

Original Research Article

Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act and its Impact on Poverty Alleviation

Abstract:

Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act is a very vital device for combating unemployment and underemployment inside the rural areas and for attacking rural mass poverty and raising the rural terrible above the poverty line. The prevailing study changed into carried out in Pauri Garhwal district of Uttarakhand. The entire pattern for this look at consisted of 300 beneficiaries. Out of ten independent variables, family and cast type was found to have a non-significant relationship with annual income. The co-coefficient of multiple determinations (R^2) indicated that most effective 74.03 percentage of the variation in the growth in annual income of the respondents 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).

Keyphrases: Beneficiaries, Livelihood, MGNREGA, Poverty Alleviation, Variable

INTRODUCTION

Open work gives the way to handle destitution, enables minorities by being more comprehensive. The universe of work is changing more quickly than any time in recent memory. Decent work has provided people with a sense of dignity and opportunity to engage fully in the society [1]. The nature of work is a vital measurement of guaranteeing that work improves human advancement [2]. Putting work creation at the heart of financial arrangement denoting, the advancement arrangements will produce better than average work openings. It will likewise prompt comprehensive and destitution lessening development. it is a righteous circle that is useful for the economy and in addition the general population and it drives feasible improvement [3]. Security nets just piece of the more extensive methodology of neediness lessening. They associate with and work nearby the social protection, for example, wellbeing, instruction and budgetary administrations the arrangement of frameworks like street and different strategies which go for lessening destitution and overseeing dangers [9]. Security nets intend to redistribute pay to the poorest with a prompt effect on the neediness and disparity lessening [4]. They are exchanges focused on poor people.

Focusing on destitution through business period utilizing rustic works has had a long history in India that started in the 1960s. After the initial three many years of experimentation, the administration propelled real plans like JRY, EAS, FFW, JGSY and SGRY that were precursors to MGNREGA [10]. The subject of the administration approach has been to union old plans to present new ones while holding the essential goal of giving extra wage business including un-gifted manual work and furthermore to make solid resources. Developing the outline of the wage work projects to all the more viable battle destitution, the Focal Government detailed the National Country Business Ensure Act (MGNREGA) in 2005. Rather than the prior wage business programs, MGNREGA, according to its definition ensured work as a lawful right.

Objective of the Scheme

The objective of the Act is to enhance livelihood security in rustic zones by providing at least 100 days of guaranteed wage employment in a financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work.

MGNREGA Goals:

- Strong social protection net for the prone organization via presenting a fall lower back employment source, when different employment alternatives are scarce or insufficient.
- Growth engine for sustainable improvement of an agriculture economy system. Through the process of providing employment on works that cope with causes of chronic poverty including drought, deforestation and soil erosion. The act seeks to reinforce the natural resource base of rural livelihood and create long lasting assets in rural regions. Effectively implemented, NREGA has the capability to transform the geography of poverty.
- Empowerment of rural poor through the process of a based totally regulation.
- New ways of doing business, as a version of governance reform anchored at the standards of transparency and grass root democracy.

Implementation

With its legitimate structure and right based approach, MGNREGA gives work to the individuals who request it and is an outlook change from prior projects. Notified on September 7, 2005. 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.

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 [5][6][7].

MGNREGA was applied to district Pauri Garhwal in the third phase and the implementation of MGNREGA scheme in the district commenced on April 1, 2008[8].

Salient Features of the Act

1. Adult members of a rural household willing to do unskilled manual work may apply for enrollment in composing or orally to the nearby Gram Panchayat.
2. The Gram Panchayat after due check will issue a Job Card (JC). The Employment Card will bear the photo of every grown-up individual from the family unit willing to work under MGNEGA and is free of cost
3. The employment card should be issued within 15 days of application
4. A job card holder may present a written application for work to the Gram Panchayat expressing the time and span for which work is looked for. The base days of work must be no less than fourteen.
5. The Gram Panchayat (GP) will issue a dated receipt of the written application for work against which the certification of giving work inside 15 days works.
6. Employment will be given within 15 days of application for work; on the off chance that it is not then day by day unemployment remittance according to the Demonstration, must be paid risk of installment of unemployment recompense is of the States.
7. Work should be provided within 5 km radius of the village. In case work is furnished beyond 5 km, more wages of 10 percent are payable to meet extra transportation and dwelling fees.
8. Wages are to be paid in keeping with piece rate or day by day fee. Disbursement of wages has to be carried out on weekly basis and no longer beyond a fortnight anyhow.
9. At least one-third beneficiaries will be women who have registered and requested work underneath the act.

94 10. Worksite facilities such as crèche, drinking water, shade have to be provided.

