MGNREGA and Its Impact on Employment and Poverty Alleviation: Study of Pauri Garhwal District Uttarakhand

Santosh Singh[1*], R. S. Negi[1] and Rekha Dhanai[1]

[1]*Department of Rural Technology, HNB Garhwal (A Central) University, Srinagar Garhwal, Uttarakhand, India.*

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between all authors. Author SS designed the study, performed the statistical analysis, wrote the protocol and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Authors RSN and RD managed the analyses of the study. Author RD managed the literature searches. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Original Research Article

ABSTRACT

Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act is exceptionally an indispensable tool for fighting unemployment and underemployment inside the rural areas; and for assaulting rural mass poverty and raising the rural problems above the poverty line. The investigation is done in Pauri Garhwal area of Uttarakhand. The district have 15 blocks , Out of those blocks, Kaljikhal block become purposive because of the most quantity beneficiaries of MGNREGA in evaluation to other blocks of the district . 15 villages were selected on the basis of the maximum wide variety of beneficiaries. Thus 20 beneficiaries from every village have been selected randomly using the simple random approach. Consequently, the total sample as evaluated consisted of three hundred beneficiaries. This study examine the impact of MGNREGA on income and employment, poverty alleviation, awareness and suggestions for improving the functioning of the act. Data collection is based on primary household-degree panel survey recorded from 2013–2015. Percentage,

_____

Corresponding author: E-mail: singhrawat.santosh@gmail.com;

frequency average and regression and correlation evaluation tools has been used. Out of ten independent variables, family and cast type was found to have a non-significant relationship with annual income. The coefficient of multiple determinations (R^2) indicate that the most effective percentage (74.03%) of the variation in the growth of annual income of the respondents which may be explained by means of 10 independent variables. The notably significant F-value reported the confirmation to the validity of R^2 (0.7403). The study has concluded that the beneficiaries of MGNREGA show more interest in participating MGNREGA works and their annual income increase significantly.

1. INTRODUCTION

Poverty is the greatest threat of human improvement. Since independence, the issue of poverty in India has remained a common anxiety. According to the general explaination of poverty, it is when a person finds it difficult to arrange the minimum necessity for living standards. Millions of people in India are incapable to arrange their basic needs; and according to government estimates in 2007 there were nearly 220.1 million people living below the poverty line (BPL). According to the Census Report (2011), 83 million people continue to live below the poverty line in rural India. The total number of villages in India have increased from 6,38,588 (Census, 2001) to 6,40,867 (Census, 2011). However, by 2015, an approximated 53 million people still live in extreme poverty and 23.6 per cent of the population still lives under $1.25 per day. This number is predictable to reduce to 20.3 per cent or 268 million people by 2020 [1].

Nearly 21.1 per cent of the entire rural population and 15 per cent of the urban population of India exists in this complicated physical and financial situation. A great deal of further endeavor is needed to generate a hunger-free and poverty-free world [1]. The taking away of poverty is an important situation for economic growth and sustainability. The problem of unemployment and underemployment is an additional important aspect and it has a close link with poverty. In this way, in 2005, India's parliament passed the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA), [2] which is the central government's response to the constitutionally manifested right to work and a means to promote livelihood security in India's rural areas. To this end, the Act guarantees 100 days of manual employment at constitutional minimum wage rates to any rural household whose adult member is willing to do unskilled manual work [3]. The manual work needs to create sustainable assets that promote the economic and communications development

of the village [4]. This Act was introduced with an aim of improving the purchasing power of the rural people, primarily semi or unskilled work to people living in rural India whether or not they are below the poverty line [5].

MGNREGA was enacted by law in 2005, notified on September 7, 2005 and the implementation started in 2006. MGNREGA is the final avatar of a set of employment schemes, some dating rear to India's independence [6,7]. The Act was implemented in a phased manner. The act was notified in 200 districts in the first phase with effect from February 2nd 2006 and then extended to additional 130 districts in the financial year 2007-2008, (130 districts were notified with effect from April 1st 2007 and 17 districts in UP were notified with effect from May 15th 2007). The remaining districts have been notified under the MGNREGA with effect from April 1, 2008. Thus, MGNREGA covers the entire country with the exception of districts that have a hundred percent urban population.

