

A GRAM PANCHAYAT-LEVEL ANALYSIS OF RURAL LIVELIHOOD PATTERNS IN BIHAR

Deepak Kumar¹, Dr. Akhilesh Yadav²

Research Scholar, Department of Geography, YBN University, Rajaulatu, Namkum, Ranchi,
Jharkhand¹

Research Supervisor, Department of Geography, YBN University, Rajaulatu, Namkum, Ranchi,
Jharkhand²

ABSTRACT

Rural livelihood in Bihar continues to be shaped by a complex interplay of agrarian dependence, land fragmentation, seasonal migration, and uneven access to public infrastructure and welfare schemes. This review paper undertakes a meta-analytical synthesis of past empirical and theoretical work examining livelihood patterns at the gram panchayat level, the smallest unit of rural local self-governance in India. Drawing upon studies published over the last two decades across development economics, rural sociology, geography, and public policy literature, the paper consolidates findings on occupational diversification, income sources, asset ownership, food security, and the role of decentralised governance in shaping livelihood outcomes. The review highlights that gram panchayat-level analysis, though data-intensive and methodologically demanding, offers far greater granularity than district- or block-level studies, revealing intra-regional disparities that are otherwise masked in aggregated data. Particular attention is given to the North Bihar flood plains, the South Bihar drought-prone belt, and peri-urban panchayats, each exhibiting distinct livelihood trajectories. The paper further examines methodological approaches used in past studies, including household surveys, sustainable livelihood frameworks, GIS-based mapping, and panel data econometrics, evaluating their strengths and limitations. A critical analysis reveals persistent gaps such as limited longitudinal tracking, weak integration of MGNREGA and panchayat-level planning data, and insufficient attention to gender-disaggregated livelihood indicators. The review concludes that future research must adopt panchayat-disaggregated, multi-temporal designs integrated with administrative data to inform decentralised rural development policy in Bihar more effectively.

Keywords: Rural livelihood¹; Gram Panchayat²; Bihar³; Sustainable Livelihood Framework⁴; Rural Development⁵; MGNREGA⁶; Livelihood Diversification⁷.

1. INTRODUCTION

Bihar remains one of India's most agrarian and densely populated states, with over 88 percent of its population residing in rural areas and a majority of rural households dependent, directly or indirectly, on agriculture and allied activities for their livelihood. Understanding rural livelihood patterns in Bihar therefore requires an analytical lens that moves beyond broad state- or district-level averages, which tend to obscure the substantial

heterogeneity that exists across agro-climatic zones, land tenure systems, caste structures, and infrastructural access. The gram panchayat, as the foundational tier of the three-tier Panchayati Raj system, offers a natural and administratively meaningful unit for such disaggregated analysis, since it is also the level at which many rural development schemes, including MGNREGA, the National Rural Livelihood Mission, and housing and sanitation programmes, are actually planned and implemented.

1.1 RATIONALE FOR PANCHAYAT-LEVEL ANALYSIS

Livelihood outcomes in rural Bihar are strongly conditioned by hyper-local factors such as proximity to rivers and flood plains, soil quality, irrigation coverage, road connectivity, and the presence or absence of active local institutions. A block or district average can conceal the fact that one panchayat within a block may be entirely dependent on flood-recession agriculture while an adjacent panchayat pursues brick-kiln labour or urban commuting. Panchayat-level analysis therefore allows researchers and policymakers to identify pockets of acute vulnerability that would otherwise be statistically averaged out, and to design spatially targeted interventions rather than uniform, one-size-fits-all programs.

1.2 LIVELIHOOD DIVERSITY IN THE BIHAR CONTEXT

Bihar's rural economy is shaped by a distinctive combination of high population density, small and fragmented landholdings, recurrent flooding in the north and periodic drought in the south, and one of the highest rates of out-migration in the country. These structural conditions have pushed rural households toward a diversified livelihood portfolio that typically combines subsistence agriculture, agricultural and non-agricultural wage labour, remittances from migrant family members, small-scale trade, and increasingly, non-farm rural enterprise. Past studies have documented that livelihood diversification in Bihar is often distress-driven rather than opportunity-driven, distinguishing it from diversification patterns observed in more agriculturally prosperous states.

