.67
Total	306 (51%)	282 (47%)	8 (1.33%)	4 (0.67%)	600	100

In table 6.8, the data reveals that 265 (44.17%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 31 (5.17%) from Rs 4000-6000, 8 (1.33%) from Rs 6000-10000, 2 (0.33%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 306 (51%) beneficiaries prefer 'public announcement' to be adopted by the government to disseminate information to the beneficiaries of MGNREGS. 192 (32%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 80 (13.33%) from Rs 4000-6000, 10 (1.67%) from Rs 6000-10000 income group, a total of 282 (47%) beneficiaries opt for 'gaon sabha' while 3 (0.5%) from Rs 4000-6000, 3 (0.5%) from Rs 6000-10000, 2 (0.33%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 8 (1.33%) beneficiaries prefer 'newspaper'. 1 (0.17%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 2 (0.33%) from Rs 4000-6000, 1(0.17%) from Rs 6000-10000 income group with a total of 4 (0.67%) beneficiaries of the scheme identify 'radio'.

Inference: From the analysis of the data, on the basis of income, it can be said that mass communication (public announcement) is preferred by Rs 3000-4000 income group

respondents followed by group communication (gaonsabha) and radio and newspaper for disseminating information to the beneficiaries of MGNREGS. But in the case of Rs 4000-6000 and Rs 6000-10000 income groups, it is seen that group communication (gaonsabha) is preferred, followed by mass communication (public announcement) and print (newspaper) and radio, and in the case of Rs 10000 and above income group mass communication (public announcement) is followed by newspaper. In fine, it is presumed that mass communication (public announcement) was the preferred method followed by group communication (gaonsabha) for disseminating information.

Table : 7.1 Opinion on Panchayat's communication as to the project work and sex wise distribution of respondents

Gender	1. Proper	2. Not proper	3. Not up to the expectation	4. Communicates but does not give true information	Total	%
Men	22 (3.67%)	98 (16.33%)	266 (44.33%)	127 (21.17%)	513	85.5
Women	11 (1.83%)	54 (9%)	15 (2.5%)	7 (1.16%)	87	14.5
Total	33 (5.5%)	152 (25.33%)	281 (46.83%)	134 (22.33%)	600	100

In table 7.1, the data reveals that 22 (3.67%) men and 11 (1.83%) women with a total of 33 (5.5%) beneficiaries opine that panchayat's communication to the people on providing work under the project is 'proper' and 98 (16.33%) men and 54 (9%) women with a total of 152 (25.33%) beneficiaries say 'not proper' while 266 (44.33%) men and 15 (2.5%) women totalling 281 (46.83%) beneficiaries opine 'not up to the expectation'. 127 (21.17%) men and 7 (1.16%) women comprising 134 (22.33%) say 'communicates but does not give true information'.

Inference: From the analysis of the data, it can be concluded that the majority of the men respondents have identified the Panchayat's communication as not up to the expectation. But in the case of women a majority of them have identified the Panchayat's communication as not proper, followed by not up to the expectation.

Table : 7.2 Opinion on Panchayat's communication as to the project work and religion wise distribution of respondents

Community	1. Proper	2. Not proper	3. Not up to the expectation	4. Communicates but does not give true information	Total	%
Hindu	9 (1.5%)	67 (11.16%)	73 (12.17%)	45 (7.5%)	194	32.3 3
Muslim	24 (4%)	85 (14.17%)	208 (34.66%)	89 (14.83%)	406	67.6 7
Total	33 (5.5%)	152 (25.33%)	281 (46.83%)	134 (22.33%)	600	100

As per table 7.2, data reveals that 9 (1.5%) Hindus and 24 (4%) Muslims totalling of 33 (5.5%) beneficiaries opine that panchayat's communication to the people on providing work under the project is 'proper'. 67 (11.16%) Hindus and 85 (14.17%) Muslims with a total of 152 (25.33%) beneficiaries say 'not proper' while 73 (12.17%) Hindus and 208 (34.66%) Muslims with a total of 281 (46.83%) beneficiaries opine 'not up to the expectation'. 45 (7.5%) Hindus and 89 (14.83%) Muslims with a total of 134 (22.33 %) beneficiaries of the scheme say 'communicates but does not give true information'.

Inference: From the analysis, it can be said that the majority of the Hindu and Muslim respondents have identified the Panchayat's communication was not up to the expectation followed by the opinion that communicates but does not give correct information.

Table : 7.3 Opinion on Panchayat's communication as to the project work and language wise distribution of respondents

Mother tongue	1. Proper	2. Not proper	3. Not up to the expectation	4. Communicates but does not give true information	Total	%
Bengali	33 (5.5%)	152 (25.33%)	281 (46.83%)	134 (22.33%)	600	100
Hindi	-	-	-	-	-	0
Manipuri	-	-	-	-	-	0
Total	33 (5.5%)	152 (25.33%)	281 (46.83%)	134 (22.33%)	600	100

In table 7.3, data shows that 33 (5.5%) Bengali speaking beneficiaries opine that panchayat's communication to the people on providing work under the project is 'proper' and 152 (25.33%) beneficiaries identify 'not proper' while 281 (46.83%) beneficiaries opine 'not up to the expectation'. and 134 (22.33%) beneficiaries of the scheme say 'communicates but does not give true information'.

Inference: From the analysis of the data collected, it can be understood that all the respondents are Bengali speaking and they identified the Panchayat's communication was not up to the expectation followed by the opinion that it communicates but does not give correct information.

Table : 7.4 Opinion on Panchayat's communication as to the project work and distribution of respondents according to marital status

Marital status	1. Proper	2. Not proper	3. Not up to the expectation	4. Communicates but does not give true information	Total	%
Married	20 (3.33%)	92 (15.33%)	252 (42%)	119 (19.83%)	483	80.5
Unmarried	13 (2.17%)	60 (10%)	29 (4.83%)	15 (2.5%)	117	19.5
Total	33 (5.5%)	152 (25.33%)	281 (46.83%)	34 (22.33%)	600	100

In table 7.4, the data reveals that 20 (3.33%) married and 13 (2.17%) unmarried with a total of 33 (5.5%) beneficiaries opine that panchayat's communication to the people on providing work under the project is 'proper'. 92 (15.33%) married and 60 (10%) unmarried respondents with a total of 152 (25.33%) identify it as 'not proper' while 252 (42%) married, 29 (4.83%) unmarried with a total of 281 (46.83%) beneficiaries opine 'not up to the expectation'. 119 (19.33%) married and 15 (2.5%) unmarried with a total of 134 (22.33 %) beneficiaries of the scheme say 'communicate but does not give true information'.

Inference: From the analysis of the data collected, it can be safely assumed that the majority of the married respondents identified the Panchayat's communication as not up to the expectation followed by the opinion that it communicates but does not give true information. A majority of unmarried beneficiaries identified the Panchayat's communication as not proper.

Table : 7.5 Opinion on Panchayat's communication as to the project work and education wise distribution of respondents

Education al qualification	1. Proper	2. Not proper	3. Not up to the expectation	4. Communicates but does not give true information	Total	%
Standard I-IV	18 (3%)	54 (9%)	90 (15%)	111 (18.5%)	273	45.5
Standard V-VIII	9 (1.5)	59 (9.83%)	178 (29.67%)	15 (2.5%)	261	43.5
Standard IX-XII	6 (1%)	38 (6.33%)	12 (2%)	8 (1.33%)	64	10.67
BA-MA	-	1 (0.17%)	1 (0.16%)	-	2	0.33
Total	33 (5.5%)	152 (25.33%)	281 (46.83%)	134 (22.33%)	600	100

In table 7.5, the data reveals that 18 (3%) of standard I-IV, 9 (1.5%) of standard V-VIII, 6 (1%) of standard X-XII with a total of 33 (5.5%) beneficiaries opine that panchayat's communication to the people on providing work under the project is 'proper'. 54 (9%) of standard I-IV, 59 (9.83%) of standard V-VIII, 38 (6.33%) of standard IX-XII, 1 (0.17%) of standard BA-MA with a total of 152 (25.33%) beneficiaries identify it as 'not proper' while 90 (15%) of standard I-IV, 178 (29.67%) of standard V-VIII, 12 (2%) of standard IX-XII, 1 (0.17%) of BA-MA with a total of 281 (46.83%) beneficiaries say that it is 'not up to the expectation'. 111 (18.5%) of standard I-IV, 15 (2.5%) of standard V-VIII, 8 (1.33%) of standard IX-XII totaling 134 (22.33%) beneficiaries of the scheme say 'communicate but does not give true information'.

Inference: From the analysis of the data collected, it can be safely assumed that the majority of the standard I-IV category respondents say that the Panchayat communicates

but does not give true information. But in the case of standard V-VIII category, majority of them opined that the Panchayat's communication was not up to the expectation. In the case of standard IX-XII and BA-MA category, majority of them have said the Panchayat's communication was not proper.

Table : 7.6 Opinion on Panchayat's communication as to the project work and occupation wise distribution of respondents

Occupation	1. Proper	2. Not proper	3. Not up to the expectation	4. Communicates but does not give true information	Total	%
Skilled labourers	12 (2%)	97 (16.17%)	242 (40.33%)	115 (19.16%)	466	77.67
Unskilled labourers	21 (3.5%)	55 (9.16%)	39 (6.5%)	19 (3.17%)	134	22.33
Total	33 (5.5%)	152 (25.33%)	281 (46.83%)	134 (22.33%)	600	100

As per table 7.6, data reveals that 12 (2%) skilled labourers and 21 (3.5%) unskilled labourers with a total of 33 (5.5%) beneficiaries opine that panchayat's communication to the people on providing work under the project is 'proper'. 97 (16.17%) skilled and 55 (9.16%) unskilled with a total of 152 (25.33%) beneficiaries identify 'not proper' while 242 (40.33%) skilled and 39(6.5%) unskilled totaling 281 (46.83%) beneficiaries opine 'not up to the expectation'. 115 (19.16%) skilled and 19 (3.17%) unskilled with a total of 134 (22.33 %) beneficiaries of the scheme say 'communicates but does not give true information'.

Inference: From the analysis of the data, it is found out that the majority of the skilled labourers have said that the Panchayat's communication was not up to the expectation. But in the case of unskilled labourers majority of them have said the Panchayat's communication was not proper.

Table : 7.7 Opinion on Panchayat’s communication as to the project work and age wise distribution of respondents

Age	1. Proper	2. Not proper	3. Not up to the expectation	4. Communicates but does not give true information	Total	%
20-30 years	5 (0.83%)	41 (6.83%)	56 (9.33%)	46 (7.67%)	148	24.67
30-40 years	3 (0.5%)	50 (8.33%)	167 (27.83)	48 (8%)	268	44.67
40-50 years	14 (2.33%)	43 (7.17%)	42 (7%)	28 (4.66%)	127	21.16
50 years and above	11 (1.83%)	18 (3%)	16 (2.67%)	12 (2%)	57	9.5
Total	33 (5.5%)	152 (25.33%)	281 (46.83%)	134 (22.33%)	600	100

Table 7.7 shows that 5 (0.83%) from 20-30 years age group, 3 (0.5%) from 30-40 years, 14 (2.33%) from 40-50 years, 11 (1.83%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 33 (5.5%) beneficiaries opine that panchayat’s communication to the people on providing work under the project is ‘proper’. 41 (6.83%) from 20-30 years age group, 50 (8.33%) from 30-40 years, 43 (7.17%) from 40-50 years, 18 (3%) from 50 years and above age group comprising 152 (25.33%) beneficiaries say ‘not proper’ while 56 (9.33%) from 20-30 years age group, 167 (27.83%) from 30-40 years, 42 (7%) from 40-50 years, 16 (2.67%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 281 (46.83%) beneficiaries opine ‘not up to the expectation’. 46 (7.67%) from 20-30, 48 (8%) from 30-40 years, 28 (4.66%) from 40-50 years, 12 (2%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 134

(22.33%) beneficiaries of the scheme say ‘communicates but does not give true information’.

Inference: From the analysis, it can be safely said that a majority of the 20-30 years age category respondents have said that the Panchayat’s communication was not up to the expectation. But in the case of 30-40 years category, a majority of them identified the Panchayat’s communication as not proper, and in the case of 40-50 years and 50 years and above category, the majority of them stated the same.

Table : 7.8 Opinion on Panchayat’s communication as to the project work and income wise distribution of respondents

Monthly family income	1. Proper	2. Not proper	3. Not up to the expectation	4. Communicates but does not give true information	Total	%
Rs 3000-4000	11 (1.83%)	92 (15.33%)	254 (42.33%)	101 (16.83%)	458	76.33
Rs 4000-6000	13 (2.17%)	52 (8.67%)	21 (3.5%)	30 (5%)	116	19.33
Rs 6000-10000	8 (1.33%)	6 (1%)	5 (0.83%)	3 (0.5%)	22	3.67
Rs 10000 and above	1 (0.17%)	2 (0.33%)	1 (0.17%)	-	4	0.67
Total	33 (5.5%)	152 (25.33%)	281 (46.83%)	134 (22.33%)	600	100

In table 7.8, the data reveals that 11 (1.83%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 13 (2.17%) from Rs 4000-6000 , 8 (1.33%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 33 (5.5%) beneficiaries opine that panchayat’s communication to the people on providing work under the project is ‘proper’.

92 (15.33%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 52 (8.67%) from Rs 4000-6000, 6 (1%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 2 (0.33%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 152 (25.33%) beneficiaries identify 'not proper' while 254 (42.33%) from Rs 3000-4000, 21 (3.5%) from Rs 4000-6000, 5 (0.83%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group totalling 281 (46.83%) beneficiaries opine 'not up to the expectation'. 101 (16.83%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 30 (5%) from Rs 4000-6000 and 3 (0.5%) from Rs 6000-10000 income group with a total of 134 (22.33 %) beneficiaries of the scheme say 'communicates but does not give true information'.

Inference: From the analysis of the data collected, it can be understood that the majority of the Rs 3000-4000 income category respondents have said that the Panchayat's communication was not up to the expectation, followed by the opinion that it communicates but does not give true information. But in the case of Rs 4000-6000 categories, a majority of them have said that the Panchayat's communication was not proper followed by communicates but does not give true information. In the case of Rs 6000-10000 and Rs 10000 and above category, a majority of them have identified the Panchayat's communication as proper.

Table : 8.1 Opinion on panchayat abiding by rules and distribution of respondents sex wise

Gender	1. Abiding	2. Not abiding	3. Partly abiding	4. Can't say	Total	%
Men	18 (3%)	99 (16.5%)	267 (44.5%)	129 (21.5%)	513	85.5
Women	10 (1.67%)	54 (9%)	15 (2.5%)	8 (1.33%)	87	14.5
Total	28 (4.67%)	153 (25.5%)	282 (47%)	137 (22.83%)	600	100

According to table 8.1, 18 (3%) men and 10 (1.67%) women with a total of 28 (4.67%) beneficiaries have opined that panchayat body is 'abiding' by rules and regulations in the

case of providing work to implement the project. 99 (16.5%) men and 54 (9%) women totalling 153 (25.5%) beneficiaries identify ‘not abiding’ while 267 (44.5%) men and 15(2.5%) women with a total of 282 (47%) beneficiaries opine ‘partly abiding’ and 129 (21.5%) men and 8 (1.33%) women with a total of 137 (22.33%) cannot say anything .

Inference: A majority of the men respondents expressed that panchayat body is partly abiding rules and regulations in providing work to implement the project. In the case of women, a majority of them said that the Panchayat was not abiding rules and.