In Uttarakhand, the MGNREGA was initially launched in 3 districts *i.e.,* Chamoli, Champawat and Tehri in 2006-2007 (Phase-I). Two additional districts, *i.e.,* Haridwar and Udham Singh Nagar were adopted in Phase-II (2007-2008). In the last phase, all the remaining districts have been notified under the MGNREGA. MGNREGA was introduced to Pauri Garhwal district in the III phase and the implementation of the Act in the district commenced on April 1, 2008 [8,9,10]. Considering the above information, this study was aimed to analyze the impact of MGNREGA on income and employment, poverty alleviation, awareness and to provide certain suggestions for improving the functioning of the act with special reference to Kaljikhal Block of Pauri Garhwal Districts of Uttarakhand, India.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The prevailing study is conduct in Pauri Garhwal district. The district include 15 blocks. Out of

those blocks, Kaljikhal block become purposive because of the most quantity beneficiaries of MGNREGA in evaluation to other block of the district. From this block, 15 villages were selected on the basis of the maximum wide variety of beneficiaries. Thus 20 beneficiaries from every village have been selected randomly using the simple random approach. Consequently, the total sample from this approach consisted of three hundred beneficiaries. Data collection is based on primary household-level survey recorded from 2013–2015. Primary information had been collected from the chosen beneficiaries via., specially based interview by the semi-structure questionnaire.

For statistical evaluation, the subsequent analytical techniques were used *viz*., percentage, frequency average and regression to investigate the statistics. Correlation and check are extensively utilized to discover the relationship between socio-economic characteristics.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The distribution of beneficiaries according to the effect of MGNREGA on annual income and economic improvement is given in Table 1. The data indicate that before implementation of MGNREGA programme, maximum of the beneficiary (60.00%) belongs to low income earning group (< Rs 20,000) followed by 34.00 percent of medium income group (Rs 20,000 to Rs 40,000) and 6.00 percent of high-income group (> Rs 40,000) beneficiaries.

While, after the implementation of MGNREGA, the percentage of the beneficiary has increased: (i.e.,68.00%) belonged to medium income earning group (Rs 20,000 to Rs 40,000), 26.67 percent beneficiary belonged to high income group (> Rs 40,000) and handiest 5.33 percent belongs to low income earning group (< Rs20,000).

The finding of [2,8,9] is identical to the prevailing finding of [11,12]. Additionally the existing finding also reported that MGNREGA improved the financial status of the beneficiaries and reduced the degree of poverty in the study area. Pearson's coefficient of correlation changed into labored out_to decide the relationship between socio-personal traits of beneficiary namely- age, caste, education, social participation, type of family, size of family, source of information, innovativeness, attitude of beneficiaries towards MGNREGA and knowledge about MGNREGA with annual income increased due to the scheme. It is far understood from the information as given in Table 2 that variables like education, social participation, size of family, source of information, innovativeness, attitude of beneficiaries towards MGNREGA and awareness about MGNREGA were significant and has positive relationship with improved annual income of the beneficiaries due to the programme and only age became observed significant but have negative relationship with increased annual income of the beneficiaries, while cast and family type were found to have non-significant relationship with annual income. The findings of [11,13] have been in the same line with the present findings. It may be stated in the other phrases, which appear on all the chosen socio-economic characters explained as significant amount of variance in the scores of improved annual income due to the implementation of MGNREGA.

Table 3 shows the regression coefficients on socio-economic of the beneficiaries and their increased annual income due to the scheme. It is far know that regression co-efficient of education (24.055) and awareness about MGNREGA (12.320) have been significant at 1% level of significant, while family size (-1.608) became negatively significant with increased annual income because of the scheme at 5% level of significant.

