

Psychological Characteristics and Communication behavior MNREGA beneficiaries women and non-beneficiaries women in Faizabad District

¹Sadhana Gupta, R.R Yadav¹, ²Subodh Kumar, and ³Manoj Kumar

¹Home Science Extension and Communication Management N.D.U.A &T., Narendra Nagar (Kumarganj), Faizabad (U.P.)- 224229

²Collage of Vat nary Science, N.D.U.A.T Kumarganj Fizabad U.P (224229)

³Department of Extension Education, College of Agriculture, N.D.U.A &T., Narendra Nagar (Kumarganj), Faizabad

⁴Department of Agricultural Extension, College of Agriculture, SVPA&T, Modipuram Meerut (U.P) 250110 (U.P.)- 224229

ABSTRACT

The study was conducted in purposely selected Milkipur block of Faizabad district (U.P.) selected purposively. A total number of 120 respondent i.e. 60 beneficiaries women & 60 non-beneficiaries women were selected through random sampling. Finding that Contact of beneficiaries women was maximum with Gram pradhan (2.23). In case of informal sources, maximum contact of beneficiaries women was seen with family members (3.18). In case of mass media exposure, the maximum respondents among beneficiaries women were using mobile (5.9). Majority of respondents among beneficiaries women (78.33%) were in medium whereas majority (51.67%) of non beneficiaries women were having low level of economic motivation. Majority of respondents of beneficiaries women (65.00%) had medium and (61.67%) non beneficiaries women were having low level of risk orientation.. Majority of respondents of beneficiaries women (83.34%) had medium and half of the non beneficiaries women were having low level of scientific orientation.

Key word- MNREGA , beneficiaries women, non beneficiaries women

Received 02/04/2017

Revised 22/02/2017

Accepted 09/07/2017

Citation of this article

Sadhana Gupta, R.R Yadav, Subodh Kumar, and Manoj Kumar. Psychological Characteristics and Communication behavior MNREGA beneficiaries women and non-beneficiaries women in Faizabad District. Int. Arch. App. Sci. Technol; Vol 8 [3] September 2017. 32-36.

INTRODUCTION

The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MNREGA) is the first tangible commitment to the poor. The scheme aims at providing employment as a source of income by ensuring their dignity. Thus, it was considered a unique scheme, which provides them Right to Work, trend in the Constitution under directive principles of state policy. In this sense the scheme was supposed to be the most unique scheme after independence as it provides them statutory right to employment. The government has a statutory obligation to provide employment to every rural household in a financial year [1-4]. Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MNREGA) is a beneficial program for rural adult men and Women. MNREGA which was implemented by Ministry of Rural Development (MoRD), Government of India. MNREGA is the flagship program of the Government that directly touches lives of poor and promotes inclusive growth. It provides a right for guarantee employment of the rural population through an act of parliament. The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) was launched in 25 August, 2005. The Act received the assent of President on September 5, 2005 and was notified on September 7, 2005. It was implemented in India "s most backward districts on February 2, 2006. The law was initially called the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) but was renamed on 2 October 2009 as MNREGA. The MNREGA is an Indian job guarantee scheme,

enacted by legislation. MNREGA is a social security legislation with a right based framework. The purpose of the Act is to make resilient resources and enhance the income source platform of the rural inadequate. It aims to enhance livelihood security in rural areas by providing at least 100 days of guaranteed wage employment to every rural household whose adult members volunteer to do skilled and unskilled manual work. This programme is effective targeting of marginalized groups (scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, BPL and women) and use of MNREGA as a supplementary income source during non-agricultural season. A very important thing is that the MNREGA is not only providing legal guarantee of work but also protecting and upholding the Right to Live of crores of Indians standing on social margins. The idea of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MNREGA) is not new. It is based on Maharashtra Employment Guarantee Scheme (MEGS), and many other wage employment schemes[5-8]. MNREGA ranks among the most powerful initiatives ever undertaken for rural transformation of rural livelihoods in India

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was conducted in purposely selected Milkipur block of Faizabad district (U.P.) selected purposively. The list of job card holder families was prepared 15 MNREGA women beneficiaries from all the four selected villages and 15 non-beneficiaries women from each of the selected villages were selected randomly. A total number of 120 respondent *i.e.* 60 beneficiaries women & 60 non-beneficiaries women were selected through random sampling. A structured schedule for data collection was designed and exercised by interviewing with few respondents for pre-testing. Then, the suitable modification were made according to need of this study. Thereafter, data was collected from the MNREGA respondents through personal interview method. The structured schedule was developed keeping in view, the variables The scale developed by Supe, (1969) was used to measure the economic motivation with some modification. There were six statements in the economic motivation, bearing five points continuum *viz.*, strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree. The scores assigned to the statements were 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 respectively. The respondents were categorized into three categories such as low, medium and high. On the basis of total scores obtained such as low, medium and high. The categories were framed on the basis of equal class interval between minimum and maximum scores obtained.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Table 1: Distribution of the respondents according to extension contact with their different information sources N=120