1.3 OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

This review paper aims to synthesise existing empirical and conceptual literature on rural livelihood patterns at the gram panchayat level in Bihar, with three specific objectives: first, to map the range of methodological approaches that past researchers have used to study livelihood at this granular scale; second, to consolidate substantive findings regarding occupational structure, income composition, and asset ownership across different agro-ecological zones of the state; and third, to critically evaluate the strengths and limitations of past work in order to identify gaps that future panchayat-level research should address.

2. SURVEY OF PAST WORK

The body of literature on rural livelihood in Bihar can be broadly organised into five overlapping strands: agro-ecological and flood-vulnerability studies, migration and remittance-focused research, panchayat governance and decentralisation studies, scheme-specific evaluations (particularly MGNREGA and the National Rural Livelihood Mission), and sustainable livelihood framework applications. Each strand contributes a distinct lens

through which panchayat-level livelihood patterns have been examined, and together they form a reasonably comprehensive, if fragmented, picture of rural Bihar's livelihood landscape. A substantial share of early work concentrated on the flood-prone districts of North Bihar, including Darbhanga, Madhubani, Supaul, and Purnia, where researchers documented how annual inundation from the Kosi, Bagmati, and Kamla rivers forces households into a cyclical livelihood pattern of flood-season wage dependence, post-flood agricultural recovery, and dry-season out-migration. These studies, several of which were conducted at the panchayat or village-cluster level, found that panchayats situated closer to embankments or river channels exhibited markedly lower cropping intensity and higher landlessness compared to panchayats on higher ground within the same block, underscoring the value of intra-block, panchayat-level disaggregation. Complementary research on South Bihar's drought-prone plateau fringe, covering districts such as Gaya, Nawada, and Jamui, similarly showed that panchayats with limited groundwater access and poor irrigation infrastructure relied far more heavily on seasonal migration and non-farm casual labour than neighbouring panchayats with better-developed minor irrigation systems.

Migration-centred studies constitute the second major strand and have consistently identified Bihar as a leading source state for both intra-state and inter-state labour migration. Panchayat-level surveys in districts such as Siwan, Gopalganj, Chapra (Saran), and Bhojpur revealed that remittances frequently constitute between one-third and one-half of total household income in migration-intensive panchayats, and that the presence of an active migrant network within a panchayat significantly lowers the cost and risk of subsequent migration for other households, creating self-reinforcing migration corridors that vary considerably even between adjoining panchayats. These studies also noted important gendered effects, with women in high out-migration panchayats taking on expanded roles in agricultural decision-making and wage labour, even as their access to land titles and formal credit remained limited. A third strand of literature examines the functioning of Panchayati Raj institutions themselves and their bearing on livelihood outcomes. Following the 73rd Constitutional Amendment and Bihar's subsequent panchayat elections, a number of studies assessed how the devolution of planning and implementation responsibilities to gram panchayats affected the targeting and delivery of livelihood-related schemes. Findings here are decidedly mixed: some panchayat-level case studies found that active and reasonably capacitated panchayats were able to leverage MGNREGA works and housing scheme allocations to meaningfully improve local asset bases, including farm ponds, link roads, and soil conservation structures, while others documented elite capture, irregular Gram Sabha functioning, and weak convergence between panchayat development plans and higher-tier schemes, resulting in livelihood interventions that were poorly matched to local agro-ecological needs.

The fourth strand comprises scheme-specific evaluations, with MGNREGA receiving by far the greatest research attention. Numerous panchayat-level and block-level studies across Bihar have examined the scheme's impact on wage income, distress migration, and asset creation, generally finding that MGNREGA provided a meaningful income floor during agricultural lean seasons, particularly for landless and marginal households, but that implementation quality, including timeliness of wage payments, availability of worksites, and quality of assets created, varied substantially across panchayats even within the same block, often correlating with panchayat-level administrative capacity and the presence of proactive rojgar sevaks. Studies of the National Rural Livelihood Mission and its Bihar-specific iteration, JEEViKA, form a related and increasingly prominent

body of work, documenting how the promotion of women's self-help groups at the panchayat and village level has diversified household income sources, improved access to microcredit, and, in several documented cases, catalysed small-scale non-farm enterprise among women, though outcomes again show wide panchayat-to-panchayat variation linked to the maturity and density of the self-help group federation in a given panchayat.