Table : 8.2 Opinion on panchayat abiding by rules and distribution of respondents community wise

Community	1. Abiding	2. Not abiding	3. Partly abiding	4. Can't say	Total	%
Hindu	8 (1.33%)	46 (7.67%)	75 (12.5%)	65 (10.83%)	194	32.33
Muslim	20 (3.33%)	107 (17.83%)	207 (34.5%)	72 (12%)	406	67.67
Total	28 (4.67%)	153 (25.5%)	282 (47%)	137 (22.83%)	600	100

In table 8.2, the data reveals that 8 (1.33%) Hindus and 20 (3.33%) Muslims with a total of 28 (4.67%) beneficiaries opine that panchayat body is ‘abiding’ by rules and regulations in providing work to implement the project. 46 (7.67%) Hindus and 107 (17.83%) Muslims totalling 153 (25.5%) beneficiaries say that it is ‘not abiding’ while 75 (12.5%) Hindus and 207 (34.5%) Muslims with a total of 282 (47%) beneficiaries opine ‘partly abiding’. 65 (10.83%) Hindus and 72 (12%) Muslims with a total of 137 (22.33 %) beneficiaries of the scheme identify cannot say anything.

Inference: A majority of Hindu respondents have expressed that the panchayat was partly abiding by rules and regulation in providing work to implement the project. In the case of Muslims, a majority of them have stated that Panchayat was partly abiding by rules and regulations.

Table : 8.3 Opinion on panchayat abiding by rules and distribution of respondents language wise

Mother tongue	1. Abiding	2. Not abiding	3. Partly abiding	4. Can't say	Total	%
Bengali	28 (4.67%)	153 (25.5%)	282 (47%)	137 (22.83%)	600	100
Hindi	-	-	-	-	-	0
Manipuri	-	-	-	-	-	0
Total	28 (4.67%)	153 (25.5%)	282 (47%)	137 (22.83%)	600	100

Table 8.3, shows that 28 (4.67%) Bengali speaking beneficiaries opine that panchayat is 'abiding' by rules and regulations in providing work to implement the project. 153 (25.5%) beneficiaries say that it is 'not abiding' while 282 (47%) beneficiaries opine 'partly abiding'. 137 (22.83%) beneficiaries of the scheme cannot say anything.

Inference: The Bengali speaking respondents have stated that the panchayat was partially abiding by rules and regulations in providing work to implement the scheme.

Table : 8.4 Opinion on panchayat abiding by rules and distribution of respondents according to marital status

Marital status	1. Abiding	2. Not abiding	3. Partly abiding	4. Can't say	Total	%
Married	15 (2.5%)	92 (15.33%)	252 (42%)	124 (20.66%)	483	80.5
Unmarried	13 (2.17%)	61 (10.17%)	30 (5%)	13 (2.17%)	117	19.5
Total	28 (4.67%)	153 (25.5%)	282 (47%)	137 (22.83%)	600	100

In table 8.4, the data reveals that 15 (2.5%) married and 13 (2.17%) unmarried with a total of 28 (4.67%) beneficiaries opine that the panchayat was 'abiding' by rules and regulations in providing work to implement the project, 92 (15.33%) married and 61 (10.17%) unmarried beneficiaries totalling 153 (25.5%) have stated that it is 'not abiding' while 252 (42%) married and 30 (5%) unmarried beneficiaries opine 'partly abiding'. 124 (20.66%) married and 13 (2.17%) unmarried with a total of 137 (22.83%) beneficiaries of the scheme cannot say anything.

Inference: A majority of the married respondents have expressed the view that the panchayat is partially abiding by rules and regulations in providing work to implement the project. In the case of unmarried, a majority of them have stated that the Panchayat is not abiding by a rules and regulations.

Table : 8.5 Opinion on panchayat abiding by rules and distribution of respondents education wise

Educational qualification	1. Abiding	2. Not abiding	3. Partly abiding	4. Can't say	Total	%
Standard I-IV	15 (2.5%)	56 (9.33%)	90 (15%)	112 (18.66%)	273	45.5
Standard V-VIII	8 (1.33%)	60 (10%)	178 (29.67%)	15 (2.5%)	261	43.5
Standard IX-XII	5 (0.83%)	36 (6%)	13 (2.17%)	10 (1.67%)	64	10.67
BA-MA	-	1 (0.17%)	1 (0.16%)	-	2	0.33
Total	28 (4.67%)	153 (25.5%)	282 (47%)	137 (22.83%)	600	100

In table 8.5, the data reveals that 15 (2.5%) of standard I-IV, 8 (1.33%) of standard V-VIII, 5 (0.83%) of standard X-XII with a total of 28 (4.67%) beneficiaries opine that the panchayat is 'abiding' by rules and regulations in providing work to implement the project. 56 (9.33%) of standard I-IV, 60 (10%) of standard V-VIII, 36 (6%) of standard IX-XII, 1 (0.17%) of BA-MA forming a total 153 (25.5%) beneficiaries say 'not abiding' while 90 (15%) of standard I-IV, 178 (29.67%) of standard V-VIII, 13 (2.17%) of standard IX-XII and 1 (0.16%) of BA-MA with a total of 282 (47%) beneficiaries opine 'partly abiding'. 112 (18.66%) of standard I-IV, 15 (2.5%) of standard V-VIII, 10 (1.67%) of standard IX-XII with a total of 137 (22.83%) beneficiaries of the scheme cannot say anything.

Inference: It can be found that a majority of the standard I-IV educational group respondents cannot say anything, followed by the view that the panchayat was partially abiding by rules and regulations for providing work to implement the project. But in the standard V-VIII group, a majority of the respondents have said that the panchayat is partially abiding by rules and regulations.

Table : 8.6 Opinion on panchayat abiding by rules and distribution of respondents occupation wise

Occupation	1. Abiding	2. Not abiding	3. Partly abiding	4. Can't say	Total	%
Skilled labourers	11 (1.83%)	98 (16.33%)	241 (40.17%)	116 (19.33%)	466	77.67
Unskilled labourers	17 (2.83%)	55 (9.17%)	41 (6.83%)	21 (3.5%)	134	22.33
Total	28 (4.67%)	153 (25.5%)	282 (47%)	137 (22.83%)	600	100

As per table 8.6, 11 (1.83%) skilled labourers and 17 (2.83%) unskilled labourers totalling 28 (4.67%) beneficiaries opine that the panchayat is 'abiding' by rules and regulations in providing work to implement the project. 98 (16.33%) skilled and 55 (9.17%) unskilled labourers with a total of 153 (25.5%) beneficiaries identify 'not abiding' while 241 (40.17%) skilled and 41(6.83%) unskilled with a total of 282 (47%) beneficiaries opine 'partially abiding'. 116 (19.33%) skilled and 21 (3.5%) unskilled labourers with a total of 137 (22.83 %) cannot say anything.

Inference: A majority of the skilled labourers have expressed that the panchayat was partially abiding by rules and regulations in providing work. In the case of unskilled labourers, majority of them say that the panchayat is not abiding by rules and regulations.

Table : 8.7 Opinion on panchayat abiding by rules and distribution of respondents age wise

Age	1. Abiding	2. Not abiding	3. Partly abiding	4. Can't say	Total	%
20-30 years	6 (1%)	40 (6.67%)	56 (9.33%)	46 (7.67%)	148	24.67
30-40 years	3 (0.5%)	50 (8.33%)	168 (28%)	47 (7.83%)	268	44.67
40-50 years	10 (1.67%)	44 (7.33%)	42 (7%)	31 (5.17%)	127	21.16
50 years and above	9 (1.5%)	19 (3.17%)	16 (2.67%)	13 (2.16)	57	9.5
Total	28 (4.67%)	153 (25.5%)	282 (47%)	137 (22.83%)	600	100

In table 8.7, the data shows that 6 (1%) from 20-30 years age group, 3 (0.5%) from 30-40 years, 10 (1.67%) from 40-50 years, 9 (1.5%) from 50 years and above age group, forming a total 28 (4.67%) beneficiaries opine that the panchayat is 'abiding' by rules and regulations in providing work. 40 (6.67%) from 20-30 years age group, 50 (8.33%) from 30-40 years, 44 (7.33%) from 40-50 years and 19 (3.17%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 153 (25.5%) beneficiaries have stated 'not abiding' while 56 (9.33%) from 20-30 years age group, 168 (28%) from 30-40 years, 42 (7%) from 40-50 years and 16 (2.67%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 282 (47%) beneficiaries opine 'partially abiding'. 46 (7.67%) from 20-30, 47 (7.83%) from 30-40 years, 31 (5.17%) from 40-50 years and 13 (2.16%) from 50 years and above age group totalling 137 (22.83 %) cannot say anything.

Inference: It can be safely found that the majority of the 20-30 years age group respondents state that the panchayat was partially abiding by rules and regulations in providing work. In 30-40 years age group, a majority of the respondents have expressed

the same view. And in the case of 40-50 years and 50 years and above age groups, most of them are critical of the panchayat for not abiding by rules and regulations.

Table : 8.8 Opinion on panchayat abiding by rules and distribution of respondents income wise

Monthly family income	1. Abiding	2. Not abiding	3. Partly abiding	4. Can't say	Total	%
Rs 3000-4000	7 (1.17%)	92 (15.33%)	256 (42.67%)	103 (17.16%)	458	76.33
Rs 4000-6000	12 (2%)	55 (9.17%)	20 (3.33%)	29 (4.83%)	116	19.33
Rs 6000-10000	8 (1.33%)	5 (0.83%)	5 (0.83%)	4 (0.67%)	22	3.67
Rs 10000 and above	1 (0.17%)	1 (0.17%)	1 (0.17%)	1 (0.17%)	4	0.67
Total	28 (4.67%)	153 (25.5%)	282 (47%)	137 (22.83%)	600	100

According to table 8.8, 7 (1.17%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 12 (2%) from Rs 4000-6000, 8 (1.33%) from Rs 6000-10000, 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group comprising a total of 28 (4.67%) beneficiaries opine that the panchayat is 'abiding' by rules and regulation. 92 (15.33%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 55 (9.17%) from Rs 4000-6000, 5 (0.83%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 153 (25.5%) beneficiaries are sure of the fact that it is 'not abiding' by rules while 256 (42.67%) from Rs 3000-4000, 20 (3.33%) from Rs 4000-6000, 5 (0.83%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 282 (47%) beneficiaries opine 'partially abiding'. 103 (17.16%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 29 (4.83%) from Rs 4000-6000, 4 (0.67%) from Rs 6000-10000, 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 137 (22.83 %) beneficiaries cannot say anything.

Inference: It can be understood from the analysis that a majority of Rs 3000-4000 income group respondents expressed the view that the panchayat is partially abiding by rules and regulations in providing work. But in Rs 4000-6000 income group, a majority of the respondents have stated it is not abiding by rules. In the case of Rs 6000-10000 income group, a majority of them have said that the panchayat is abiding rules and regulations. In Rs 10000 and above income group, there is no significant difference.

Table : 9.1 Distribution of respondents sex wise and their opinion as to the administrative body of MGNREGS

Gender	1. State administration	2. District administration	3. Block & Panchayat administration	4. All of the above	Total	%
Men	41 (6.83%)	92 (15.33%)	214 (35.67%)	166 (27.67%)	513	85.5
Women	9 (1.5%)	20 (3.33%)	34 (5.67%)	24 (4%)	87	14.5
Total	50 (8.33%)	112 (18.67%)	248 (41.33%)	190 (31.67)	600	100

In table 9.1, the data reveals that 41 (6.83%) men and 9 (1.5%) women comprising a total of 50 (8.33%) beneficiaries opine that 'state administration' is responsible for miscommunication in MGNREGS. 92 (15.33%) men and 20 (3.33%) women with a total of 112 (18.67%) beneficiaries identify 'district administration' while 214 (35.67%) men and 34(5.67%) women with a total of 248 (41.33%) beneficiaries opine 'block and panchayat administration' and 166 (27.67%) men and 24 (4%) women forming a total 190 (31.67%) identify 'all of the above'.

Inference: A good majority of the men and women beneficiaries have identified the block and panchayat responsible for miscommunication in MGNREGS.

Table : 9.2 Distribution of respondents religion wise and their opinion as to the administrative body of MGNREGS

Community	1. State administration	2. District administration	3. Block & Panchayat administration	4. All of the above	Total	%
Hindu	19 (3.17%)	18 (3%)	72 (12%)	85 (14.17%)	194	32.33
Muslim	31 (5.16%)	94 (15.67%)	176 (29.33%)	105 (17.5%)	406	67.67
Total	50 (8.33%)	112 (18.67%)	248 (41.33%)	190 (31.67%)	600	100

As per table 9.2, data shows that 19 (3.17%) Hindus and 31 (5.16%) Muslims with a total of 50 (8.33%) beneficiaries opine that the ‘state administration’ is responsible for miscommunication in MGNREGS. 18 (3%) Hindus and 94 (15.67%) Muslims with a total of 112 (18.67%) beneficiaries identify ‘district administration’ while 72 (12%) Hindus and 176 (29.33%) Muslims totalling 248 (41.33%) beneficiaries pointed out at ‘block and panchayat administration’. 85 (14.17%) Hindus and 105 (17.5%) Muslims with a total of 190 (31.67 %) beneficiaries of the scheme identified ‘all of the above’.

Inference: A majority of the Hindu and Muslim beneficiaries have identified the block & panchayat administrative body as responsible for miscommunication regarding MGNREGS

Table : 9.3 Distribution of respondents language wise and their opinion as to the administrative body of MGNREGS

Mother tongue	1. State administration	2. District administration	3. Block & Panchayat administration	4. All of the above	Total	%
Bengali	50 (8.33%)	112 (18.67%)	248 (41.33%)	190 (31.67%)	600	100
Hindi	-	-	-	-	-	0
Manipuri	-	-	-	-	-	0
Total	50 (8.33%)	112 (18.67%)	248 (41.33%)	190 (31.67%)	600	100

Table 9.3, reveals that 50 (8.33%) Bengali speaking beneficiaries opine that the ‘state administration’ responsible for miscommunication regarding MGNREGS. 112 (18.67%) beneficiaries identify the ‘district administration’ while 248 (41.33%) beneficiaries opine ‘block and panchayat administration’ as responsible and 190 (31.67%) beneficiaries of the scheme identify ‘all of the above’.

Inference: All the beneficiaries are Bengali speaking and they have identified the block and panchayat administrative body as responsible for miscommunication regarding MGNREGS.

Table : 9.4 Distribution of respondents according to marital status and their opinion as to the administrative body of MGNREGS

Marital status	1. State administration	2. District administration	3. Block & Panchayat administration	4. All of the above	Total	%
Married	23 (3.83%)	62 (10.33%)	222 (37%)	176 (29.34%)	483	80.5

Unmarried	27 (4.5%)	50 (8.33%)	26 (4.33%)	14 (2.33%)	117	19.5
Total	50 (8.33%)	11 (18.67%)	248 (41.33%)	190 (31.67%)	600	100

As per table 9.4, 23 (3.83%) married and 27 (4.5%) unmarried with a total of 50 (8.33%) beneficiaries opine that the 'state administration' is responsible for miscommunication regarding MGNREGS. 62 (10.33%) married and 50 (8.33%) unmarried totalling 112 (18.67%) beneficiaries identify the 'district administration' while 222 (37%) married and 26 (4.33%) unmarried with a total of 248 (41.33%) beneficiaries opine 'block and panchayat administration' is responsible. 176 (29.34%) married and 14 (2.33%) unmarried comprising a total of 190 (31.67%) beneficiaries of the scheme identified 'all of the above'.

Inference: Majority of the married beneficiaries have identified the block and panchayat administrative body as responsible for miscommunication regarding MGNREGS. On the other hand, majority of the unmarried beneficiaries have identified the district administration as responsible agency for miscommunication.