Table 1. Distribution of the respondents according to their annual income accelerated because of the MGNREGA

Categories	Beneficiaries (300)			
	Before		After	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Low Income (<Rs 20,000)	180	60.00	16	5.33
Medium Income (Rs20,000-40,000)	102	34.00	204	68.00
High Income (>Rs40,000)	18	6.00	80	26.67
Total	300	100	300	100

Source: Primary data

3

The coefficient of multiple determinations (R^2) indicate that only 74.03 percent of the variation in the annual income accelerated due to the scheme which explain because of 10 selected independent variables. The exceedingly significant F-value reported the confirmation to the validity of R^2 (0.7403) worked out with the variables identified for the study.

The data given in Table 4 indicate that most of the beneficiaries were reported delay in wage payment(71.66%), people who wanted to work for 100 days (65.83%), people who do not get completed information related to programme (62.50%), administration at the block level lacks staff and internet facility (51.66), MGNREGA as a large scale corruption at all levels (44.66%), Social audit as very mechanical and only a routine (44.57%), knowledge of activities undertaken (38.43%), administration is the interference as middlemen in MGNREGA works (37.50%), knowledge about wage per day (33.76%), co-operation between educated and un-educated people (28.80%) and 26.43 percent asked to come another day.

The data given in Table 5 indicate that, majority of the beneficiaries recommended a given boost to boost transparency and accountability in the operation of MGNREGA(72.00%),an extra initiation and awareness given to the rural poor about the programme were reported by 66.00 percent . Most of the beneficiaries (63.00%) suggested that Government give significance to effective works .Training to the staff and beneficiaries under MGNREGA has been recommended by 66.00 percent. Proper monitoring and assessment have been 45.00 percent and improving the staff and strength in the program had been discovered rank VI.

Table 2. Correlation among socio-economic characters of the beneficiary and their annual income expanded

Sl. no.	Characteristics	Correlation coefficient (r)	t-value
1	Age	-0.2400*	-4.18
2	Education	0.4710**	9.10
3	Cast	0.1510	2.70
4	Type of family	0.1332	2.26
5	Size of family	0.2532*	4.51
6	Social participation	0.2861**	5.13
7	Source of information	0.2263*	4.02
8	Innovativeness	0.3411**	6.20
9	Attitude of beneficiaries towards MGNREGA	0.3301**	6.10
10	Awareness about MGNREGA	0.4770**	8.30

*Significant at 5%, **Significant at 1%*

Table 3. Regression analysis of socio-economic characters of the beneficiary and their annual income expanded

S. no.	Characteristics	Regression coefficient	Std. error of regression coefficient	Computed t-value
1	Age	0.86	0.35	0.85
2	Education	24.055**	1.760	13.619
3	Cast	0.351	1.282	0.273
4	Type of family	-0.045	0.242	0.185
5	Size of family	-1.608*	3.211	0.614
6	Social participation	0.677	3.032	0.223
7	Source of information	0.351	1.282	0.273
8	Innovativeness	1.305	1.561	0.836
9	Attitude of beneficiaries towards MGNREGA	0.900	0.890	1.011
10	Awareness about MGNREGA	12.320**	1.523	8.736

*R^2= 0.7403, F-value=3.86 with 10, **Significant at 1% level, *Significant at 5% level*

Table 4. Became aware of the issues faced by the beneficiaries in obtaining the advantage of the program (N=300)

Particulars	Beneficiaries	
	Percentage	Rank
Delays in wage payment	71.66	I
People do not get complete information related to scheme	62.50	III
Administration at the block level lacks staff and internet facility	51.66	IV
Administration is the interference as middlemen in MGNREGA works	37.50	VIII
MGNREGA as a large scale corruption at all levels	46.66	V
People wanted to work for 100 days	65.85	II
Social audit as very mechanical and only a routine	44.57	VI
There is no co-operation between educated and un-educated people	28.80	X
Knowledge about wage per day	33.76	IX
Knowledge of activities undertaken	38.43	VII
Asked to come another day	26.43	XI