95 11. The shelf of projects for a village could be advocated through the Gram Sabha and
96 authorised by means of the zilla panchayat.

97 12. As a minimum 50 percent of works can be allotted to Gram Panchayat for execution.

98 13. The Social audit must be completed by the Gram Sabha (GS).

99 14. Constrictors and use of labour displacing equipment are prohibited

100 **Permissible Work under the Scheme**

101 The goal of the MGNREGA is provided a primary employment guarantee in rural areas. The
102 act shows the form of works that may be taken up for this motive. The act stipulates the
103 permissible works are following[11]:

- 104 ➤ Water conservation and water harvesting
- 105 ➤ Drought proofing, including afforestation and tree plantation
- 106 ➤ Irrigation canals, including micro and minor irrigation works
- 107 ➤ Provision of irrigation facility, plantation , horticulture, land development
- 108 ➤ Renovation of traditional water bodies including de silting of tanks
- 109 ➤ Flood control and protection works, including drainage in waterlogged areas
- 110 ➤ Rural connectivity to provide all weather access.
- 111 ➤ Any other work that may be notified by the Central Government in consultation with the
112 State Government.

113 **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

114 The prevailing have a look at changed into conducted in Pauri Garhwal district. The
115 district includes 15 blocks. Out of those blocks, Kaljikhil block becomes decided on purposively
116 because of the most quantity of beneficiaries of MGNREGA in evaluation to every other block
117 of the district. From this block, 15 villages were selected purposively on the basis of the
118 maximum wide variety of beneficiaries. Then 20 beneficiaries of every village have been
119 selected randomly through using the simple random approach. Consequently, the total sample for
120 this has a look at consisted of three hundred beneficiaries. Data collection is based on primary
121 household-degree panel survey records from 2013–2015. Primary information had been collected
122 from the chosen beneficiaries the use of specially based interview agenda designed for the
123 observe purposes.

For statistical evaluation, the subsequent analytical techniques were used viz., percentages frequency average and regression evaluation tools had been used to investigate the statistics. Correlation and check are extensively utilized to discover the relationship between socio-personnel trails

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The distribution of beneficiary's according to the effect of MGNREGA on annual income and economic improvement has been to be had in table 1. The data indicate that in case of before implementation of MGNREGA programme, maximum of the beneficiary (66.00%) belonged to low income earning group (< Rs 20,000) followed by 34.00 percent of them medium income group (Rs 20,000 to Rs 40,000) and 6.00 percent of them in high-income group (> `40,000) beneficiaries.

While, after the implementation of MGNREGA, a better percentage of the beneficiary (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 they belonged to low income earning group (< Rs20,000).

The finding of [12][13] had been inside the identical of the prevailling finding. [14] additionally support the existing finding reporting that MGNREGA also 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's far understood from the information said 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 was became observed significant but 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 [13] [15] have been inside the same line of the present findings. It may be stated in other phrases that appear on all the chosen socio-personal

taints explained a significant amount of variance in the scores of improved annual income due to the implementation of MGNREGA.

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 (<`20,000)	180	60.00	16	5.33
Medium Income (`20,000-40,000)	102	34.00	204	68.00
High Income (> 40,000)	18	6.00	80	26.67
Total	300	100	300	100

Table 3 shows the regression coefficients among decided on socio personal traits of the beneficiary and their increased annual income due to the scheme. It's far found 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.

The coefficient of multiple determinations (R^2) indicated that only 74.03 percent of the variation in the annual income accelerated due to the scheme will be explained 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.

Table 2- Correlation among socio-personnel trails of the beneficiary and their annual income expanded because of the program

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-personal traits of the beneficiary and their annual income expanded because of the program

Sl. 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

The data presented in table 4 indicate that most of the beneficiaries (71.66%) reported the delay in wage payment, accompanied by the people wanted to paintings for a 100 days (65.83%), people do not get completed information related to programme (62.50%), administration at the block level lacks staff and internet facility (51.66), MGNREGA is the huge scale corruption at all levels (44.66%), Social audit has become very mechanical and only a routine (44.57%), knowledge of activities undertaken (38.43%), administration is the interference of the middlemen in MGNREGA works (37.50%), knowledge about wage per day (33.76%), there is

no co-operation between educated and un-educated people (28.80) and 26.43 percent asked to come another day.

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 of the middlemen in MGNREGA works	37.50	VIII
MGNREGA is the large scale corruption at all levels	46.66	V
People wanted to work for 100 days	65.85	II
Social audit has become 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

The data show in table 5 indicated that majority of the (72.00 %) beneficiaries recommended that given a boost to boost transparency and accountability in the operation of MGNREGA, extra initiation and awareness should be delivery of the rural poor about the programme were reported by 66.00 percent of the beneficiaries. Most of the beneficiaries (63.00%) suggested that Government delivers 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 VI rank.