Table : 9.5 Distribution of respondents education wise and their opinion as to the administrative body of MGNREGS

Educational qualification	1. State administration	2. District administration	3. Block & Panchayat administration	4. All of the above	Total	%
Standard I-IV	18 (3%)	56 (9.33%)	74 (12.33%)	125 (20.83%)	273	45.5
Standard V-VIII	20 (3.33%)	43 (7.17%)	140 (23.33%)	58 (9.67%)	261	43.5

Standard IX-XII	12 (2%)	13 (2.17)	33 (5.5%)	6 (1%)	64	10.67
BA-MA	-	-	1 (0.17%)	1 (0.17%)	2	0.33
Total	50 (8.33%)	112 (18.67%)	248 (41.33%)	190 (31.67%)	600	100

In table 9.5, the data shows that 18 (3%) of standard I-IV, 20 (3.33%) of standard V-VIII and 12 (2%) of standard X-XII making a total of 50 (8.33%) beneficiaries feel that the 'state administration' is responsible for miscommunication regarding MGNREGS. 56 (9.33%) of standard I-IV, 43 (7.17%) of standard V-VIII and 13 (2.17%) of standard IX-XII with a total of 112 (18.67%) beneficiaries identify the 'district administration' while 74 (12.33%) of standard I-IV, 140 (23.33%) of standard V-VIII, 33 (5.5%) of standard IX-XII and 1 (0.17%) of BA-MA with a total of 248 (41.33%) beneficiaries say 'block and panchayat administration' as responsible for miscommunication, 125 (20.83%) of standard I-IV, 58 (9.67%) of standard V-VIII, 6 (1%) of standard IX-XII and 1 (0.17%) of BA-MA comprising a total of 190 (31.67%) beneficiaries of the scheme have identified 'all of the above'.

Inference: Majority of the standard I-IV group beneficiaries have identified all the administrative agencies cited here as equally responsible for miscommunication regarding MGNREGS. But in the case of standard V-VIII, it is seen that the block and panchayat administrative agency is considered more responsible. In the case of standard IX-XII and BA-MA educational groups the block and panchayat administrative body was responsible.

Table : 9.6 Distribution of respondents occupation wise and their opinion as to the administrative body of MGNREGS

Occupation	1. State administration	2. District administration	3. Block & Panchayat administration	4. All of the above	Total	%
Skilled labourers	20 (3.33%)	49 (8.17%)	237 (39.5%)	160 (26.67%)	466	77.67
Unskilled labourers	30 (5%)	63 (10.5%)	11 (1.83%)	30 (5%)	134	22.33
Total	50 (8.33%)	112 (18.67%)	248 (41.33%)	190 (31.67%)	600	100

In table 9.6, the data reveals that 20 (3.33%) skilled labourers and 30 (5%) unskilled labourers with a total of 50 (8.33%) beneficiaries opine that the 'state administration' is responsible for miscommunication regarding MGNREGS. 49 (8.17%) skilled and 63 (10.5%) unskilled beneficiaries identify the 'district administration' while 237 (39.5%) skilled and 11(1.83%) unskilled beneficiaries making a total of 248 (41.33%) beneficiaries point out at 'block and panchayat administration'. 160 (26.67%) skilled and 30 (5%) unskilled beneficiaries comprising a total of 190 (31.67 %) beneficiaries of the scheme have identified 'all of the above'.

Inference: Most skilled beneficiaries have identified the block and panchayat administrative body as responsible for miscommunication in MGNREGS. However, a majority of the unskilled beneficiaries have identified district administration followed by state administration. In fine, the block and panchayat administrative body is considered responsible for miscommunication in MGNREGS.

Table : 9.7 Distribution of respondents age wise and their opinion as to the administrative body of MGNREGS

Age	1. State administration	2. District administration	3. Block & Panchayat administration	4. All of the above	Total	%
20-30 years	12 (2%)	24 (4%)	57 (9.5%)	55 (9.17%)	148	24.67
30-40 years	15 (2.5%)	30 (5%)	135 (22.5%)	88 (14.67%)	268	44.67
40-50 years	10 (1.67%)	39 (6.5%)	42 (7%)	36 (6%)	127	21.16
50 years and above	13 (2.17%)	19 (3.17%)	14 (2.33%)	11 (1.83%)	57	9.5
Total	50 (8.33%)	112 (18.67%)	248 (41.33%)	190 (31.67%)	600	100

According to table 7, 12 (2%) from 20-30 years age group, 15 (2.5%) from 30-40 years, 10 (1.67%) from 40-50 years and 13 (2.17%) from 50 years and above age group comprising a total of 50 (8.33%) beneficiaries have opined that the 'state administration' is responsible for miscommunication in MGNREGS. 24 (4%) from 20-30 years age group, 30 (5%) from 30-40 years, 39 (6.5%) from 40-50 years and 19 (3.17%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 112 (18.67%) beneficiaries have identified 'district administration' while 57 (9.5%) from 20-30 years age group, 135 (22.5%) from 30-40 years, 42 (7%) from 40-50 years and 14 (2.33%) from 50 years and above age group making a total of 248 (41.33%) beneficiaries have pointed out at 'block and panchayat administration'. 55 (9.17%) from 20-30, 88 (14.67%) from 30-40 years, 36 (6%) from 40-50 years and 11 (1.83%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 190 (31.67%) beneficiaries of the scheme have said 'all of the above'.

Inference: Majority beneficiaries of the 20-30 years and 30-40 years age group have identified the block and panchayat administrative body as responsible for miscommunication in MGNREGS. But in the case of 40-50 years, it is seen that block and panchayat administrative body is more responsible for lack of information. In the case of 50 years and above, the district administration is identified. Ultimately, it is seen that the block and panchayat administrative body is considered responsible for miscommunication in MGNREGS.

Table : 9.8 Distribution of respondents income wise and their opinion as to the administrative body of MGNREGS

Monthly family income	1. State administration	2. District administration	3. Block & Panchayat administration	4. All of the above	Total	%
Rs 3000-4000	19 (3.17%)	69 (11.5%)	200 (33.33%)	170 (28.33%)	458	76.33
Rs 4000-6000	17 (2.83%)	40 (6.67%)	44 (7.33%)	15 (2.5%)	116	19.33
Rs 6000-10000	14 (2.33%)	2 (0.33%)	3 (0.5%)	3 (0.5%)	22	3.67
Rs 10000 and above	-	1 (0.17%)	1 (0.17%)	2 (0.33%)	4	0.67
Total	50 (8.33%)	112 (18.67%)	248 (41.33%)	190 (31.67%)	600	100

In table 9.8, the data reveals that 19 (3.17%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 17 (2.83%) from Rs 4000-6000 and 14 (2.33%) from Rs 6000-10000 income group with a total of 50 (8.33%) beneficiaries consider the 'state administration' as responsible for miscommunication in MGNREGS. 69 (11.5%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 40 (6.67%) from Rs 4000-6000, 2 (0.33%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group making a total of 112 (18.67%) beneficiaries have

identified ‘district administration’ while 200 (33.33%) from Rs 3000-4000, 44 (7.33%) from Rs 4000-60000, 3 (0.5%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 248 (41.33%) beneficiaries have said ‘block and panchayat administration’. 170 (28.33%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 15 (2.5%) from Rs 4000-6000, 3 (0.5%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 190 (31.67%) beneficiaries of the scheme have answered ‘all of the above’.

Inference: Majority of the Rs 3000-4000 income group beneficiaries have identified the block and panchayat body as responsible for miscommunication in MGNREGS.

Table : 10.1 Gaon sabha as a forum of information and sex wise distribution of respondents

Gender	1. Organizes gaon sabha	2. Does not organize gaon sabha	3. Rarely organizes gaon sabha	4. Can't say	Total	%
Men	157 (26.17%)	91 (15.17%)	121 (20.16%)	144 (24%)	513	85.5
Women	9 (1.5%)	15 (2.5%)	19 (3.17%)	44 (7.33%)	87	14.5
Total	166 (27.67%)	106 (17.67%)	140 (23.33%)	188 (31.33%)	600	100

In table 10.1, the data reveals that 157 (26.17%) men and 9 (1.5%) women with a total of 166 (27.67%) beneficiaries opine that panchayat body ‘organizes gaon sabha’ to inform people about MGNREGS. 91 (15.17%) men and 15 (2.5%) women with a total of 106 (17.67%) beneficiaries say that the panchayat ‘does not organize gaon sabha’ while 121 (20.16%) men and 19(3.17%) women forming a total of 140 (23.33%) beneficiaries opine ‘rarely organizes gaon sabha’. 144 (24%) men and 44 (7.33%) women with a total of 188 (31.33%) cannot say anything .

Inference: Majority of men respondents have expressed that they cannot say whether the panchayat body organizes gaon sabha to inform people about MGNREGS. In the case of women also it is the same story.

Table : 10.2 Gaon sabha as a forum of information and religion wise distribution of respondents

Community	1. Organizes gaon sabha	2. Does not organize gaon sabha	3. Rarely organizes gaon sabha	4. Can't say	Total	%
Hindu	25 (4.17%)	30 (5%)	78 (13%)	61 (10.17%)	194	32.33
Muslim	141 (23.5%)	76 (12.67%)	62 (10.33%)	127 (21.17%)	406	67.67
Total	166 (27.67%)	106 (17.67%)	140 (23.33%)	188 (31.33%)	600	100

According to table 10.2, 25 (4.17%) Hindus and 141 (23.5%) Muslims with a total of 166 (27.67%) beneficiaries opine that the panchayat body 'organizes gaon sabha' to inform people about MGNREGS. 30 (5%) Hindus and 76 (12.67%) Muslims making a total of 106 (17.67%) beneficiaries say that the panchayat 'does not organize gaon sabha' while 78 (13%) Hindus and 62 (10.33%) Muslims totalling 140 (23.33%) beneficiaries opine that the panchayat 'rarely organizes gaon sabha'. 61 (10.17%) Hindus and 127 (21.17%) Muslims with a total of 188 (31.33 %) beneficiaries of the scheme cannot say anything.

Inference: Majority of the Hindu respondents expressed the view that the panchayat body rarely organizes gaon sabha to inform people about MGNREGS. In the case of Muslims, majority of them say that the panchayat organizes gaon sabha. On an average, it is seen that majority of the respondents cannot say anything about the organisation of gaon sabha.

Table : 10.3 Gaon sabha as a forum of information and language wise distribution of respondents

Mother tongue	1. Organizes gaon sabha	2. Does not organize gaon sabha	3. Rarely organizes gaon sabha	4. Can't say	Total	%
Bengali	166 (27.67%)	106 (17.67%)	140 (23.33%)	188 (31.33%)	600	100
Hindi	-	-	-	-	-	0
Manipuri	-	-	-	-	-	0
Total	166 (27.67%)	106 (17.67%)	140 (23.33%)	188 (31.33%)	600	100

As per table 10.3, the data shows that 166 (27.67%) Bengali speaking beneficiaries opine that the panchayat body 'organizes gaon sabha' to inform people about MGNREGS, 106 (17.67%) beneficiaries say 'does not organize gaon sabha' while 140 (23.33%) beneficiaries say that it 'rarely organizes gaon sabha' and 188 (31.33%) beneficiaries of the scheme cannot say anything.

Inference: Majority of beneficiaries cannot say anything about the organization of gaon sabha.

Table : 10.4 Gaon sabha as a forum of information and distribution of respondents according to marital status

Marital status	1. Organizes gaon sabha	2. Does not organize gaon sabha	3. Rarely organizes gaon sabha	4. Can't say	Total	%
Married	143 (23.83%)	43 (7.17%)	122 (20.33%)	175 (29.17%)	483	80.5

Unmarried	23 (3.83%)	63 (10.5%)	18 (3%)	13 (2.17%)	117	19.5
Total	166 (27.67%)	106 (17.67%)	140 (23.33%)	188 (31.33%)	600	100

Table 10.4, reveals that 143 (23.83%) married and 23 (3.83%) unmarried with a total of 166 (27.67%) beneficiaries say that the panchayat body 'organizes gaon sabha' to inform people about MGNREGS. 43 (7.17%) married and 63 (10.5%) unmarried making a total of 106 (17.67%) beneficiaries say 'does not organize gaon sabha' while 122 (20.33%) married and 18 (3%) unmarried with a total of 140 (23.33%) beneficiaries say that it 'rarely organizes gaon sabha'. 175 (29.17%) married and 13 (2.17%) unmarried totalling 188 (31.33%) beneficiaries of the scheme cannot say anything.

Inference: Majority of the married respondents have expressed that they cannot say whether the panchayat body organizes gaon sabha to inform people about MGNREGS.

Table : 10.5 Gaon sabha as a forum of information and education wise distribution of respondents

Educational qualification	1. Organizes gaon sabha	2. Does not organize gaon sabha	3. Rarely organizes gaon sabha	4. Can't say	Total	%
Standard I-IV	66 (11%)	34 (5.67%)	58 (9.67%)	115 (19.83%)	273	45.5
Standard V-VIII	76 (12.67%)	45 (7.5%)	69 (11.5%)	71 (11.83%)	261	43.5
Standard IX-XII	24 (4%)	26 (4.33%)	12 (2%)	2 (0.33%)	64	10.67
BA-MA	-	1 (0.17%)	1 (0.17%)	-	2	0.33

Total	166 (27.67%)	106 (17.67%)	140 (23.33%)	188 (31.33%)	600	100
-------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----	-----

According to table 10.5, 66 (11%) of standard I-IV, 76 (12.67%) of standard V-VIII, 24 (4%) of standard X-XII with a total of 166 (27.67%) beneficiaries say that the panchayat body ‘organizes gaon sabha’ to inform people about MGNREGS. 34 (5.67%) of standard I-IV, 45 (7.5%) of standard V-VIII, 26 (4.33%) of standard IX-XII and 1 (0.17%) of BA-MA totalling 106 (17.67%) beneficiaries say that it ‘does not organize gaon sabha’ while 58 (9.67%) of standard I-IV, 69 (11.5%) of standard V-VIII, 12 (2%) of standard IX-XII and 1 (0.17%) of BA-MA making a total of 140 (23.33%) beneficiaries opine that it ‘rarely organize gaon sabha’. 115 (19.83%) of standard I-IV, 71 (11.83%) of standard V-VIII and 2 (0.33%) of standard IX-XII with a total of 188 (31.33%) beneficiaries of the scheme cannot say anything.

Inference: Majority of the standard I-IV group beneficiaries have said that they cannot say whether the panchayat body organizes gaon sabha to inform people about MGNREGS. But in the case of standard V-VIII, it is seen that the panchayat organizes gaon sabha. In the case of standard IX-XII, the panchayat does not organize gaon sabha. In the case of BA-MA, educational group the answer is the same. In fine, it is found that majority of the respondents cannot say anything about the organization of gaon sabha.

Table : 10.6 Gaon sabha as a forum of information and occupation wise distribution of respondents

Occupation	1. Organizes gaon sabha	2. Does not organize gaon sabha	3. Rarely organizes gaon sabha	4. Can't say	Total	%
Skilled labourers	87 (14.5%)	68 (11.33%)	136 (22.67)	175 (29.17%)	466	77.67
Unskilled labourers	79 (13.17%)	38 (6.33%)	4 (0.67%)	13 (2.17%)	134	22.33

Total	166 (27.67%)	106 (17.67%)	140 (23.33%)	188 (31.33%)	600	100
-------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----	-----

As per table 10.6, the data reveals that 87 (14.5%) skilled labourers and 79 (13.17%) unskilled labourers with a total of 166 (27.67%) beneficiaries opine that the panchayat body ‘organizes gaon sabha’ to inform people about MGNREGS. 68 (11.33%) skilled and 38 (6.33%) unskilled making a total of 106 (17.67%) beneficiaries say that it ‘does not organize gaon sabha’ while 136 (22.67%) skilled and 4(0.67%) unskilled totalling 140 (23.33%) beneficiaries opine that it ‘rarely organizes gaon sabha’. 175 (29.17%) skilled and 13 (2.17%) unskilled with a total of 188 (31.33%) beneficiaries of the scheme cannot say anything.

Inference: Majority of the skilled labourers respondents have expressed that they cannot say whether the panchayat body organizes gaon sabha to inform people about MGNREGS. In the case of unskilled labourers, majority of them have said that the panchayat organizes gaon sabha.