Table 5. Suggestions for improvement of the programme (N=300)

Suggestions	Beneficiaries	
	Percentage	Rank
Government give significance to effective work	63.00	III
To Strengthen transparency and accountability in the operation of MGNREGA	72.00	I
Improving the staff strength in the programme	46.00	VI
Extra initiation and awareness should be given to the rural poor about this programme	66.00	II
Proper monitoring and assessment	45.00	V
Training to the staff and beneficiaries under MGNREGA	60.00	IV

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

It could be concluded that after the inclusion of beneficiaries under MGNREGA program their annual income increased in a significant manner. Out of ten independent variables, family and caste type were found to have the non-significant relationship with annual income. Delay in wage payment, people wanted to work for 100 days and people do not get complete information related to the program have been discovered as the foremost problem. To strengthen transparency and accountability within the operation of MGNREGA. Initiation and awareness should be given the rural poor about this program were determined the important suggestion in the study. Eventually or ultimately from this study, we can conclude that Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act is a flagship programme and it is really a boon for the rural poor.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Kurinjimalar R, Prasanna N. Impact of MGNREGP on poverty alleviation in Rural India: A Case study of two Districts in Tamil Nadu. Journal of Academia and Industrial Research. 2017;5(9):139-142.
2. Sarkar P, Kumar J, Supriya. Impact of MGNREGA improving socio-economic status of rural poor: A study in Burdwan district of west Bengal. Agricult. Econom. Res. Rev. 2011;24:437-448.
3. Chakraborty P. Implementation of employment guarantee: A primary appraisal. Economic and Political Weekly. 2007;42(7):548-551.
4. Pamecha S, Sharma I. Socio-economic Impact of MGNREGA-A study Undertaken among beneficiaries of 20 villages of Dungarpur District of Rajasthan. International J. of Scientific and Res. Publications. 2015;5(1):1-4.
5. Das TK. Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) as Social safety Net: Analysis of Public works in Odisa, India. Review of Economic

Perspectives-Narodohospodarsky Obzor. 2016;16(4):337-360.

6. Ahuja UR, Tyagi D, Chauhan S, Chaudhary KR. Impact of MGNREGA on Rural employment and migration: A study in agriculturally-backward and agriculturally-advanced Districts of Haryana. Agricultural Economics Research Revie. 2011;24:495-502.

7. Jorgensen TM. Implementing the MG National Rural Employment Guarantee Act in Rajasthan. University of Oslo; 2016.

8. Singh S, Negi RS, Dhanai R, Rahul MD. Socio-economic Impact of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA): A Case study in Pauri Garhwal District of Uttarakhand. Indian Journal of Social Research. 2017; 58(5):745-755.

9. Singh S, Negi RS. Impact of MGNREGA on poverty and ameliorate socio-economic status: A study in Pauri Garhwal District of Uttarakhand. Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociolog. 2017; 20(4):1-6.

10. Singh S, Negi RS, Dhanai R. Awareness about MGNREGA Provision: Some Facts from the District Pauri Garhwal Uttarakhand, India. International J. for Scientific Res. And Development. 2016; (4)6:747-750.

11. Mohanraj K, Karthikeyan C. Socio-economic impact on Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGA) on beneficiaries: A case study in Coimbatore District on Tamil Nadu. International J. of Exten. Education. 2015;8:77-82.

12. Deka T, Panda B. Employment generation and social capital formation: A study of the impact of MGNREGA in Assam. Int. J. of Rece. Scientific Res. 2015;6(11):7619-7626.

13. Jha R, Bhattacharyya S, Gaiha R, Shanker S. Capture of anti poverty programs: An analysis of the National Rural Employment Guarantee Program in India. Journal of Asia Economic. 2009;20(4):456-464.

_____