197

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

Suggestions	Beneficiaries	
	Percentage	Rank
Government deliver 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 delivery of 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

198

199 CONCLUSION

200 It could be concluded that after the inclusion of beneficiaries under MGNREGA program
 201 their annual income increased in a significant manner. Out of ten independent variables, family
 202 and caste type were found to have the non significant relationship with annual income. Delay in
 203 wage payment, people wanted to work for 100 days and people do not get complete information
 204 related to the program have been discovered the foremost problem. To strengthen transparency
 205 and accountability within the operation of MGNREGA, and initiation and awareness should be
 206 given the rural poor about this program were determined the important suggestion in the study.

207

208 REFERENCE

- 209 1. Das, T. K., (2016). Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act
 210 (MGNREGA) as Social safety Net: Analysis of Public works in Odisha, India. Review of
 211 Economic Perspectives- Narodohospodarsky Obzor Vol. 16(4):337-360.
- 212 2. United Nations Development Program (UNDP) (2015). Human Development Report:
 213 Work for Human Development, New York. 1-272.
- 214 3. UNDP, (2016). The eighth goal of the new 2030 agenda for Sustainable Development
 215 Goals (SDG) calls for the promotion of sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic
 216 growth, full and production employment and decent work.

- 217 4. Grosh, M.C, D., Ninno, E. Tesliuc and A. Ouerghi. (2008). For Protection and
218 Promotion: The Design and Implementation of Effective Safety Nets. Chapter 5: Benefit
219 Levels and Delivery Mechanisms and Chapter 7: Understanding common Interventions,
220 World Bank.
- 221 5. Singh, S., Negi, R.S., Dhanai, R., and M.K. Parmar (2015). Performance of MGNREGA
222 to Poverty Reduction: Study in Pauri Garhwal District. International J. for Innovative
223 Res. In Sci. and Technology, Vol 1(7): 257-260.
- 224 6. Singh, S., Negi, R.S., and R., Dhanai (2016). Awareness about MGNREGA Provision:
225 Some Facts From the District Pauri Garhwal Uttarakhand,India, International J. for
226 Scientific Res. And Development, Vol (4)6: 747-750.
- 227 7. Singh, S., Negi, R.S., (2017). Impact of MGNREGA on Poverty and Ameliorate Socio-
228 economic Status: A Study in Pauri Garhwal District of Uttarakhand, *Asian Journal of*
229 *Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology* 20(4): 1-6
- 230 8. Singh, S., Negi, R.S., R., Dhanai and Rahul, MD, (2017). Socio-economic Impact of
231 Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA): A Case study
232 in Pauri Garhwal District of Uttarakhand, Indian Journal of Social Research Vol.58 (5),
233 pp:745-755
- 234 9. Deka, T., and B., Panda (2015). Employment Genereation and Social Capital Formation:
235 A study of the Impact of MGNREGA in Assam. Int. J. of Rece.) Scientific Res., vol 6
236 (11) 7619-7626.
- 237 10. Himanshu (2007). Recent trends in poverty and inequality: Some preliminary results.
238 Economic and Political Weekly, 42(6): 497-509.
- 239 11. Jha, R., Gaiha R., and pandey M. (2012). Net transfer benefits under India's rural
240 employment guarantee scheme. Journal of Policy Modeling 34(2):296-311.
- 241 12. Bebarta, P.K., (2013). Impact on MGNREGA in the Lives of Traibal People: A Study on
242 Rayagad Block in Gajapati District. Odisha Review (Feb-March), 62-6.
- 243 13. Mohanraj, K., and C., Karthikeyan (2015). Socio-economic Impact on Mahatma Gandhi
244 National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGA) on Beneficiaries: A Case
245 study in Coimbatore District on Tamil Nadu, International J. of Exten. Education, vol. 8:
246 77-82.

- 247 14. Jha, R., Bhattacharyya S., Gaiha R., and Shanker S. (2009). Capture of anti poverty
248 programs: An analysis of the National Rural Employment Guarantee Program in India.
249 Journal of Asia Economic, 20(4); 456-464.
- 250 15. Pamecha, S., and I Sharma, (2015). Socio-economic Impact of MGNREGA – A study
251 Undertaken among Beneficiaries of 20 Villages of Dungarpur District of Rajasthan.
252 International J. of Scientific and Res.Publications, Vol 5(1): 1-4.