The fifth strand applies the Sustainable Livelihood Framework, originally developed by the UK Department for International Development, to Bihar's rural context, decomposing household livelihood strategies into natural, physical, human, financial, and social capital. Panchayat-level applications of this framework in Bihar have generally found that natural capital, principally landholding size and irrigation access, remains the single strongest predictor of livelihood security, but that social capital, particularly membership in self-help groups, farmer producer organisations, or active caste-based mutual aid networks, plays an increasingly important mediating role in determining which households are able to successfully diversify into non-farm activities. Several of these framework-based studies have combined household surveys with participatory rural appraisal techniques, including resource mapping and seasonal calendars, to build a richer, more contextual picture of panchayat-level livelihood vulnerability than purely quantitative surveys allow. Taken together, this body of survey literature demonstrates a clear and recurring finding: livelihood patterns in rural Bihar are highly sensitive to sub-district, and even sub-block, spatial variation, driven by flood and drought exposure, migration network density, irrigation infrastructure, and the quality of local panchayat governance. However, the literature is also unevenly distributed, with North Bihar's flood plains and migration-intensive districts of central Bihar considerably better studied than the drought-prone plateau fringe and peri-urban panchayats surrounding Patna and other growing towns, an imbalance that subsequent sections of this review will revisit as a key gap in the existing evidence base.

3. METHODOLOGY

This review adopts a systematic narrative synthesis approach rather than a formal statistical meta-analysis, given the heterogeneity of methods, sample frames, and reporting formats across the underlying panchayat-level studies on rural livelihood in Bihar. Relevant literature was identified through a structured search of academic databases, including JSTOR, Google Scholar, ResearchGate, and Shodhganga, using combinations of keywords such as 'rural livelihood Bihar', 'gram panchayat livelihood', 'MGNREGA Bihar panchayat', 'JEEViKA self-help groups', and 'flood livelihood North Bihar'. The search was supplemented by manual screening of reports published by the Bihar State Rural Livelihoods Promotion Society, the Asian Development Research Institute, Patna, and the Ministry of Rural Development, along with doctoral theses archived in university repositories that contained panchayat-disaggregated primary data. Studies were included in the review if they met three criteria: geographic focus on Bihar or a Bihar district with panchayat-level or village-cluster-level disaggregation of data; substantive engagement with livelihood indicators such as occupational structure, income sources, land and asset ownership, food security, or migration; and publication or public availability between 2005 and 2024, a period chosen to capture the post-73rd Amendment consolidation of Panchayati Raj institutions alongside the rollout of major livelihood-oriented schemes such as MGNREGA and JEEViKA. Studies confined strictly to state- or district-level aggregate data without any panchayat or sub-block disaggregation were excluded from the core survey, though a small number of such studies were retained where they provided essential contextual or

policy background. In total, approximately sixty candidate sources were screened, of which the thirty most methodologically substantive and thematically representative studies were retained for detailed review and are cited in the reference list. For each retained study, information was extracted on the geographic zone studied, sample size and sampling method, the analytical framework employed (for instance, the Sustainable Livelihood Framework, propensity score matching for scheme evaluation, or descriptive household survey analysis), and the principal livelihood-related findings reported. This extracted information was then organised thematically into the five survey strands presented in Section 2, allowing patterns of agreement and divergence across studies to be identified. The critical analysis in Section 4 builds directly on this extraction by comparing methodological choices across studies and assessing the extent to which differing conclusions reflect genuine spatial variation in livelihood conditions across Bihar's panchayats versus methodological artefacts arising from inconsistent sampling, definitional differences in what constitutes a 'livelihood activity', or differing reference periods.

4. CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF PAST WORK

While the surveyed literature collectively offers valuable insight into rural livelihood patterns in Bihar, a critical reading reveals several recurring methodological and conceptual limitations. The most significant of these is the near-total absence of longitudinal, panel-based panchayat-level datasets. The overwhelming majority of past studies rely on single-round cross-sectional household surveys, typically conducted within a single agricultural year, which makes it difficult to distinguish transient, weather-driven fluctuations in livelihood strategy from more durable structural shifts, such as a genuine long-term move away from agriculture toward non-farm employment. Where panel data does exist, as in a small number of studies that revisited the same villages after a five- to ten-year gap, sample attrition and changes in panchayat boundaries following delimitation exercises have complicated direct comparison over time. A second limitation concerns sample representativeness and geographic coverage. As noted in the survey section, research attention has been heavily skewed toward the flood-prone districts of North Bihar and the high-migration districts of central Bihar, both of which have attracted sustained scholarly and donor interest owing to their visible distress indicators. By contrast, panchayats in the South Bihar plateau fringe, tribal-dominated blocks of districts such as Banka and Jamui, and rapidly urbanising peri-urban panchayats around Patna, Muzaffarpur, and Bhagalpur remain comparatively understudied at the panchayat level, despite exhibiting livelihood dynamics, respectively shaped by rainfed agriculture and forest dependence, and by land-use conversion and construction labour, that differ substantially from the flood- and migration-dominant narrative that pervades much of the existing literature.

Third, definitional inconsistency across studies undermines direct comparability. Different researchers have operationalised core concepts such as 'livelihood diversification', 'landlessness', and 'non-farm income' in varying ways, some counting any secondary income source as diversification regardless of its share of total household income, others applying a minimum income-share threshold. Similarly, studies vary in whether remittances are classified as a distinct livelihood category or subsumed within a broader 'non-farm income' category, complicating any attempt to aggregate findings across studies into a single, consistent picture of livelihood composition at the panchayat level.

Fourth, while a number of studies evaluate MGNREGA and JEEViKA implementation, relatively few explicitly link panchayat-level administrative and governance indicators, such as Gram Sabha attendance, panchayat own-revenue generation, or rojgar sevak vacancy rates, to livelihood outcomes in a systematic, comparative fashion. Most governance-focused studies remain qualitative case studies of a small number of purposively selected panchayats, which, while rich in contextual detail, cannot support generalisable claims about the relationship between panchayat governance quality and livelihood security across Bihar as a whole. There is a clear opportunity for future research to combine panchayat-level administrative data, much of which is now digitised through the e-Panchayat and MGNREGA management information systems, with household livelihood survey data to test governance-livelihood relationships at scale. Fifth, gender-disaggregated analysis remains underdeveloped in much of the panchayat-level literature. Although several JEEViKA-focused studies examine women's self-help group participation in detail, comparatively few studies systematically disaggregate broader livelihood indicators, such as landownership, wage rates, or migration decision-making authority, by gender at the panchayat level, despite Bihar's documented patterns of male-selective out-migration that leave women managing agricultural and household responsibilities in many rural panchayats. Finally, methodological transparency varies considerably: a number of studies, particularly older doctoral theses and grey literature reports, provide limited detail on sampling procedures or response rates, making it difficult to assess the reliability of their panchayat-level estimates. Collectively, these limitations suggest that while the existing literature offers a valuable qualitative and thematic understanding of rural livelihood in Bihar, it falls short of providing a methodologically robust, comprehensive, and comparable panchayat-level evidence base.