S.No.	Categories	Beneficiaries n =60		Non- Beneficiaries n =60	
		Mean score value	Rank order	Mean score value	Rank order
A.	Formal sources				
1.	BDO	0.91	IV	0.95	II
2.	V.D.O.	0.38	V	0.05	IV
4.	MNREGA Supervisor	1.51	II	00	Nil
5.	Gram Pradhan	2.23	I	1	I
6.	Cooperative societies	0.95	III	0.28	III
7.	Agril. School/college	0.2	VI	00	Nil
	Total	6.38		2.28	
B.	Informal sources				
1.	Family members	3.18	I	3.78	I
2.	Neighbours	1.8	II	1.73	II
3.	Friends	1.63	III	1.6	III
4.	Relatives	1.18	IV	0.36	IV
5.	Progressive farmers	0.75	V	0.4	V
6.	Local Leaders	0.35	VI	0.23	VI
	Total	8.91		8.1	
C.	Mass Media Exposure				
1.	Radio	1.3	III	1.68	III

2.	T.V.	5.61	II	3.68	II
3.	Mobile	5.9	I	4.81	I
4.	Farm Magazine	0.46	V	0.15	VI
5.	Poster/Chart	0.08	VI	0.3	V
6.	Farm fairs/Exhibition	0.76	IV	1.66	IV
	Total	14.33		12.3	
	Overall mean score	29.63		22.68	

The data furnished in Table-2 pertains to extent of contact of respondents with different information sources as used by them for receiving general information as well as about various aspects of MNREGA Scheme. Information sources were categorized in three categories namely formal sources, informal sources and mass media exposure to find out the extent of contact of respondents. So far as the contact of beneficiaries women with formal sources was concerned, it was found the mean score value in descending order viz., Gram pradhan (2.23), MNREGA supervisor (1.51), Cooperative societies (0.95), B.D.O.(0.91), V.D.O. (0.38) and Agril. School/college (0.2) and ranks were assigned to here as I, II, III, IV, V and VI respectively. While in case of non beneficiaries women the contact with formal sources was found the mean score value in descending order i.e. Gram pradhan (1), B.D.O. (0.95), Cooperative societies (0.28), V.D.O. (0.05) and ranks were assigned to I, II, III, and IVth respectively. The total mean score value of all formal sources for beneficiaries women was found to be 6.38 and of non beneficiaries women was found to be 2.28 respectively. The extent of contact of beneficiaries women with informal sources was found the mean score value in descending order like family members (3.38), neighbour (1.8), friends (1.63), relative (1.18), progressive farmers (0.75) and local leader (0.35) and ranks were assigned to I, II, III, IV, V and VI respectively. Likewise in case of non beneficiaries women the contact with informal sources was found the mean score value in descending order like family members (3.78), neighbour (1.73), friends (1.6), relative (0.36), progressive farmers (0.4) and local leaders (0.23) ranks were assigned to I, II, III, IV, V and VI respectively. The total mean scores value of all informal sources for beneficiaries women was found to be 8.91 and of non beneficiaries women was found to be 8.1 respectively.

The extent of contact of beneficiaries women with mass media sources was found mean score value in descending order like mobile (5.9), T.V (5.61), Radio (1.3), poster /chart (0.08), farm fairs/exhibition (0.76) & farm magazines (0.46) and ranks were assigned to I, II, III, IV, V and VI respectively. While in case of non beneficiaries women the contact with mass media sources was found the mean score value in descending order like mobile (4.81), T.V (3.68), Radio (1.68), farmers fairs/exhibition (1.66), poster/chart (0.3) and farm magazine (0.15) and ranks were assigned to I, II, III, IV, V and VI respectively. The total mean scores value of mass media sources for beneficiaries women was found to be 14.33 and of non beneficiaries women was found to be 12.30 respectively.

Table 3: Distribution of the respondents according to their economic motivation

S. No.	Categories (score)	Beneficiaries (n =60)	Non- Beneficiaries (n =60)	Total (N= 120)
1.	Low (11-16)	06 (10.00)	31 (51.67)	37 (30.84)
2.	Medium (17-22)	47(78.33)	20 (33.33)	67 (55.83)
3.	High (23-28)	07 (11.67)	09(15.00)	16 (13.33)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage

It can be seen in table 4. That the majority of beneficiaries women (78.33%) found in medium category of economic motivation followed by high (11.67%) and low (10.00%) category respectively. Likewise that majority of the non beneficiaries women (51.67%) were observed in the low category followed by medium (33.33%) and 15.00% in high category. Pooled figures indicate that majority of the respondents 55.83% were in medium category, while 30.84% in low category and 13.33% in the high category.