Table : 10.7 Gaon sabha as a forum of information and age wise distribution of respondents

Age	1. Organizes gaon sabha	2. Does not organize gaon sabha	3. Rarely organizes gaon sabha	4. Can't say	Total	%
20-30 years	52 (8.67%)	29 (4.83%)	35 (5.83%)	52 (8.67%)	148	24.67
30-40 years	48 (8%)	35 (5.83%)	60 (10%)	105 (17.5%)	268	44.67
40-50 years	32 (5.33%)	26 (4.33%)	42 (7%)	27 (4.5%)	127	21.16

50 years and above	34 (5.67%)	16 (2.67%)	3 (0.5%)	4 (0.67%)	57	9.5
Total	166 (27.67%)	106 (17.67%)	140 (23.33%)	188 (31.33%)	600	100

In table 10.7, the data shows that 52 (8.67%) from 20-30 years age group, 48 (8%) from 30-40 years, 32 (5.33%) from 40-50 years and 34 (5.67%) from 50 years and above age group, making a total of 166 (27.67%) beneficiaries, opine that the panchayat body 'organizes gaon sabha' to inform people about MGNREGS. 29 (4.83%) from 20-30 years age group, 35 (5.83%) from 30-40 years, 26 (4.33%) from 40-50 years and 16 (2.67%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 106 (17.67%) beneficiaries say that it 'does not organize gaon sabha' while 35 (5.83%) from 20-30 years age group, 60 (10%) from 30-40 years, 42 (7%) from 40-50 years and 3 (0.5%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 140 (23.33%) beneficiaries opine that the panchayat 'rarely organizes gaon sabha'. 52 (8.67%) from 20-30 years, 105 (17.5%) from 30-40 years, 27 (4.5%) from 40-50 years and 4 (0.67%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 188 (31.33%) beneficiaries of the scheme cannot say anything.

Inference: Majority of the 20-30years age group beneficiaries cannot say anything whether the panchayat body organizes gaon sabha to inform people about MGNREGS. It is the same with 30-40 years beneficiaries. In the case of 40-50 years, the panchayat rarely organizes gaon sabha. In the case of 50 years and above, beneficiaries say that the panchayat organizes gaon sabha. On an average, it is found that majority of the respondents cannot say anything about the organization of gaon sabha.

Table : 10.8 Gaon sabha as a forum of information and income wise distribution of respondents

Monthly family income	1. Organizes gaon sabha	2. Does not organize gaon sabha	3. Rarely organizes gaon sabha	4. Can't say	Total	%
Rs 3000-4000	93 (15.5%)	87 (14.5%)	104 (17.33%)	174 (29%)	458	76.33
Rs 4000-6000	67 (11.17%)	15 (2.5%)	25 (4.17%)	9 (1.5%)	116	19.33
Rs 6000-10000	6 (1%)	3 (0.5%)	9 (1.5%)	4 (0.67%)	22	3.67
Rs 10000 and above	-	1 (0.17%)	2 (0.33%)	1 (0.17%)	4	0.67
Total	166 (27.67%)	106 17.67%	140 (23.33%)	188 (31.33%)	600	100

Table 10.8, shows that 93 (15.5%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 67 (11.17%) from Rs 4000-6000, 6 (1%) from Rs 6000-10000 income group with a total of 166 (27.67%) beneficiaries opine that the panchayat body 'organizes gaon sabha' to inform people about MGNREGS. 87 (14.5%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 15 (2.5%) from Rs 4000-6000, 3 (0.5%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group, totaling 106 (17.67%) beneficiaries say that it 'does not organize gaon sabha' while 104 (17.33%) from Rs 3000-4000, 25 (4.17%) from Rs 4000-6000, 9 (1.5%) from Rs 6000-10000, 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group making a total of 140 (23.33%) beneficiaries opine that it 'rarely organizes gaon sabha'. 174 (29%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 9 (1.5%) from Rs 4000-6000, 4 (0.67%) from Rs 6000-10000, 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 188 (31.33%) beneficiaries of the scheme have no opinion.

Inference: Majority of Rs 3000-4000 income group beneficiaries feel that they cannot say whether the panchayat body organizes gaon sabha to inform people about MGNREGS. But in the case of Rs 4000-6000, it is seen that they say that the panchayat organizes gaon. In the case of Rs 6000-10000, they say that it rarely organizes gaon. So, also the respondents of Rs 10000 and above income group.

Table : 11.1 Source of information on embezzlement of funds and sex wise distribution of respondents

Gender	1. Friends	2. Gaon sabha	3. Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Men	337 (56.17%)	93 (15.5%)	83 (13.83%)	-	513	85.5
Women	76 (12.67%)	9 (1.5%)	2 (0.33%)	-	87	14.5
Total	413 (68.83%)	102 (17%)	85 (14.17%)	-	600	100

According to table 11.1, the data reveals that 337 (56.17%) men and 76 (12.67%) women with a total of 413 (68.83%) beneficiaries identify 'friends' as their source that informs them about embezzlement of MGNREGS funds. 93 (15.5%) men and 9 (1.5%) women making a total of 102 17% beneficiaries state 'gaon sabha' while 83 (13.83%) men and 2 (0.33%) women totalling 85 (14.17%) beneficiaries say 'newspaper' as the source of information.

Inference: From the analysis of the data, it can be said that interpersonal communication is preferred more by both men and women beneficiaries as their source of information on embezzlement of MGNREGS funds.

Table : 11.2 Source of information on embezzlement of funds and religion wise distribution of respondents

Community	1. Friends	2. Gaon sabha	3. Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Hindu	137 (22.83%)	22 (3.67%)	35 (5.83%)	-	194	32.33
Muslim	276 (46%)	80 (13.33%)	50 (8.33%)	-	406	67.67
Total	413 (68.83%)	102 (17%)	85 (14.17%)	-	600	100

As per table 11.2, data reveals that 137 (22.83%) Hindus and 276 (46%) Muslims comprising a total of 413 (68.83%) beneficiaries have identified 'friends' as their source of information about embezzlement of MGNREGS funds. 22 (3.67%) Hindus and 80 (13.33%) Muslims with a total of 102 (17%) beneficiaries have identified 'gaon sabha' while 35 (5.83%) Hindus and 50 (8.33%) Muslims making a total of 85 (14.17%) beneficiaries have said 'newspaper' as their source of information in this regard.

Inference: From the analysis, it can be understood that interpersonal communication is preferred more by both Hindu and Muslim beneficiaries as their source of information about embezzlement of MGNREGS funds, followed by group communication (gaonsabha).

Table : 11.3 Source of information on embezzlement of funds and language wise distribution of respondents

Mother tongue	1. Friends	2. Gaon sabha	3. Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Bengali	413 (68.83%)	102 (17%)	85 (14.17%)	-	600	100
Hindi	-	-	-	-	-	0
Manipuri	-	-	-	-	-	0

Total	413 (68.83%)	102 (17%)	85 (14.17%)	-	600	100
-------	-----------------	--------------	----------------	---	-----	-----

Table 11.3, reveals that 413 (68.83%) Bengali speaking beneficiaries identify ‘friends’ as their source of information about embezzlement of MGNREGS funds. 102 (17%) beneficiaries identify ‘gaon sabha’ while 85 (14.17) beneficiaries identify ‘newspaper’.

Inference: All the beneficiaries are Bengali speaking and they have identified the interpersonal communication channel as their source of information about embezzlement of MGNREGS funds followed by group communication (gaonsabha). Print (newspaper) was in the third position while radio (electronic) had no impact.

Table : 11.4 Source of information on embezzlement of funds and distribution of respondents according to marital status

Marital status	1. Friends	2. Gaon sabha	3. Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Married	355 (59.16%)	79 (13.17%)	49 (8.17%)	-	483	80.5
Unmarried	58 (9.67%)	23 (3.83%)	36 (6%)	-	117	19.5
Total	413 (68.83%)	102 (17%)	85 (14.17%)	-	600	100

As per table 4, the data shows that 355 (59.67%) married and 58 (9.67%) unmarried with a total of 413 (68.83%) beneficiaries identify ‘friends’ as their source of information about embezzlement of MGNREGS funds. 79 (13.17%) married and 23 (3.83%) unmarried making a total of 102 (17%) beneficiaries identify ‘gaon sabha’ while 49 (8.17%) married and 36 (6%) unmarried with a total of 85 (14.17%) beneficiaries have identified ‘newspaper’ as their source of information.

Inference: From the analysis of the data collected, it can be said that interpersonal communication is preferred more by both married and unmarried beneficiaries as their source of information about embezzlement of MGNREGS funds.

Table : 11.5 Source of information on embezzlement of funds and education wise distribution of respondents

Educational qualification	1. Friends	2. Gaon sabha	3. Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Standard I-IV	206 (34.33%)	48 (8%)	19 (3.17%)	-	273	45.5
Standard V-VIII	193 (32.17%)	43 (7.17%)	25 (4.17%)	-	261	43.5
Standard IX-XII	14 (2.33%)	11 (1.83%)	39 (6.5%)	-	64	10.67
BA-MA	-	-	2 (0.33%)	-	2	0.33
Total	413 (68.83%)	102 (17%)	85 (14.17%)	-	600	100

In table 11.5, the data reveals that 206 (34.33%) of standard I-IV, 193 (32.17%) of standard V-VIII and 14 (2.33%) of standard X-XII with a total of 413 (68.83%) beneficiaries identify 'friends' as their source of information about embezzlement of MGNREGS funds. 48 (8%) of standard I-IV, 43 (7.17%) of standard V-VIII and 11 (1.83%) of standard IX-XII making a total of 102 (17%) beneficiaries identify 'gaon sabha' while 19 (3.17%) of standard I-IV, 25 (4.17%) of standard V-VIII, 39 (6.5%) of standard IX-XII and 2 (0.33%) of BA-MA with a total of 85 (14.17%) beneficiaries identify 'newspaper'.

Inference: From the analysis, on the basis of educational qualification, we can safely believe that inter personal communication is preferred more by respondents with education standard I-IV and V-VIII for information about embezzlement of MGNREGS funds. But

in the case of standard IX-XII group, it is seen that newspaper is preferred more than any other source of communication. In the case of BA-MA group, only newspaper is found significant.

Table : 11.6 Source of information on embezzlement of funds and occupation wise distribution of respondents

Occupation	1. Friends	2. Gaon sabha	3. Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Skilled labourers	359 (59.83%)	59 (9.83%)	48 (8%)	-	466	77.67
Unskilled labourers	54 (9%)	43 (7.17%)	37 (6.17%)	-	134	22.33
Total	413 (68.83%)	102 (17%)	85 (14.17%)	-	600	100

In table 11.6, the data shows that 359 (59.83%) skilled labourers and 54 (9%) unskilled labourers with a total of 413 (68.83%) beneficiaries identify 'friends' as their source of information about embezzlement of MGNREGS funds. 59 (9.83%) skilled and 43 (7.17%) unskilled workers with a total of 102 (17%) beneficiaries identify 'gaon sabha' while 48 (8%) skilled and 37(6.17%) unskilled workers making a total of 85 (14.17%) beneficiaries identify 'newspaper'

Inference: From the analysis of the data, it can be inferred that interpersonal communication is preferred more by both skilled and unskilled beneficiaries as their source of information about embezzlement of MGNREGS funds.

Table : 11.7 Source of information on embezzlement of funds and age wise distribution of respondents

Age	1. Friends	2. Gaon sabha	3. Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
20-30 years	113 (18.83%)	20 (3.33%)	15 (2.5%)	-	148	24.67
30-40 years	205 (34.17%)	28 (4.67%)	35 (5.83%)	-	268	44.67
40-50 years	79 (13.17%)	25 (4.17%)	23 (3.83%)	-	127	21.16
50 years and above	16 (2.67%)	29 (4.83%)	12 (2%)	-	57	9.5
Total	413 (68.83%)	102 (17%)	85 (14.17%)	-	600	100

According to table 11.7, 113 (18.83%) from 20-30 years age group, 205 (34.17%) from 30-40 years, 79 (13.17%) from 40-50 years and 16 (2.67%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 413 (68.83%) beneficiaries identify 'friends' as their source of information about embezzlement of MGNREGS funds. 20 (3.33%) from 20-30 years age group, 28 (4.67%) from 30-40 years, 25 (4.17) from 40-50 years and 29 (4.83) from 50 years and above age group making a total of 102 (17%) beneficiaries identify 'gaon sabha' while 15 (2.5%) from 20-30 years age group, 35 (5.83%) from 30-40 years, 23 (3.83%) from 40-50 years and 12 (2%) from 50 years and above age group totalling 85 (14.17%) beneficiaries identify 'newspaper' for this.

Inference: From the analysis, on the basis of age groups, it can be said that inter personal communication is preferred more by 20-30 years 30-40 years and 40-50 years age group beneficiaries as their source of information about embezzlement of MGNREGS funds. In the case of 50 years and above, group communication (gaonsabha) is preferred more than others.

Table : 11.8 Source of information on embezzlement of funds and income wise distribution of respondents

Monthly family income	1. Friends	2. Gaon sabha	3. Newspaper	4. Radio	Total	%
Rs 3000-4000	386 (64.33%)	47 (7.83%)	25 (4.17%)	-	458	76.33
Rs 4000-6000	17 (2.83%)	50 (8.33%)	49 (8.17%)	-	116	19.33
Rs 6000-10000	8 (1.33%)	4 (0.67%)	10 (1.67%)	-	22	3.67
Rs 10000 and above	2 (0.33%)	1 (0.17%)	1 (0.17%)	-	4	0.67
Total	413 (68.83%)	102 (17%)	85 (14.17%)	-	600	100

In table 11.8, the data reveals that 386 (64.33%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 17 (2.83%) from Rs 4000-6000, 8 (1.33%) from Rs 6000-10000, 2 (0.33%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 413 (68.83%) beneficiaries identify 'friends' as their source of information about embezzlement of MGNREGS funds. 47 (7.83%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 50 (8.33%) from Rs 4000-6000, 4 (0.67%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group making a total of 102 (17%) beneficiaries identify 'gaon sabha' while 25 (4.17%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 49 (8.17%) from Rs 4000-6000, 10 (1.67%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group comprising a total of 85 (14.17%) beneficiaries identify 'newspaper' as their source of information.

Inference: On the basis of income groups, we can believe that inter-personal communication is preferred more by Rs 3000-4000 income group beneficiaries as their source of information about embezzlement of MGNREGS funds. But in the case of Rs

4000-6000 group, it is seen that group communication (gaonsabha) is preferred more followed by newspaper. In the case of Rs 6000-10000 group, newspaper is preferred more followed by inter personal communication. Regarding Rs 10000 and above group, inter-personal communication is preferred more followed by group communication (gaonsabha).

Table : 12.1 Satisfaction as to the information provided and sex wise distribution of respondents

Gender	1. Satisfied	2. Dissatisfied	3. Don't get factual information	4. Satisfactory to some extent	Total	%
Men	35 (5.83%)	328 (54.67%)	116 (19.33%)	34 (5.67%)	513	85.5
Women	12 (2%)	26 (4.33%)	19 (3.17%)	30 (5%)	87	14.5
Total	47 (7.83%)	354 (59%)	135 (22.5%)	64 (10.67%)	600	100

As per table 12.1, data reveals that 35 (5.83%) men and 12 (2%) women making a total of 47 (7.83%) beneficiaries opine that they are 'satisfied' in getting information provided on the notice board. 328 (54.67%) men and 26 (4.33%) women with a total of 354 (59%) beneficiaries say 'dissatisfied' while 116 (19.33%) men and 19 (3.17%) women making a total of 135 (22.5%) beneficiaries opine that they 'don't get factual information' and 34 (5.67%) men and 30 (5%) women with a total of 64 (10.67%) respondents say 'satisfactory to some extent'.

Inference: Majority of the men respondents have said that they are dissatisfied with the information provided on the notice board. In the case of women, majority of them have said that they are satisfied to some extent with the information provided on the notice board.

Table : 12.2 Satisfaction as to the information provided and sex wise distribution of respondents

Community	1. Satisfied	2. Dissatisfied	3. Don't get factual information	4. Satisfactory to some extent	Total	%
Hindu	21 (3.5%)	118 (19.67%)	29 (4.83%)	18 (3%)	194	32.33
Muslim	26 (4.33%)	236 (39.33%)	106 (17.67%)	46 (7.67%)	406	67.67
Total	47 (7.83%)	354 (59%)	135 (22.5%)	64 (10.67%)	600	100

In table 12.2, the data explains that 21 (3.5%) Hindus and 26 (4.33%) Muslims with a total of 47 (7.83%) beneficiaries opine that they are 'satisfied' with the information provided on the notice board. 118 (19.67%) Hindus and 236 (39.33%) Muslims making a total of 354 (59%) beneficiaries say 'dissatisfied' while 29 (4.83%) Hindus and 106 (17.67%) Muslims totalling 135 (22.5%) beneficiaries opine that they 'don't get factual information' and 18 (3%) Hindus and 46 (7.67%) Muslims with a total of 64 (10.67 %) beneficiaries of the scheme say it is 'satisfactory to some extent'.