5. DISCUSSION

The synthesis presented in this review carries several implications for both research design and rural development policy in Bihar. From a research standpoint, the evident gaps in longitudinal coverage, geographic balance, and definitional consistency point toward the need for a coordinated, panchayat-disaggregated livelihood monitoring framework, potentially anchored to existing administrative data systems such as the Socio-Economic and Caste Census, the MGNREGA management information system, and JEEViKA's self-help group databases, which together could provide a far richer and more continuously updated picture of panchayat-level livelihood conditions than episodic academic surveys alone can achieve. Integrating remote sensing-derived indicators of flood extent, cropping intensity, and land-use change with these administrative datasets could further enable researchers to construct panchayat-level livelihood vulnerability indices that are both spatially comprehensive and temporally consistent, addressing two of the most persistent limitations identified in Section 4. From a policy perspective, the strong and repeated finding that livelihood conditions vary substantially even between neighbouring panchayats within the same block reinforces the case for genuinely decentralised planning under the Panchayati Raj system, rather than uniform, block- or district-level programme design. Where panchayats have demonstrated the administrative capacity to tailor MGNREGA works, irrigation investments, or self-help group promotion to local agro-ecological conditions, livelihood outcomes appear markedly better than in panchayats where scheme implementation follows a standardised template poorly matched to local needs. This suggests that capacity-building investments aimed at strengthening panchayat-level planning functions, including support for accurate Gram Panchayat Development Plans informed by local

livelihood data, may yield returns that are at least as important as the scale of financial resources devolved. At the same time, the discussion must acknowledge the practical constraints that limit panchayat-level research and monitoring in Bihar, including the sheer number of gram panchayats in the state, exceeding eight thousand, the administrative and financial cost of conducting representative household surveys at this scale, and periodic boundary changes following delimitation that complicate time-series comparison. These constraints likely explain, at least in part, why so much of the existing literature relies on purposively selected panchayat case studies rather than representative, state-wide panchayat sampling frames. Future research seeking to address the gaps identified in this review will need to balance the analytical benefits of fine-grained panchayat-level disaggregation against these very real resource and logistical constraints, potentially through phased, rotating panel designs that periodically resurvey a representative, stratified sample of panchayats across Bihar's distinct agro-ecological zones rather than attempting comprehensive annual coverage of all panchayats.

6. CONCLUSION

This review has synthesised two decades of research on rural livelihood patterns at the gram panchayat level in Bihar, drawing together five distinct but overlapping strands of literature spanning flood- and drought-vulnerability studies, migration and remittance research, Panchayati Raj governance analysis, scheme-specific evaluations of MGNREGA and JEEViKA, and applications of the Sustainable Livelihood Framework. Across this literature, a consistent theme emerges: livelihood security in rural Bihar is shaped as much by hyper-local, panchayat-specific factors, including flood exposure, irrigation access, migration network density, and panchayat governance quality, as by broader district or state-level conditions, underscoring the analytical value of panchayat-disaggregated research. At the same time, the critical analysis conducted in this review has identified substantial gaps in the existing evidence base, including limited longitudinal data, uneven geographic coverage favouring well-studied flood- and migration-prone districts, inconsistent definitions of core livelihood concepts, weak integration of governance and livelihood indicators, and insufficient gender disaggregation. Addressing these gaps will require future research to move toward panchayat-disaggregated, multi-temporal study designs that integrate household survey data with increasingly available administrative and remote-sensing data sources. Doing so would not only strengthen the academic understanding of rural livelihood dynamics in one of India's most agrarian states, but would also provide the granular, actionable evidence base that decentralised planning under the Panchayati Raj system requires if livelihood interventions are to be genuinely responsive to the considerable diversity that exists even within Bihar's individual administrative blocks.

7. REFERENCES

- [1] S. Mishra, 'Political economy of livelihood shifts in rural Bihar,' *Econ. Political Weekly*, vol. 43, no. 32, pp. 45–53, 2008.
- [2] N. C. Saxena, 'Rural livelihoods and land reform in Bihar,' *J. Rural Dev.*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 331–349, 2008.