Table 4: Distribution of the respondents according to their risk orientation

S. No.	Categories (score)	Beneficiaries (n =60)	Non-Beneficiaries (n =60)	Total (N= 120)
1.	Low (11-17)	11 (18.33)	37 (61.67)	48 (40.00)
2.	Medium (18-24)	39 (65.00)	20 (33.33)	59 (49.16)
3.	High (25-31)	10(16.67)	03 (5.00)	13 (10.84)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage

It is apparent from Table-4. that 65% of the beneficiaries women were found having medium level followed by 18.33% low and 16.67% high level of risk orientation respectively. Likewise that majority of the non beneficiaries women 61.67% were observed in low category followed by medium (33.33%) and 5.00% in high category respectively. Pooled figures indicated that majority of the respondents (49.16%) were found belonging to medium category of risk orientation followed by low (40.00%) and high (10.84%) categories respectively.

Table 5: Distribution of the respondents according to their Scientific orientation

S. No.	Categories (score)	Beneficiaries (n =60)	Non-Beneficiaries (n =60)	Total (N= 120)
1.	Low (10-18)	08 (13.33)	30 (50.00)	38 (31.67)
2.	Medium (19-27)	50 (83.34)	23 (38.33)	73 (60.83)
3.	High (28-36)	02 (3.33)	07 (11.67)	09 (7.50)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage

The Table 5.reflects that majority of the beneficiaries women (83.33%) were in medium category of scientific orientation followed by low category (13.33%) and 3.33% in high category. In case of non beneficiaries women majority (60.83%) indicated medium level of scientific orientation followed by low category (31.67%) and 7.50% in high category respectively. Pooled figures indicate that 60.83% of respondents were in medium category followed by 31.67% low category and 7.50% in high category respectively.

CONCLUSION

The majority of beneficiaries women were found as mobile/telephone followed by radio TV, DVD player and DTH Likewise in case of non beneficiaries women majority of the respondents were found having mobile/telephone followed by radio, DVD player TV and DTH as communication media possession. The overall material possession majority of beneficiaries women were observed in the medium category followed by low and high categories while majority of the non beneficiaries women were observed in the low category followed by medium and high categories respectively. Contact of beneficiaries women was maximum with Gram pradhan followed by MNREGA supervisor while non beneficiaries women were found more in contact with Gram pradhan then BDO among all formal sources. In case of informal sources, maximum contact of beneficiaries women was seen with family members, neighbor and non beneficiaries women the contact with informal sources was found more with family members neighbor respectively. In case of mass media exposure, the maximum respondents among beneficiaries women were using mobile followed by TV, Radio (similarly non beneficiaries women were also found more contact with mobile then TV and Radio. Majority of respondents among beneficiaries women were in medium whereas majority of non beneficiaries women were having low level of economic motivation. Majority of respondents of beneficiaries women had medium and non beneficiaries women were having low level of risk orientation. Majority of respondents of beneficiaries women had medium and half of the non beneficiaries women were having low level of scientific orientation.

REFERENCES

1. Bannerjee, K. and Saha, P. (2010). The NREGA, the Maoists and the Developmental Woes of the Indian State”, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 28 , pp 42-47.

2. Kareemulla, K.; Kumar, S.; Reddy, K.S.; and Rao, R. (2010). "Impact of NREGA on Rural Livelihoods and Agricultural Capital Formation", *Indian Journal Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 3, pp 524-539.
3. Kareemulla, K.; Reddy, K.S.; Rao, C.; Kumar, S.; and Venkateswarlu, B. (2009). Soil and Water Conservation Works through National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGA) in Andhra Pradesh-An Analysis of Livelihood Impact ", *Agricultural Economics Research Review*, vol. 22, pp 443-450.
4. Khera, R. and Nayak, N. (2009). Women Workers and Perceptions of the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act", *Economic & Political Weekly (EPW)*, Vol.44, pp 49-57.
5. Klonner, S. and Christian, O. (2014). "Can an Employment Guarantee Alleviate Poverty? Evidence from India's National Rural Employment Guarantee Act." Working Paper, South Asia Institute, University of Heidelberg.
6. Kumar, S.V. (2011). Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act: A review kurekshetra, vol 3, pp10-12.
7. Mathur, L. (2007). "Employment Guarantee: Progress So Far", *Economics and Political Weekly*, Dec. 29-Jan. 4, Vol. XLII, No.52, pp 18.
8. Mathur, L. (2008). "Employment guarantee: progress so far" *EPW* vol. 52, pp17-20. Mathur, L. (2009). Silent but successful initiative, *The Hind*. 1st March.