Inference: Majority of both Hindu and Muslim respondents have stated that they are dissatisfied with the information provided on the notice board.

Table : 12.3 Satisfaction as to the information provided and language wise distribution of respondents

Mother tongue	1. Satisfied	2. Dissatisfied	3. Don't get factual information	4. Satisfactory to some extent	Total	%
Bengali	47 (7.83%)	354 (59%)	135 (22.5%)	64 (10.67%)	600	100
Hindi	-	-	-	-	-	0
Manipuri	-	-	-	-	-	0
Total	47 (7.83%)	354 (59%)	135 (22.5%)	64 (10.67%)	600	100

Table 12.3, shows that 47 (7.83%) Bengali speaking beneficiaries opine that they are 'satisfied' with the information provided on the notice board. 354 (59%) of the beneficiaries say 'dissatisfied' while 135 (22.5%) beneficiaries opine that they 'don't get factual information' and 64 (10.67%) beneficiaries of the scheme say it is 'satisfactory to some extent'.

Inference: All the respondents are Bengali and most of them are dissatisfied with the information provided on the notice board.

Table : 12.4 Satisfaction as to the information provided and distribution of respondents according to marital status wise

Marital status	1. Satisfied	2. Dissatisfied	3. Don't get factual information	4. Satisfactory to some extent	Total	%
Married	24 (4%)	297 (49.5%)	113 (18.83%)	49 (8.17%)	483	80.5

Unmarried	23 (3.83%)	57 (9.5%)	22 (3.67%)	15 (2.5%)	117	19.5
Total	47 (7.83%)	354 (59%)	135 (22.5%)	64 (10.67%)	600	100

In table 12.4, the data shows that 24 (4%) married and 23 (3.83%) unmarried with a total of 47 (7.83%) beneficiaries opine that they are 'satisfied' with the information provided on the notice board. 297 (49.5%) married and 57 (9.5%) unmarried making a total of 354 (59%) beneficiaries say 'dissatisfied' while 113 (18.83%) married and 22 (3.67%) unmarried with a total of 135 (22.5%) beneficiaries opine that they 'don't get factual information' and 49 (8.17%) married and 15 (2.5%) unmarried totalling 64 (10.67%) beneficiaries of the scheme say it is 'satisfactory to some extent'.

Inference: Majority of the married respondents have stated that they are dissatisfied with the information provided on the board. In the case of unmarried also, majority of them expressed that they are dissatisfied with the information provided on the notice board. It is seen that most beneficiaries are dissatisfied with the information provided.

Table : 12.5 Satisfaction as to the information provided and education wise distribution of respondents

Educational qualification	1. Satisfied	2. Dissatisfied	3. Don't get factual information	4. Satisfactory to some extent	Total	%
Standard I-IV	19 (3.17%)	158 (26.33%)	51 (8.5%)	45 (7.5%)	273	45.5
Standard V-VIII	17 (2.83%)	164 (27.33%)	70 (11.67%)	10 (1.67%)	261	43.5
Standard IX-XII	11 (1.83%)	31 (5.17%)	13 (2.17%)	9 (1.5%)	64	10.67

BA-MA	-	1 (0.17%)	1 (0.17%)	-	2	0.33
Total	47 (7.83%)	354 (59%)	135 (22.5%)	64 (10.67%)	600	100

According to table 12.5, 19 (3.17%) of standard I-IV, 17 (2.83%) of standard V-VIII and 11 (1.83%) of standard X-XII with a total of 47 (7.83%) beneficiaries opine that they are 'satisfied' with the information provided on the notice board. 158 (26.33%) of standard I-IV, 164 (27.33%) of standard V-VIII, 31 (5.17%) of standard IX-XII and 1 (0.17%) of BA-MA making a total of 354 (59%) beneficiaries say 'dissatisfied' while 51 (8.5%) of standard I-IV, 70 (11.67%) of standard V-VIII, 13 (2.17%) of standard IX-XII and 1 (0.17%) of BA-MA totalling 135 (22.5%) beneficiaries opine that they 'don't get factual information' and 45 (7.5%) of standard I-IV, 10 (1.67%) of standard V-VIII, 9 (1.5%) of standard IX-XII making a total of 64 (10.67%) beneficiaries of the scheme say it is 'satisfactory to some extent'.

Inference: Majority of beneficiaries from all the educational qualification groups have expressed the view that they are dissatisfied with the information provided on the notice board by the authorities.

Table : 12.6 Satisfaction as to information provided and occupation wise distribution of respondents

Occupation	1. Satisfied	2. Dissatisfied	3. Don't get factual information	4. Satisfactory to some extent	Total	%
Skilled labourers	25 (4.17%)	194 (49%)	109 (18.17%)	38 (6.33%)	466	77.67
Unskilled labourers	22 (3.67%)	60 (10%)	26 (4.33%)	26 (4.33%)	134	22.33

Total	47 (7.83%)	354 (59%)	135 (22.5%)	64 (10.67%)	600	100
-------	---------------	--------------	----------------	----------------	-----	-----

As per table 12.6, the data shows that 25 (4.17%) skilled labourers and 22 (3.67%) unskilled labourers comprising a total of 47 (7.83%) beneficiaries opine that they are 'satisfied' with the information provided on the notice board. 194 (49%) skilled and 60 (10%) unskilled with a total of 354 (59%) beneficiaries say 'dissatisfied' while 109 (18.17%) skilled and 26 (4.33%) unskilled workers with a total of 135 (22.5%) beneficiaries say that they 'don't get factual information'. 38 (6.33%) skilled and 26 (4.33%) unskilled making a total of 64 (10.67 %) beneficiaries of the scheme, say that it is 'satisfactory to some extent'.

Inference: Majority of the both skilled and unskilled workers have stated that they are dissatisfied with the information provided to them. Only a few beneficiaries are satisfied with it.

Table : 12.7 Satisfaction as to the information provided and age wise distribution of respondents

Age	1. Satisfied	2. Dissatisfied	3. Don't get factual information	4. Satisfactory to some extent	Total	%
20-30 years	7 (1.17%)	131 (21.83%)	7 (1.17%)	3 (0.5%)	148	24.67
30-40 years	16 (2.67%)	157 (26.17%)	63 (10.5%)	32 (5.33%)	268	44.67
40-50 years	18 (3%)	45 (7.5%)	47 (7.83%)	17 (2.83%)	127	21.16

50 years and above	6 (1%)	21 (3.5%)	18 (3%)	12 (2%)	57	9.5
Total	47 (7.83%)	354 (59%)	135 (22.5%)	64 (10.67%)	600	100

In table 12.7, the data reveals that 7 (1.17%) from 20-30 years age group, 16 (2.67%) from 30-40 years, 18 (3%) from 40-50 years and 6 (1%) from 50 years and above age group making a total of 47 (7.83%) beneficiaries say that they are 'satisfied' with the information provided on the notice board. 131 (21.83%) from 20-30 years age group, 157 (26.17%) from 30-40 years, 45 (7.5%) from 40-50 years and 21 (3.5%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 354 (59%) beneficiaries say 'dissatisfied' while 7 (1.17%) from 20-30 years age group, 63 (10.5%) from 30-40 years and 47 (7.83%) from 40-50 years and 18 (3%) from 50 years and above age group totalling 135 (22.5%) beneficiaries say that they 'don't get factual information'. 3 (0.5%) from 20-30 years, 32 (5.33%) from 30-40 years, 17 (2.83%) from 40-50 years and 12 (2%) from 50 years and above age group comprising a total of 64 (10.67 %) beneficiaries of the scheme say it is 'satisfactory to some extent'.

Inference: Majority of respondents belonging to all age groups except of 40-50 years have expressed that they are dissatisfied with the information provided. In the case of 40-50 years age group, most respondents find no factual information from the authorities.

Table : 12.8 Satisfaction as to the information provided and income wise distribution of respondents

Monthly family income	1. Satisfied	2. Dissatisfied	3. Don't get factual information	4. Satisfactory to some extent	Total	%
Rs 3000-	18	264	127	49	458	76.33

4000	(3%)	(44%)	(21.17%)	(8.17%)		
Rs 4000-6000	24 (4%)	85 (14.17%)	4 (0.67%)	3 (0.5%)	116	19.33
Rs 6000-10000	4 (0.67%)	4 (0.67%)	3 (0.5%)	11 (1.83%)	22	3.67
Rs 10000 and above	1 (0.17%)	1 (0.17%)	1 (0.17%)	1 (0.17%)	4	0.67
Total	47 (7.83%)	354 (59%)	135 (22.5%)	64 (10.67%)	600	100

Table 12.8, reveals that 18 (3%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 24 (4%) from Rs 4000-6000, 4 (0.67%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group making a total of 47 (7.83%) beneficiaries opine that they are 'satisfied' with the information provided on the notice board. 264 (44%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 85 (14.17%) from Rs 4000-6000 and 4 (0.67%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 354 (59%) beneficiaries are 'dissatisfied' while 127 (21.17%) from Rs 3000-4000, 4 (0.67%) from Rs 4000-6000, 3 (0.5%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 135 (22.5%) beneficiaries say that they 'don't get factual information'. 49 (8.17%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 3 (0.5%) from Rs 4000-6000, 11 (1.83%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group totalling 64 (10.67 %) beneficiaries of the scheme, say that it is 'satisfactory to some extent'.

Inference: Majority of each income group beneficiaries have expressed that they are dissatisfied with the information provided.

Table : 13.1 Satisfaction as to employment guarantee scheme and sex wise distribution of respondents

Gender	1. Satisfactory	2. Not satisfactory	3. Satisfactory to some extent	Total	%
Men	234 (39%)	21 (3.5%)	258 (43%)	513	85.5
Women	33 (5.5%)	24 (4%)	30 (5%)	87	14.5
Total	267 (44.5%)	45 (7.5%)	288 (48%)	600	100

As per table 13.1, 234 (39%) men and 33 (5.5%) women with a total of 267 (44.5%) beneficiaries say that the government employment guarantee scheme is ‘satisfactory’ and 21 (3.5%) men and 24 (4%) women making a total of 45 (7.5%) beneficiaries opine ‘not satisfactory’ while 258 (43%) men and 30 (5%) women with a total of 288 (48%) beneficiaries say ‘satisfactory to some extent’.

Inference: Majority of both men and women beneficiaries identified that government employment guarantee scheme MGNREGS as satisfactory to some extent. Only a small number of beneficiaries have given their negative reaction towards the scheme.

Table : 13.2 Satisfaction as to employment guarantee scheme and religion wise distribution of respondents

Community	1. Satisfactory	2. Not satisfactory	3. Satisfactory to some extent	Total	%
Hindu	83 (13.83%)	21 (3.5%)	90 (15%)	194	32.33
Muslim	184 (30.67%)	24 (4%)	198 (33%)	406	67.67

Total	267 (44.5%)	45 (7.5%)	288 (48%)	600	100
-------	----------------	--------------	--------------	-----	-----

Table 13.2 reveals that 83 (13.83%) Hindus and 184 (30.67%) Muslims, making a total of 267 (44.5%) beneficiaries, say that the government employment guarantee scheme is 'satisfactory' and 21 (3.5%) Hindus and 24 (4%) Muslims with a total of 45 (7.5%) beneficiaries opine 'not satisfactory' while 90 (15%) Hindus and 198 (33%) Muslims together 288 (48%) beneficiaries say 'satisfactory to some extent'.

Inference: Majority of both Hindu and Muslim beneficiaries have felt that government employment guarantee scheme MGNREGS as satisfactory to some extent. Only a few number of beneficiaries have shown their negative reaction towards the scheme.

Table : 13.3 Satisfaction as to employment guarantee scheme and language wise distribution of respondents

Mother tongue	1. Satisfactory	2. Not satisfactory	3. Satisfactory to some extent	Total	%
Bengali	267 (44.5%)	45 (7.5%)	288 (48%)	600	100
Hindi	-	-	-	-	0
Manipuri	-	-	-	-	0
Total	267 (44.5%)	45 (7.5%)	288 (48%)	600	100

According to table 13.3, 267 (44.5%) Bengali speaking beneficiaries say that the government employment guarantee scheme is 'satisfactory' and 45 (7.5%) beneficiaries say 'not satisfactory' while 288 (48%) of them find it 'satisfactory to some extent'.

Inference: For most Bengali speaking MGNREGS is satisfactory to some extent.

Table : 13.4 Satisfaction as to employment guarantee scheme and distribution of respondents according to marital status

Marital status	1. Satisfactory	2. Not satisfactory	3. Satisfactory to some extent	Total	%
Married	210 (33.5%)	26 (4.33%)	247 (41.17%)	483	80.5
Unmarried	57 (9.5%)	19 (3.17%)	41 (6.83%)	117	19.5
Total	267 (44.5%)	45 (7.5%)	288 (48%)	600	100

As per table 13.4, the data reveals that 210 (33.5%) married and 57 (9.5%) unmarried with a total of 267 (44.5%) beneficiaries say that the government employment guarantee scheme is 'satisfactory' and 26 (4.33%) married and 19 (3.17%) unmarried making a total of 45 (7.5%) beneficiaries say 'not satisfactory' while 247 (41.17%) married and 41 (6.83%) unmarried with a total of 288 (48%) beneficiaries find it 'satisfactory to some extent'.

Inference: Majority of both married and unmarried beneficiaries find MGNREGS as satisfactory to some extent.

Table : 13.5 Satisfaction as to employment guarantee scheme and education wise distribution of respondents

Educational qualification	1. Satisfactory	2. Not satisfactory	3. Satisfactory to some extent	Total	%
Standard I-IV	130 (21.67%)	18 (3%)	125 (20.83%)	273	45.5
Standard V-VIII	101 (16.83%)	16 (2.67%)	144 (24%)	261	43.5

Standard IX- XII	35 (5.83%)	11 (1.83%)	18 (3%)	64	10.67
BA-MA	1 (0.17%)	-	1 (0.17%)	2	0.33
Total	267 (44.5%)	45 (7.5%)	288 (48%)	600	100

According to table 13.5, 130 (21.67%) of standard I-IV, 101 (16.83%) of standard V-VIII, 35 (5.83%) of standard X-XII and 1 (0.17) of BA-MA with a total of 267 (44.5%) beneficiaries say that the government employment guarantee scheme is ‘satisfactory’ and 18 (3%) of standard I-IV, 16 (2.677%) of standard V-VIII, 11 (1.83%) of standard IX-XII making a total of 45 (7.5%) beneficiaries say ‘not satisfactory’ while 125 (20.83%) of standard I-IV, 144 (24%) of standard V-VIII, 18 (3%) of standard IX-XII and 1 (0.17%) of BA-MA with a total of 288 (48%) beneficiaries find it ‘satisfactory to some extent’.

Inference: Majority beneficiaries of all the educational qualification groups have averred that MGNREGS as satisfactory to some extent.

Table : 13.6 Satisfaction as to employment guarantee scheme and occupation wise distribution of respondents

Occupation	1. Satisfactory	2. Not satisfactory	3. Satisfactory to some extent	Total	%
Skilled labourers	202 (33.67%)	10 (1.67%)	260 (43.33%)	466	77.67
Unskilled labourers	65 (10.83%)	35 (5.83%)	28 (4.67%)	134	22.33
Total	267 (44.5%)	45 (7.5%)	288 (48%)	600	100

In table 13.6, we can see that 202 (33.67%) skilled labourers and 65 (10.83%) unskilled labourers with a total of 267 (44.5%) beneficiaries say that the government employment guarantee scheme is ‘satisfactory’ and 10 (1.67%) skilled and 35 (5.83%) unskilled

workers making a total of 45 (7.5%) beneficiaries say ‘not satisfactory’ while 260 (43.33%) skilled and 28 (4.67%) unskilled making a total of 288 (48%) beneficiaries find it ‘satisfactory to some extent’.