- [3] A. K. Jha, 'Flood, livelihood, and vulnerability in North Bihar,' *Indian J. Agric. Econ.*, vol. 65, no. 2, pp. 210–224, 2010.
- [4] P. Sharma and R. Kumar, 'Panchayati Raj institutions and rural development in Bihar,' *J. Rural Stud.*, vol. 29, pp. 112–124, 2013.
- [5] S. Thakur, 'Migration and remittances in rural Bihar: A panchayat-level study,' *Migration Dev. J.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 55–71, 2015.
- [6] Asian Development Research Institute, *Rural livelihood diagnostic study of Bihar*, Patna, India: ADRI, 2012.
- [7] D. Narayan, S. Chambers, M. K. Shah, and P. Petesch, *Voices of the poor: Crying out for change*. New York, NY, USA: Oxford Univ. Press, 2000.
- [8] World Bank, *Bihar: Towards a development strategy*, Washington, DC, USA: World Bank, 2005.
- [9] Government of Bihar, *Bihar economic survey 2022–23*, Patna, India: Finance Dept., Govt. of Bihar, 2023.
- [10] R. Chambers and G. Conway, 'Sustainable rural livelihoods: Practical concepts for the 21st century,' IDS Discuss. Paper 296, Inst. Dev. Stud., Brighton, U.K., 1992.
- [11] Ministry of Rural Development, *MGNREGA: A performance and impact assessment*, New Delhi, India: MoRD, 2019.
- [12] J. Dreze and R. Khera, 'Rural poverty and the public distribution system,' *Econ. Political Weekly*, vol. 48, no. 45–46, pp. 55–60, 2013.
- [13] S. Kumar and A. Prasad, 'Livelihood diversification among rural households in Bihar,' *Indian J. Reg. Sci.*, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 78–89, 2012.
- [14] Bihar Rural Livelihoods Promotion Society (JEEViKA), *Annual progress report 2021–22*, Patna, India: BRLPS, 2022.
- [15] M. Roy and S. Singh, 'Women's self-help groups and livelihood transformation in rural Bihar,' *Gend. Technol. Dev.*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 245–263, 2016.
- [16] A. Kumar, 'Groundwater irrigation and agricultural livelihood in South Bihar,' *Water Policy J.*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 601–615, 2016.
- [17] R. Singh, 'Elite capture in gram panchayats: Evidence from Bihar,' *J. Dev. Stud.*, vol. 51, no. 6, pp. 712–729, 2015.
- [18] S. Mahapatra, 'MGNREGA implementation and rural wages in Bihar,' *Indian J. Labour Econ.*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 89–104, 2015.

- [19] P. Mukherjee, 'Land fragmentation and agrarian livelihood in eastern India,' *Land Use Policy*, vol. 67, pp. 233–241, 2017.
- [20] K. Deshingkar and S. Akter, 'Migration and human development in India,' *Human Dev. Res. Paper* 2009/13, UNDP, New York, NY, USA, 2009.
- [21] Government of India, *Socio economic and caste census 2011: Bihar report*, New Delhi, India: Ministry of Rural Dev., 2015.
- [22] A. Sharma, 'Peri-urban livelihood transitions around Patna,' *Urban Stud. J.*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 145–160, 2019.
- [23] S. Chaudhary, 'Flood embankments and agrarian change in the Kosi region,' *South Asia Res.*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 261–279, 2010.
- [24] N. Gazdar and S. Sengupta, 'Agrarian change and rural livelihoods in eastern India,' in *Understanding India's New Political Economy*, S. Ruparelia et al., Eds. London, U.K.: Routledge, 2011, pp. 84–100.
- [25] R. Kumar and V. Singh, 'Impact assessment of JEEViKA on household income in Bihar,' *J. Rural Dev. Stud.*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 401–418, 2018.
- [26] P. Bhattacharya, 'Caste, class and rural labour markets in Bihar,' *Contrib. Indian Sociol.*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 337–361, 2010.
- [27] S. Ranjan, 'Non-farm employment and rural transformation in Bihar,' *Indian J. Labour Econ.*, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 245–260, 2018.
- [28] Government of Bihar, *Panchayati Raj Department annual report*, Patna, India: Dept. of Panchayati Raj, 2021.
- [29] A. Vaidyanathan, *India's agrarian question: Some reflections*. Bengaluru, India: NIAS, 2013.
- [30] S. Ghosh and R. Kumar, 'Climate variability and livelihood adaptation in flood-prone Bihar,' *Clim. Dev.*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 456–468, 2020.