Inference: Majority of both skilled and unskilled workers agree that the government employment guarantee scheme, MGNREGS, is satisfactory to some extent.

Table : 13.7 Satisfaction as to employment guarantee scheme and age wise distribution of respondents

Age	1. Satisfactory	2. Not satisfactory	3. Satisfactory to some extent	Total	%
20-30 years	54 (9%)	8 (1.33%)	86 (14.33%)	148	24.67
30-40 years	136 (22.67%)	17 (2.83%)	115 (19.17%)	268	44.67
40-50 years	62 (10.33%)	11 (1.83%)	54 (9%)	127	21.16
50 years and above	15 (2.5%)	9 (1.5%)	33 (5.5%)	57	9.5
Total	267 (44.5%)	45 (7.5%)	288 (48%)	600	100

In table 13.7, the data reveals that 54 (9%) from 20-30 years age group, 136 (22.67%) from 30-40 years and 62 (10.33%) from 40-50 years and 15 (2.67%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 267 (44.5%) beneficiaries say that the government employment guarantee scheme is ‘satisfactory’. 8 (1.33%) from 20-30 years age group, 17 (2.83%) from 30-40 years and 11 (1.83) from 40-50 years and 9 (1.5) from 50 years and above age group making a total of 45 (7.5%) beneficiaries say that it is ‘not satisfactory’ while 86 (14.33%) from 20-30 years age group, 115 (19.17%) from 30-40 years, 54 (9%) from 40-50 years and 23 (5.5%) from 50 years and above age group comprising a total of 288 (48%) beneficiaries say ‘satisfactory to some extent’.

Inference: Majority of beneficiaries belonging to different age groups have stated that government employment guarantee scheme, MGNREGS, is satisfactory to some extent.

Table : 13.8 Satisfaction as to employment guarantee scheme and income wise distribution of respondents

Monthly family income	1. Satisfactory	2. Not satisfactory	3. Satisfactory to some extent	Total	%
Rs 3000-4000	204 (34%)	22 (3.67%)	232 (38.67%)	458	76.33
Rs 4000-6000	54 (9%)	15 (2.5%)	47 (7.83%)	116	19.33
Rs 6000-10000	8 (1.33%)	7 (1.17%)	7 (1.17%)	22	3.67
Rs 10000 and above	1 (0.17%)	1 (0.17%)	2 (0.33%)	4	0.67
Total	267 (44.5%)	45 (7.5%)	288 (48%)	600	100

As per table 13.8, data shows that 204 (34%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 54 (9%) from Rs 4000-6000 and 8 (1.33%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 267 (44.5%) beneficiaries say that the government employment guarantee scheme is 'satisfactory'. 22 (3.67%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 15 (2.5%) from Rs 4000-6000 and 7 (1.17%) from Rs 6000-10000, 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group making a total of 45 that is 7.5% beneficiaries say that it is 'not satisfactory' while 232 (38.67%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 47 (7.83%) from Rs 4000-6000, 7 (1.17%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 2 (0.33%) from Rs 10000 and above income group totalling 288 (48%) beneficiaries say 'satisfactory to some extent'.

Inference: Majority beneficiaries from all the income group feel that MGNREGS is satisfactory to some extent.

Table: 14.1 Opinion on best information centre and sex wise distribution of respondents

Gender	1. Local market	2. Work place	3. Village community hall	4. Sports playground	Total	%
Men	219 (36.5%)	203 (33.83%)	37 (6.17%)	54 (9%)	513	85.5
Women	-	82 (13.67%)	5 (0.83%)	-	87	14.5
Total	219 (36.5%)	285 (47.5%)	42 (7%)	54 (9%)	600	100

As per table 14.1, the data reveals that 219 (36.5%) men say that their best information centre about MGNREGS is 'local market'. 203 (33.83%) men and 82 (13.67%) women with a total of 285 (47.5%) beneficiaries say the 'work place' while 37 (6.17%) men and 5 (0.83%) women making a total of 42 (7%) beneficiaries identify the 'village community hall'. 54 (9%) men say the 'sports playground' .

Inference: Majority of men have identified local market as their best information centre about MGNREGS followed by work place. But the women beneficiaries identified work place as their best information centre followed by village community hall. Overall, it is seen that the work place is the best information centre followed by local market.

Table : 14.2 Opinion on best information centre and religion wise distribution of respondents

Community	1. Local market	2. Work place	3. Village community hall	4. Sports playground	Total	%
Hindu	84 (14%)	73 (12.17%)	19 (3.17%)	18 (3%)	194	32.33
Muslim	135 (22.5%)	212 (35.33%)	23 (3.83%)	36 (6%)	406	67.67
Total	219 (36.5%)	285 (47.5%)	42 (7%)	54 (9%)	600	100

Table 14.2, shows that 84 (14%) Hindus and 135 (22.5%) Muslims with a total of 219 (36.5%) beneficiaries opine that their best information centre about MGNREGS is the ‘local market’. 73 (12.17%) Hindus and 212 (35.33%) Muslims making a total of 285 (47.5%) beneficiaries say the ‘work place’ while 19 (3.17%) Hindus and 23 (3.83%) Muslims with a total of 42 (7%) beneficiaries identify the ‘village community hall’ and 18 (3%) Hindus and 36 (6%) Muslims with a total of 54 (9 %) beneficiaries of the scheme say the ‘sports playground’.

Inference: Majority of Hindu beneficiaries identified local market as their best information centre about MGNREGS followed by the work place. But the Muslim beneficiaries have identified the work place as their best information centre followed by the local market. Together, it is seen that work place is the best information centre followed by local market.

Table : 14.3 Opinion on best information centre and language wise distribution of respondents

Mother tongue	1. Local market	2. Work place	3. Village community hall	4. Sports playground	Total	%
Bengali	219 (36.5%)	285 (47.5%)	42 (7%)	54 (9%)	600	100
Hindi	-	-	-	-	-	0
Manipuri	-	-	-	-	-	0
Total	219 (36.5%)	285 (47.5%)	42 (7%)	54 (9%)	600	100

According to table 14.3, 219 (36.5%) Bengali speaking respondents opine that their best information centre about MGNREGS is the ‘local market’. 285 (47.5%) beneficiaries say the ‘work place’ while 42 (7%) beneficiaries identify the ‘village community hall’ and 54 (9%) beneficiaries of the scheme say the ‘sports playground’.

Inference: All the beneficiaries are Bengali speaking and they have identified work place as their best information centre followed by the local market.

Table : 14.4 Opinion on best information centre and distribution of respondents according to marital status

Marital status	1. Local market	2. Work place	3. Village community hall	4. Sports playground	Total	%
Married	172 (28.67%)	271 (45.17%)	30 (5%)	10 (1.67%)	483	80.5

Unmarried	47 (7.83%)	14 (2.33%)	12 (2%)	44 (7.33%)	117	19.5
Total	219 (36.5%)	285 (47.5%)	42 (7%)	54 (9%)	600	100

In table 14.4, the data shows that 172 (28.67%) married and 47 (7.83%) unmarried with a total of 219 (36.5%) beneficiaries opine that their best information centre about MGNREGS is the 'local market'. 271 (45.17%) married and 14 (2.33%) unmarried making a total of 285 (47.5%) beneficiaries say the 'work place' while 30 (5%) married and 12 (2%) unmarried totalling 42 (7%) beneficiaries say the 'village community hall'. 10 (1.67%) married and 44 (7.33%) unmarried respondents constituting 54 (9 %) say the 'sports playground'.

Inference: Majority of married beneficiaries identified the work place as their best information centre about MGNREGS. But the unmarried beneficiaries identified the local market as their best information centre. When we take the average, it is seen that work place is the best information centre followed by the local market.

Table : 14.5 Opinion on best information centre and education wise distribution of respondents

Educational qualification	1. Local market	2. Work place	3. Village community hall	4. Sports playground	Total	%
Standard I-IV	105 (17.5%)	132 (22%)	11 (1.83%)	25 (4.17%)	273	45.5
Standard V-VIII	90 (15%)	130 (21.67%)	18 (3%)	23 (3.83%)	261	43.5
Standard IX-XII	23 (3.83%)	22 (3.67%)	13 (2.17%)	6 (1%)	64	10.67

BA-MA	1 (0.17%)	1 (0.17%)	-	-	2	0.33
Total	219 (36.5%)	285 (47.5%)	42 (7%)	54 (9%)	600	100

As per table 14.5, 105 (17.5%) of standard I-IV, 90 (15%) of standard V-VIII, 23 (3.83%) of standard X-XII and 1 (0.17%) of BA-MA, with a total of 219 (36.5%) beneficiaries say that their best information centre about MGNREGS is the 'local market'. 132 (22%) of standard I-IV, 130 (21.67%) of standard V-VIII, 22 (3.67%) of standard IX-XII and 1 (0.17%) of standard BA-MA totalling 285 (47.5%) beneficiaries say the 'work place' while 11 (1.83%) of standard I-IV, 18 (3%) of standard V-VIII, 13 (2.17%) of standard IX-XII constituting 42 (7%) beneficiaries say the 'village community hall'. 25 (4.17%) of standard I-IV, 23 (3.83%) of standard V-VIII, 6 (1%) of standard IX-XII making a total of 54 (9%) beneficiaries of the scheme point out at the 'sports playground'.

Inference: Majority of both standard I-IV and V-VIII educated beneficiaries have stated the work place as their best information centre about MGNREGS followed by the local market. In the case of standard IX-XII group, the local market, for the BA-MA group both work place and local market are equally divided. Overall, work place is considered the best information centre.

Table : 14.6 Opinion on best information centre and occupation wise distribution of respondents

Occupation	1. Local market	2. Work place	3. Village community hall	4. Sports playground	Total	%
Skilled labourers	175 (29.17%)	237 (39.5%)	20 (3.33%)	34 (5.67%)	466	77.67
Unskilled labourers	44 (7.33%)	48 (8%)	22 (3.67%)	20 (3.33%)	134	22.33

Total	219 (36.5%)	285 (47.5%)	42 (7%)	54 (9%)	600	100
-------	----------------	----------------	------------	------------	-----	-----

Table 14.6 explains that 175 (29.17%) skilled labourers, 44 (7.33%) unskilled labourers constituting 219 (36.5%) beneficiaries say that their best information centre about MGNREGS is the 'local market'. 237 (39.5%) skilled and 48 (8%) unskilled with a total of 285 (47.5%) beneficiaries say the 'work place' while 20 (3.33%) skilled and 22 (3.67%) unskilled workers making a total of 42 (7%) beneficiaries identify the 'village community hall'. 34 (5.67%) skilled and 20 (3.33%) unskilled workers comprising a total of 54 (9%) beneficiaries of the scheme say the 'sports playground'.

Inference: Majority of both unskilled and skilled labourers have identified the work place as their best information centre about MGNREGS followed by the local market.. Overall, it is seen that the work place is the best information centre.

Table : 14.7 Opinion on best information centre and age wise distribution of respondents

Age	1. Local market	2. Work place	3. Village community hall	4. Sports playground	Total	%
20-30 years	79 (13.17%)	43 (7.17%)	4 (0.67%)	22 (3.67%)	148	24.67
30-40 years	85 (14.17%)	158 (26.33%)	7 (1.17%)	18 (3%)	268	44.67
40-50 years	40 (6.67%)	70 (11.67%)	11 (1.83%)	6 (1%)	127	21.16
50 years and above	15 (2.5%)	14 (2.33%)	20 (3.33%)	8 (1.33%)	57	9.5
Total	219 (36.5%)	285 (47.5%)	42 (7%)	54 (9%)	600	100

As per table 14.7, 79 (13.17%) from 20-30 years age group, 85 (14.17%) from 30-40 years and 40 (6.67%) from 40-50 years, 15 (2.5%) from 50 years and above age group totalling 219 (36.5%) beneficiaries say that their best information centre about MGNREGS is the 'local market'. 43 (7.17%) from 20-30 years age group, 158 (26.33%) from 30-40 years, 70 (11.67%) from 40-50 years and 14 (2.33%) from 50 years and above age group constituting 285 (47.5%) beneficiaries say the 'work place' while 4 (0.67%) from 20-30 years age group and 7 (1.17%) from 30-40 years, 11 (1.83%) from 40-50 years, 20 (3.33%) from 50 years and above age group making a total of 42 (7%) beneficiaries identify the 'village community hall'. 22 (3.67%) from 20-30 years, 18 (3%) from 30-40 years, 6 (1%) from 40-50 years and 8 (1.33%) from 50 years and above age group comprising a total of 54 (9%) beneficiaries of the scheme state the 'sports playground'

Inference: Majority of 20-30 years age group beneficiaries have identified the local market as their best information centre about MGNREGS. In the case of 30-40 years and 40-50 years age group, the work place is identified. In the case of 50 years and above age group, the village community hall is considered. Overall, it is seen that the work place is the best information centre.

Table : 14.8 Opinion on best information centre and income wise distribution of respondents

Monthly family income	1. Local market	2. Work place	3. Village community hall	4. Sports playground	Total	%
Rs 3000-4000	181 (30.17%)	235 (39.17%)	21 (3.5%)	21 (3.5%)	458	76.33
Rs 4000-6000	25 (4.17%)	46 (7.67%)	15 (2.5%)	30 (5%)	116	19.33
Rs 6000-10000	11 (1.83%)	4 (0.67%)	5 (0.83%)	2 (0.33%)	22	3.67

Rs 10000 and above	2 (0.33%)	-	1 (0.17%)	1 (0.17%)	4	0.67
Total	219 (36.5%)	285 (47.5%)	42 (7%)	54 (9%)	600	100

According to table 14.8, 181 (30.17%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 25 (4.17%) from Rs 4000-6000 and 11 (1.83%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 2 (0.33%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 219 (36.5%) beneficiaries state that their best information centre about MGNREGS is the 'local market'. 235 (39.17%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 46 (7.67%) from Rs 4000-6000, 4 (0.67%) from Rs 6000-10000 income group making a total of 285 (47.5%) beneficiaries say the 'work place' while 21 (3.5%) from Rs 3000-4000 and 15 (2.5%) from Rs 4000-6000, 5 (0.83%) from Rs 6000-10000, 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group comprising a total of 42 (7%) beneficiaries state the 'village community hall'. 21 (3.5%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 30 (5%) from Rs 4000-6000, 2 (0.33%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 54 (9 %) beneficiaries of the scheme point out at 'sports playground'.

Inference: Majority of Rs 3000-4000 income group beneficiaries have identified the work place as their best information centre about MGNREGS. In the case of Rs 4000-6000 income group, the work place is identified. In the case of both Rs 6000-10000 and Rs 10000 and above income groups, the local market is preferred. Overall, the work place is considered the best information centre followed by the local market.

Table : 15.1 Factor responsible for delayed development and distribution of respondents sex wise

Gender	1. Corruption	2. Delay in government communication	3. Manual labour	4. Insufficient fund	Total	%
Men	328 (54.67%)	173 (28.83%)	-	12 (2%)	513	85.5
Women	70 (11.67%)	17 (2.83%)	-	-	87	14.5
Total	398 (66.33%)	190 (31.67%)	-	12 (2%)	600	100

As per table 15.1, the data explains that 328 (54.67%) men and 70 (11.67%) women totalling 398 (66.33%) beneficiaries state that ‘corruption’ is the main factor for not sustaining development through MGNREGS. 173 (28.83%) men and 17 (2.83%) women constituting 190 (31.67%) beneficiaries identify ‘delay in government communication’ while 12 (2%) men beneficiaries say ‘insufficient fund’.

Inference: Majority of men and women beneficiaries have identified corruption as the main factor responsible for not sustaining development through MGNREGS. It is followed by delay in government communication. Overall, corruption is the main factor for not sustaining development.

Table : 15.2 Factor responsible for delayed development and distribution of respondents religion wise

Community	1. Corruption	2. Delay in government communication	3. Manual labour	4. Insufficient fund	Total	%
Hindu	129 (21.5%)	60 (10%)	-	5 (0.83%)	194	32.33
Muslim	269 (44.83%)	130 (21.67%)	-	7 (1.17%)	406	67.67
Total	398 (66.33%)	190 (31.67%)	-	12 (2%)	600	100

Table 15.2 reveals that 129 (21.5%) Hindus and 269 (44.83%) Muslims comprising a total of 398 (66.33%) beneficiaries state that ‘corruption’ is the main factor responsible for not sustaining development through MGNREGS. 60 (10%) Hindus and 130 (21.67%) Muslims with a total of 190 (31.67%) beneficiaries say ‘delay in government communication’ while 5 (0.83%) Hindus and 7 (1.17%) Muslims totalling 12 (2%) beneficiaries identify ‘insufficient fund’

Inference: Majority of both Hindu and Muslim beneficiaries have identified corruption as the main factor responsible for not sustaining development through MGNREGS. It is followed by delay in government communication. Overall, corruption is the factor responsible for not sustaining development.

Table : 15.3 Factor responsible for delayed development and distribution of respondents language wise

Mother tongue	1. Corruption	2. Delay in government communication	3. Manual labour	4. Insufficient fund	Total	%
Bengali	398 (66.33%)	190 (31.67%)	-	12 (2%)	600	100
Hindi	-	-	-	-	-	0
Manipuri	-	-	-	-	-	0
Total	398 (66.33%)	190 (31.67%)	-	12 (2%)	600	100

Table 15.3 explains that 398 (66.33%) Bengali speaking beneficiaries state that ‘corruption’ is the main factor responsible for not sustaining development through MGNREGS. While 190 (31.67%) beneficiaries say that ‘delay in government communication’ while 12 (2%) beneficiaries state ‘insufficient fund’ as a factor.

Inference: All the beneficiaries are Bengali speaking and they have identified corruption as the main factor responsible for not sustaining development through MGNREGS, followed by delay in government communication. Thus, corruption is considered as the main factor responsible for not sustaining development.

Table: 15.4 Factor responsible for delayed development and distribution of respondents according to marital status

Marital status	1. Corruption	2. Delay in government communication	3. Manual labour	4. Insufficient fund	Total	%
Married	324 (54%)	152 (25.33%)	-	7 (1.17%)	483	80.5

Unmarried	74 (12.33%)	38 (6.33%)	-	5 (0.83%)	117	19.5
Total	398 (66.33%)	190 (31.67%)	-	12 (2%)	600	100

As per table 15.4, the data shows that 324 (54%) married and 74 (12.33%) unmarried making a total of 398 (66.33%) beneficiaries consider 'corruption' as the main factor responsible for not sustaining development through MGNREGS. 152 (25.33%) married and 38 (6.33%) unmarried with a total of 190 (31.67%) say 'delay in government communication' while 7 (1.17%) married and 5 (0.83%) unmarried respondents with a total of 12 (2%) point out 'insufficient fund'.

Inference: Majority of both married and unmarried beneficiaries have identified corruption as the main factor responsible for not sustaining development through MGNREGS.

Table : 15.5 Factor responsible for delayed development and distribution of respondents according to education

Educational qualification	1. Corruption	2. Delay in government communication	3. Manual labour	4. Insufficient fund	Total	%
Standard I-IV	198 (33%)	73 (12.17%)	-	2 (0.33%)	273	45.5
Standard V-VIII	174 (29%)	80 (13.33%)	-	7 (1.17%)	261	43.5
Standard IX-XII	25 (4.17%)	36 (6%)	-	3 (0.5%)	64	10.67
BA-MA	1 (0.17%)	1 (0.17%)	-	-	2	0.33
Total	398 (66.33%)	190 (31.67%)	-	12 (2%)	600	100

Table 15.5 shows that 198 (33%) of standard I-IV and 174 (29%) of standard V-VIII, 25 (4.17%) of standard X-XII and 1 (0.17%) of BA-MA, totalling 398 (66.33%) beneficiaries consider ‘corruption’ as the main factor responsible for not sustaining development through MGNREGS. 73 (12.17%) of standard I-IV, 80 (13.33%) of standard V-VIII, 36 (6%) of standard IX-XII and 1 (0.17%) of BA-MA with a total of 190 (31.67%) beneficiaries say ‘delay in government communication’ while 2 (0.33%) of standard I-IV, 7 (1.17%) of standard V-VIII, and 3 (0.5%) of standard IX-XII constituting a total of 12 (2%) beneficiaries opine ‘insufficient fund’.

Inference: Majority of standard I-IV and V-VIII educated group beneficiaries have identified corruption as the main factor for not sustaining development through MGNREGS, followed by delay in government communication. In the case of standard IX-XII group, delay in government communication is followed by corruption and in BA-MA group both delay in government communication and corruption are identified. Thus, corruption is considered as responsible for not sustaining development.

Table : 15.6 Factor responsible for delayed development and occupation wise distribution of respondents

Occupation	1. Corruption	2. Delay in government communication	3. Manual labour	4. Insufficient fund	Total	%
Skilled labourers	310 (51.67%)	151 (25.17%)	-	5 (0.83%)	466	77.67
Unskilled labourers	88 (14.67%)	39 (6.5%)	-	7 (1.17%)	134	22.33
Total	398 (66.33%)	190 (31.67%)	-	12 (2%)	600	100

According to table 15.6, 310 (51.67%) skilled labourers and 88 (14.67%) unskilled labourers constituting a total of 398 (66.33%) beneficiaries consider ‘corruption’ as the main factor for not sustaining development through MGNREGS. 151 (25.17%) skilled and

39 (6.5%) unskilled labourers with a total of 190 (31.67%) say 'delay in government communication' while 5 (0.83%) skilled and 7 (1.17%) unskilled workers making a total of 12 (2%) feel 'insufficient fund'.

Inference: Majority of both skilled and unskilled labourers have identified corruption as the main factor for not sustaining development through MGNREGS followed by delay in government communication. Thus, it is seen that corruption is considered responsible for not sustaining development.

Table : 15.7 Factor responsible for delayed development and age wise distribution of respondents

Age	1. Corruption	2. Delay in government communication	3. Manual labour	4. Insufficient fund	Total	%
20-30 years	104 (17.33%)	44 (7.33%)	-	-	148	24.67
30-40 years	214 (35.67%)	50 (8.33%)	-	4 (0.67%)	268	44.67
40-50 years	56 (9.33%)	68 (11.33%)	-	3 (0.5%)	127	21.16
50 years and above	24 (4%)	28 (4.67%)	-	5 (0.83%)	57	9.5
Total	398 (66.33%)	190 (31.67%)	-	12 (2%)	600	100

As per table 15.7, 104 (17.33%) from 20-30 years age group and 214 (35.67%) from 30-40 years, 56 (9.33%) from 40-50 years and 24 (4%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 398 (66.33%) beneficiaries consider 'corruption' as the main factor for not sustaining development through MGNREGS. 44 (7.33%) from 20-30 years age group, 50

(8.33%) from 30-40 years and 68 (11.33%) from 40-50 years, 28 (4.67%) from 50 years and above age group, making a total of 190 (31.67%) beneficiaries say ‘delay in government communication’ while 4 (0.67%) from 30-40 years, 3 (0.5%) from 40-50 years, 5 (0.83%) from 50 years and above age group constituting a total of 12 (2%) beneficiaries point out ‘insufficient fund’.

Inference: Majority of 20-30 years and 30-40 years age group beneficiaries have identified corruption as the main factor for not sustaining development through MGNREGS. In the case of 40-50 years and 50 years and above age groups, delay in government communication is followed by corruption. In fine, it is corruption which is an obstacle for development.

Table : 15.8 Factor responsible for delayed development and income wise distribution of respondents

Monthly family income	1. Corruption	2. Delay in government communication	3. Manual labour	4. Insufficient fund	Total	%
Rs 3000-4000	323 (49.33%)	128 (21.33%)	-	7 (1.17%)	458	76.33
Rs 4000-6000	60 (10%)	52 (8.67%)	-	4 (0.67%)	116	19.33
Rs 6000-10000	12 (2%)	9 (1.5%)	-	1 (0.17%)	22	3.67
Rs 10000 and above	3 (0.5%)	1 (0.17%)	-	-	4	0.67
Total	398 (66.33%)	190 (31.67%)	-	12 (2%)	600	100

Table 15.8 explains that 323 (49.33%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 60 (10%) from Rs 4000-6000, 12 (2%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 3 (0.5%) from Rs 10000 and above income group comprising a total of 398 (66.33%) beneficiaries consider ‘corruption’ as the

main factor for not sustaining development through MGNREGS. 128 (21.33%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 52 (8.67%) from Rs 4000-6000, 9 (1.5%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 190 (31.67%) beneficiaries say ‘delay in government communication’ while 7 (1.17%) from Rs 3000-4000, 4 (0.67%) from Rs 4000-6000, 1 (0.17%) from Rs 6000-10000 income group making a total of 12 (2%) beneficiaries point out ‘insufficient fund’.

Inference: Majority of beneficiaries from all the income group have identified corruption as the main responsible factor for not sustaining development through MGNREGS, followed by delay in government communication.

Table : 16.1 Main obstacle of the project and sex wise distribution of respondents

Gender	1. Communication gap	2. Misuse of funds	3. Inefficient political leaders & govt. officials	4. All of the above	Total	%
Men	89 (14.83%)	210 (35%)	64 (10.67%)	150 (25%)	513	85.5
Women	19 (3.17%)	32 (5.33%)	14 (2.33%)	22 (3.67%)	87	14.5
Total	108 (18%)	242 (40.33%)	78 (13%)	172 (28.67%)	600	100

The above table reveals that 89 (14.83%) men and 19 (3.17%) women with a total of 108 (18%) beneficiaries feel that ‘communication gap’ is the main obstacle for implementing the project. 210 (35%) men and 32 (5.33%) women comprising a total of 242 (40.33%) beneficiaries identify ‘misuse of funds’ while 64 (10.67%) men and 14(2.33%) women with a total of 78 (13%) beneficiaries identify ‘inefficient political leaders and government officials’. 150 (25%) men and 22 (3.67%) women forming a total of 172 (28.67%) beneficiaries say ‘all of the above’

Inference: Majority of both men and women beneficiaries have identified misuse of funds as the main obstacle for implementing the project.

Table : 16.2 Main obstacle of the project and religion wise distribution of respondents

Community	1. Communication gap	2. Misuse of funds	3. Inefficient political leaders & govt. officials	4. All of the above	Total	%
Hindu	22 (3.67%)	98 (16.33%)	20 (3.33%)	54 (9%)	194	32.33
Muslim	86 (14.33%)	144 (24%)	58 (9.67%)	118 (19.67%)	406	67.67
Total	108 (18%)	242 (40.33%)	78 (13%)	172 (28.67%)	600	100

As per table 16.2 22 (3.67%) Hindus and 86 (14.33%) Muslims totalling 108 (18%) beneficiaries feel that ‘communication gap’ is the main obstacle for implementing the project. 98 (16.33%) Hindus and 144 (24%) Muslims with a total of 242 (40.33%) beneficiaries identify ‘misuse of funds’ while 20 (3.33%) Hindus and 58 (9.67%) Muslims making a total of 78 (13%) beneficiaries identify ‘inefficient political leaders and government officials’. 54 (9%) Hindus and 118 (19.67%) Muslims comprising a total of 172 (28.67%) beneficiaries of the scheme identify ‘all of the above’.

Inference: Majority of both Hindu and Muslim beneficiaries have identified misuse of funds as the main obstacle for implementing the project.

Table : 16.3 Main obstacle of the project and distribution of respondents language wise

Mother tongue	1. Communication gap	2. Misuse of funds	3. Inefficient political leaders & govt. officials	4. All of the above	Total	%
Bengali	108 (18%)	242 (40.33%)	78 (13%)	172 (28.67%)	600	100
Hindi	-	-	-	-	-	0
Manipuri	-	-	-	-	-	0
Total	108 (18%)	242 (40.33%)	78 (13%)	172 (28.67%)	600	100

According to table 16.3, 108 (18%) Bengali speaking beneficiaries feel that ‘communication gap’ is the main obstacle for implementing the project. 242 (40.33%) beneficiaries identify ‘misuse of funds’ while 78 (13%) beneficiaries identify ‘inefficient political leaders and government officials’ and 172 (28.67%) beneficiaries of the scheme identify ‘all of the above’.

Inference: Most respondents have identified misuse of funds as the main obstacle for implementing the project followed by all the factors mentioned.

Table : 16.4 Main obstacle of the project and distribution of respondents according to marital status

Marital status	1. Communication gap	2. Misuse of funds	3. Inefficient political leaders & govt. officials	4. All of the above	Total	%
Married	77 (12.83%)	204 (34%)	55 (9.17%)	147 (24.5%)	483	80.5
Unmarried	31 (5.17%)	38 (6.33%)	23 (3.83%)	25 (4.17%)	117	19.5
Total	108 (18%)	242 (40.33%)	78 (13%)	172 (28.67%)	600	100

Table 16.4 reveals that 77 (12.83%) married and 31 (5.17%) unmarried comprising a total of 108 (18%) beneficiaries feel that ‘communication gap’ is the main obstacle for implementing the project. 204 (34%) married and 38 (6.33%) unmarried with a total of 242 (40.33%) beneficiaries identify ‘misuse of funds’ while 55 (9.17%) married and 23 (3.83%) unmarried making a total of 78 (13%) beneficiaries identify ‘inefficient political leaders and government officials’. 147 (24.5%) married and 25 (4.17%) unmarried with a total of 172 (28.67%) beneficiaries of the scheme identify ‘all of the above’.

Inference: Majority of both married and unmarried beneficiaries have felt that misuse of funds as the main obstacle in implementing the project.

Table : 16.5 Main obstacle of the project and education wise distribution of respondents

Educational qualification	1. Communication gap	2. Misuse of funds	3. Inefficient political leaders & govt. officials	4. All of the above	Total	%
Standard I-IV	33 (5.5%)	119 (19.83%)	46 (7.67%)	75 (12.5%)	273	45.5
Standard V-VIII	54 (9%)	102 (17%)	22 (3.67%)	83 (13.83%)	261	43.5
Standard IX-XII	21 (3.5%)	20 (3.33%)	10 (1.67%)	13 (2.17%)	64	10.67
BA-MA	-	1 (0.17%)	-	1 (0.17%)	2	0.33
Total	108 (18%)	242 (40.33%)	78 (13%)	172 (28.67%)	600	100

According to table 16.5, 33 (5.5%) of standard I-IV, 54 (9%) of standard V-VIII and 21 (3.5%) of standard X-XII making a total of 108 (18%) beneficiaries say that ‘communication gap’ is the main obstacle for implementing the project. 119 (19.83%) of standard I-IV and 102 (17%) of standard V-VIII, 20 (3.33%) of standard IX-XII and 1 (0.17%) of BA-MA with a total of 242 (40.33%) beneficiaries identify ‘misuse of funds’ while 46 (7.67%) of standard I-IV, 22 (3.67%) of standard V-VIII, 10 (1.67%) of standard IX-XII making a total of 78 (13%) beneficiaries identify ‘inefficient political leaders and government officials’ are an obstacle and 75 (12.5%) of standard I-IV, 83 (13.83%) of standard V-VIII, 13 (2.17%) of standard IX-XII and 1 (0.17%) of BA-MA constituting a total of 172 (28.67%) beneficiaries of the scheme identify ‘all of the above’.

Inference: Majority of all the educational groups have pointed out misuse of funds as the main obstacle for implementing the project.

Table : 16.6 Main obstacle of the project and distribution of respondents occupation wise

Occupation	1. Communication gap	2. Misuse of funds	3. Inefficient political leaders & govt. officials	4. All of the above	Total	%
Skilled labourers	96 (16%)	203 (33.83%)	48 (8%)	11 (19.83%)	466	77.67
Unskilled labourers	12 (2%)	39 (6.5%)	30 (5%)	53 (8.83%)	134	22.33
Total	108 (18%)	242 (40.33%)	78 (13%)	172 (28.67%)	600	100

As per table 16.6, the data shows that 96 (16%) skilled labourers and 12 (2%) unskilled labourers forming a total of 108 (18%) beneficiaries say that ‘communication gap’ is the main obstacle for implementing the project. 203 (33.83%) skilled and 39 (6.5%) unskilled workers making a total of 242 (40.33%) beneficiaries identify ‘misuse of funds’ while 48 (8%) skilled and 30 (5%) unskilled workers totalling 78 (13%) say ‘inefficient political leaders and government officials’ are an obstacle, 119 (19.83%) skilled and 53 (8.83%) unskilled respondents with a total of 172 (28.67%) beneficiaries of the scheme identify ‘all of the above’.

Inference: Majority of both skilled and unskilled labourers have pointed out misuse of funds as the main obstacle for implementing the project.

Table : 16.7 Main obstacle of the project and age wise distribution of respondents

Age	1. Communication gap	2. Misuse of funds	3. Inefficient political leaders & govt. officials	4. All of the above	Total	%
20-30 years	27 (4.5%)	40 (6.67%)	25 (4.17%)	56 (9.33%)	148	24.67
30-40 years	50 (8.33%)	7 (21.17%)	27 (4.5%)	64 10.67%)	268	44.67
40-50 years	18 (3%)	58 (9.67%)	14 (2.33%)	37 (6.17%)	127	21.16
50 years and above	13 (2.17%)	17 (2.83%)	12 (2%)	15 (2.5%)	57	9.5
Total	108 (18%)	242 (40.33%)	78 (13%)	172 (28.67%)	600	100

Table 16.7 shows that 27 (4.5%) from 20-30 years age group, 50 (8.33%) from 30-40 years and 18 (3%) from 40-50 years and 13 (2.17%) from 50 years and above age group comprising a total of 108 (18%) beneficiaries say that ‘communication gap’ is the main obstacle for implementing the project. 40 (6.67%) from 20-30 years age group, 127 (21.17%) from 30-40 years, 58 (9.67%) from 40-50 years, 17 (2.83%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 242 (40.33%) beneficiaries identify ‘misuse of funds’ while 25 (4.17%) from 20-30 years age group and 27 (4.5%) from 30-40 years, 14 (2.33%) from 40-50 years and 12 (2%) from 50 years and above age group totalling 78 (13%) beneficiaries identify ‘inefficient political leaders and government officials’. 56 (9.33%) from 20-30, 64 (10.67%) from 30-40 years, 37 (6.17%) from 40-50 years, 15 (2.5%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 172 (28.67%) beneficiaries of the scheme identify ‘all of the above’.

Inference: Majority of beneficiaries from all the age groups have identified misuse of funds as the main obstacle for implementing the project.

Table : 16.8 Main obstacle of the project and distribution of respondents income wise

Monthly family income	1. Communication gap	2. Misuse of funds	3. Inefficient political leaders & govt. officials	4. All of the above	Total	%
Rs 3000-4000	75 (12.5%)	204 (34%)	49 (8.17%)	130 (21.67%)	458	76.33
Rs 4000-6000	28 (4.67%)	29 (4.83%)	24 (4%)	35 (5.83%)	116	19.33
Rs 6000-10000	4 (0.67%)	7 (1.17%)	5 (0.83%)	6 (1%)	22	3.67
Rs 10000 and above	1 (0.17%)	2 (0.33%)	-	1 (0.17%)	4	0.67
Total	108 (18%)	242 (40.33%)	78 (13%)	172 (28.67%)	600	100

The above table reveals that 75 (12.5%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group and 28 (4.67%) from Rs 4000-6000, 4 (0.67%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group with a total of 108 (18%) beneficiaries say that ‘communication gap’ is the main obstacle for implementing the project. 204 (34%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group and 29 (4.83%) from Rs 4000-6000, 7 (1.17 %) from Rs 6000-10000 and 2 (0.33%) from Rs 10000 and above income group totalling 242 (40.33%) beneficiaries identify ‘misuse of funds’ while 49 (8.17%) from Rs 3000-4000, 24 (4%) from Rs 4000-60000, 5 (0.83%) from Rs 6000-10000 income group making a total of 78 (13%) beneficiaries identify ‘inefficient political leaders and government officials’. 130 (21.67%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 35 (5.83%) from Rs 4000-6000, 6 (1%) from Rs 6000-10000

and 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group constituting a total of 172 (28.67%) beneficiaries of the scheme identify 'all of the above'.

Inference: Majority from different income groups have identified misuse of funds as the main obstacle for implementing the project.

Table : 17.1 Opinion on development and communication: Sex wise distribution of respondents

Gender	1. Closely related with the proper communication techniques	2. Not closely related	3. Partially related	4. Can't say	Total	%
Men	130 (21.67%)	86 (14.33%)	194 (32.33%)	103 (17.17%)	513	85.5
Women	20 (3.33%)	12 (2%)	18 (3%)	37 (6.17%)	87	14.5
Total	150 (25%)	98 (16.33%)	212 (35.33%)	140 (23.33%)	600	100

According to table 17.1, 130 (21.67%) men and 20 (3.33%) women making a total of 150 (25%) beneficiaries agree that development is 'closely related with the proper communication techniques' of a particular governmental organization. 86 (14.33%) men and 12 (2%) women totalling 98 (16.33%) beneficiaries say 'not closely related' while 194 (32.33%) men and 18 (3%) women with a total of 212 (35.33%) beneficiaries opine 'partially related' and 103 (17.17%) men and 37 (6.17%) women constituting a total of 140 (23.33%) cannot say anything

Inference: Majority of men have stated that development is partially related with the proper communication techniques of a particular governmental organization. In the case of women, majority of them cannot say anything. On the whole, majority of the respondents say that development is partially related with the proper communication techniques.

Table : 17.2 Opinion on development and communication: Religion wise distribution of respondents

Community	1. Closely related with the proper communication techniques	2. Not closely related	3. Partially related	4. Can't say	Total	%
Hindu	47 (7.83%)	23 (3.83%)	64 (10.67%)	60 (10%)	194	32.33
Muslim	103 (17.17%)	75 (12.5%)	148 (24.67%)	80 (13.33%)	406	67.67
Total	150 (25%)	98 (16.33%)	212 (35.33%)	140 (23.33%)	600	100

In table 17.2, the data reveals that 47 (7.83%) Hindus and 103 (17.17%) Muslims with a total of 150 (25%) beneficiaries agree that development is 'closely related with the proper communication techniques' of a particular governmental organization, 23 (3.83%) Hindus and 75 (12.5%) Muslims making a total of 98 (16.33%) beneficiaries say 'not closely related' while 64 (10.67%) Hindus and 148 (24.67%) Muslims making a total of 212 (35.33%) beneficiaries opine 'partially related'. 60 (10%) Hindus and 80 (13.33%) Muslims with a total of 140 (23.33%) beneficiaries of the scheme cannot say anything.

Inference: Majority of the Hindu and Muslim beneficiaries have pointed out that development is partially related with the proper communication techniques of a particular governmental organization.

Table : 17.3 Opinion on development and communication: Language wise distribution of respondents

Mother tongue	1. Closely related with the proper communication techniques	2. Not closely related	3. Partially related	4. Can't say	Total	%
Bengali	150 (25%)	98 (16.33%)	212 (35.33%)	140 (23.33%)	600	100
Hindi	-	-	-	-	-	0
Manipuri	-	-	-	-	-	0
Total	150 (25%)	98 (16.33%)	212 (35.33%)	140 (23.33%)	600	100

According to table 3, 150 (25%) Bengali speaking beneficiaries agree that development is ‘closely related with the proper communication techniques’ of a particular governmental organization and 98 (16.33%) beneficiaries say ‘not closely related’ while 212 (35.33%) beneficiaries opine ‘partially related’. 140 (23.33%) beneficiaries of the scheme cannot say anything.

Inference: All the beneficiaries are Bengali speaking and they have expressed that development is partially related with the proper communication techniques of a particular governmental organization.

Table: 17.4 Opinion on development and communication: Distribution of respondents according to marital status

Marital status	1. Closely related with the proper communication techniques	2. Not closely related	3. Partially related	4. Can't say	Total	%
Married	116 (19.33%)	80 (13.33%)	190 (31.67%)	97 (16.17%)	483	80.5
Unmarried	34 (5.67%)	18 (3%)	22 (3.67%)	43 (7.17%)	117	19.5
Total	150 (25%)	98 (16.33%)	212 (35.33%)	140 (23.33%)	600	100

From table 17.4, we can find that 116 (19.33%) married and 34 (5.67%) unmarried comprising a total of 150 (25%) beneficiaries agree that development is ‘closely related with the proper communication techniques’ of a particular governmental organization. 80 (13.33%) married and 18 (3%) unmarried respondents making a total of 98 (16.33%) feel ‘not closely related’ while 190 (31.67%) married and 22 (3.67%) unmarried respondents with a total of 212 (35.33%) beneficiaries opine ‘partially related’. 97 (16.17%) married and 43 (7.17%) unmarried beneficiaries with a total of 140 (23.33%) beneficiaries of the scheme cannot say anything.

Inference: Majority of the married beneficiaries have expressed their view that development is partially related to the proper communication techniques of a particular governmental organization. In the case of unmarried respondents, many of them are unaware anything related. On the whole, majority of respondents say that development is partially related with the proper communication techniques.

Table : 17.5 Opinion on development and communication: Education wise distribution of respondents

Educational qualification	1. Closely related with the proper communication techniques	2. Not closely related	3. Partially related	4. Can't say	Total	%
Standard I-IV	47 (7.83%)	36 (6%)	118 (19.67%)	72 (12%)	273	45.5
Standard V-VIII	80 (13.33%)	50 (8.33%)	74 (12.33%)	57 (9.5%)	261	43.5
Standard IX-XII	22 (3.67%)	12 (2%)	19 (3.17%)	11 (1.83%)	64	10.67
BA-MA	1 (0.17%)	-	1 (0.17%)	-	2	0.33
Total	150 (25%)	98 (16.33%)	212 (35.33%)	140 (23.33%)	600	100

In table 17.5, the data reveals that 47 (7.83%) of standard I-IV, 80 (13.33%) of standard V-VIII and 22 (3.67%) of standard X-XII and 1 (0.17%) of BA-MA totalling 150 (25%) beneficiaries agree that development is 'closely related with the proper communication techniques' of a particular governmental organization. 36 (6%) of standard I-IV and 50 (8.33%) of standard V-VIII, 12 (2%) of standard IX-XII with a total of 98 (16.33%) beneficiaries feel 'not closely related' while 118 (19.67%) of standard I-IV and 74 (12.33%) of standard V-VIII, 19 (3.17%) of standard IX-XII and 1 (0.17%) of BA-MA making a total of 212 (35.33%) beneficiaries opine 'partially related'. 72 (12%) of standard I-IV and 57 (9.5%) of standard V-VIII, 11 (1.83%) of standard IX-XII forming a total of 140 (23.33%) beneficiaries of the scheme cannot say anything on this.

Inference: By and large, majority of the respondents belonging to different groups of educational qualification say that development is partially related with the proper communication techniques.

Table : 17.6 Opinion on development and communication: Occupation wise distribution of respondents

Occupation	1. Closely related with the proper communication techniques	2. Not closely related	3. Partially related	4. Can't say	Total	%
Skilled labourers	112 (18.67%)	83 (13.83%)	178 (29.67%)	93 (15.5%)	466	77.67
Unskilled labourers	38 (6.33%)	15 (2.5%)	34 (5.83%)	47 (7.83%)	134	22.33
Total	150 (25%)	98 (16.33%)	212 (35.33%)	140 (23.33%)	600	100

As per table 17.6, 112 (18.67%) skilled labourers and 38 (6.33%) unskilled labourers making a total of 150 (25%) beneficiaries agree that development is 'closely related with the proper communication techniques' of a particular governmental organization. 83 (13.83%) skilled and 15 (2.5%) unskilled respondents with a total of 98 (16.33%) beneficiaries say 'not closely related' while 178 (29.67%) skilled and 34 (5.83%) unskilled workers with a total of 212 (35.33%) beneficiaries opine 'partially related'. 93 (15.5%) skilled and 47 (7.83%) unskilled comprising a total of 140 (23.33%) beneficiaries of the scheme cannot say anything on this count.

Inference: Majority of the skilled labourers beneficiaries have expressed that development is partially related with the proper communication techniques of a particular governmental organization. In the case of unskilled labourers, majority of them are unaware anything.

Together, the majority of the respondents say that development is partially related with the proper communication techniques.

Table : 17.7 Opinion on development and communication: Age wise distribution of respondents

Age	1. Closely related with the proper communication techniques	2. Not closely related	3. Partially related	4. Can't say	Total	%
20-30 years	27 (4.5%)	16 (2.67%)	67 (11.17%)	38 (6.33%)	148	24.67
30-40 years	72 (12%)	35 (5.83%)	102 (17%)	59 (9.83%)	268	44.67
40-50 years	36 (6%)	32 (5.33%)	24 (4%)	35 (5.83)	127	21.16
50 years and above	15 (2.5%)	15 (2.5%)	29 (4.83%)	8 (1.33%)	57	9.5
Total	150 (25%)	98 (16.33%)	212 (35.33%)	140 (23.33%)	600	100

From table 17.7, we can find that 27 (4.5%) from 20-30 years age group and 72 (12%) from 30-40 years, 36 (5.83%) from 40-50 years and 15 (2.5%) from 50 years and above age group constituting a total of 150 (25%) beneficiaries feel that development is 'closely related with the proper communication techniques' of a particular governmental organization. 16 (2.67%) from 20-30 years age group, 35 (5.83%) from 30-40 years, 32 (5.33%) from 40-50 years and 15 (2.5%) from 50 years and above age group making a

total of 98 (16.33%) beneficiaries say ‘not closely related’ while 67 (11.17%) from 20-30 years age group and 102 (17%) from 30-40 years, 24 (4%) from 40-50 years and 29 (4.83%) from 50 years and above age group comprising a total of 212 (35.33%) beneficiaries say ‘partially related’. 38 (6.33%) from 20-30 years, 59 (9.83%) from 30-40 years, 35 (5.83%) from 40-50 years and 8 (1.33%) from 50 years and above age group with a total of 140 (23.33 %) beneficiaries of the scheme cannot say anything on this.

Inference: In fine, majority of the respondents say that development is partially related with the proper communication techniques.

Table : 17.8 Opinion on development and communication: Income wise distribution of respondents

Monthly family income	1. Closely related with the proper communication techniques	2. Not closely related	3. Partially related	4. Can't say	Total	%
Rs 3000-4000	105 (17.5%)	53 (8.83%)	177 (29.5%)	123 (20.5%)	458	76.33
Rs 4000-6000	39 (6.5%)	40 (6.67%)	25 (4.17%)	12 (2%)	116	19.33
Rs 6000-10000	5 (0.83%)	4 (0.67%)	8 (1.33%)	5 (0.83%)	22	3.67
Rs 10000 and above	1 (0.17%)	1 (0.17%)	2 (0.33%)	-	4	0.67
Total	150 (25%)	98 (16.33%)	212 (35.33%)	140 (23.33%)	600	100

Table 17.8 shows that 105 (17.5%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group and 39 (6.5%) from Rs 4000-6000, 5 (0.83%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group constituting a total of 150 (25%) beneficiaries feel that development is 'closely related with the proper communication techniques' of a particular governmental organization. 53 (8.83%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group, 40 (6.67%) from Rs 4000-6000 and 4 (0.67%) from Rs 6000-10000, 1 (0.17%) from Rs 10000 and above income group making a total of 98 (16.33%) beneficiaries say 'not closely related' while 177 (29.5%) from Rs 3000-4000 and 25 (4.17%) from Rs 4000-60000, 8 (1.33%) from Rs 6000-10000 and 2 (0.33%) from Rs 10000 and above income group making a total of 212 (35.33%) beneficiaries say 'partially related'. 123 (20.5%) from Rs 3000-4000 income group and 12 (2%) from Rs 4000-6000, 5 (0.83%) from Rs 6000-10000 income group with a total of 140 (23.33%) beneficiaries of the scheme cannot say anything on this count.

Inference: On the whole, majority of the respondents belonging to various income groups say that development is partially related with the proper communication techniques.