

PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS TOWARDS EXPERIENCE WITH MGNREG SCHEME

B.Vasanth Kumar, Research Scholar in PhD, Dept. of Sociology and Social Work, Acharya Nagarjuna University, Guntur.

Dr.M.Harsha Preetham Dev Kumar, Assistant Professor, Dept. of Social Work, Acharya Nagarjuna University, Ongole Campus, Ongole.

Abstract

The Government of India has initiated various employment generation programmes self-employment and wage employment programmes since independence. The wage-employment programmes generate employment, infrastructure and social capital. Evaluation of these programmes is another very significant component to achieve the laid down objectives. Further, these wage employment programmes must be need based and cost effective to improve the life of rural people, especially poor families. A few important wage employment programmes launched by the Government of India are Food for Work Programme (FWP); National Rural Employment Programme (NREP) Etc.

Key words : Employment, Programme, Omprove, Poverty etc.

The main objective of the MGNREGS is not only to reduce rural poverty and unemployment but also to develop the livelihood security by generating wage employment for developing durable assets to the community for reducing distress migration. For the first time in India, the promotion of social security measures under the scheme made the rural people right to work, was concerned as the fundamental right, through this scheme, the government aims at removing poverty in rural areas. The scheme also largely facilitates social inclusion and empowerment to the deprived classes. The main provisions of the scheme are providing employment, promoting empowerment and payment of wages and socio economic development of the poor. Moreover, this programme created better environment for the male and female workers for effective participation in works relating to MGNREGS.

1. To study the socio-economic conditions of Scheduled Castes community in the selected villages.
2. To appraise the perceptions of the respondents on the performance of MGNREGS in the study area.

The present study has been adopted descriptive research design to explain the socio-economic conditions and assess perceptions towards experience of MGNREGS.

The study adopts multi-stage random sampling method to select the sample units in YSR Kadapa district in Rayalaseema region of AP. The YSR Kadapa district was selected purposefully based on the incidence of poverty. Basing on the study was initiated by the State Planning Department, Government of Andhra Pradesh.

The study covers three Revenue Divisions, three Mandal Parishads choosing one Mandal Parishad from each selected Revenue Division of YSR Kadapa District, 9 Gram Panchayats choosing 3 Gram Panchayats from each selected Mandal Parishad and 30 respondents from each selected Gram Panchayaths. From each selected Gram Panchayaths, 30 respondents were chosen randomly as third stage units of sampling as respondents comprising the last stage. Thus, the sample MGNREGS workers covered by the study are 270.

Table-1:

Awareness before join in MGNREGS Vs. Place of Residence

Place of Residence	Are You aware of the MGNREGS before you join		Total
	Yes	No	
Duvvur	48	42	90
	53.3%	46.7%	100.0%
Kalasapadu	47	43	90
	52.2%	47.8%	100.0%
Ramapuram	48	42	90
	53.3%	46.7%	100.0%
Total	143	127	270
	53.0%	47.0%	100.0%

$\chi^2=0.030$, $df=2$, $P < 0.985$, Not Significant at 0.01 level

The table 1 reveals that aware of the provisions of MGNREGA before joining, of the total 270 respondents, 53.0 per cent respondents said that they know the provisions of MGNREGA and 47.0 per cent respondents said that they did not know the provisions of MGNREGA.

In Duvvur mandal, of the total 90 respondents, 53.3 per cent respondents said that they know the provisions of MGNREGA and 46.7 per cent respondents said that they did not know the provisions of MGNREGA.

In Kalasapadu mandal, of the total 90 respondents, 52.2 per cent respondents said that they know the provisions of MGNREGA and 47.8 per cent respondents said that they did not know the provisions of MGNREGA.

In Ramapuram mandal, of the total 90 respondents, 53.3 per cent respondents said that they know the provisions of MGNREGA and 46.7 per cent respondents said that they did not know the provisions of MGNREGA.

Thus, it is observed that the enactment of MGNREG Act many beneficiaries are unaware of its provisions before joining. A good number of the respondents, i.e. 47.0 per cent said that they did not know the provisions of MGNREGA. However, majority of the beneficiaries are aware of the provisions of the Act.

The chi-square table indicates that the relationship between place of residence and Awareness before join in MGNREGS. There is no difference of perceptions by mandal wise (place of residence) on Awareness before join in MGNREGS ($P= 0.985$) at 0.01 levels.

Table-2: Motivated to join in MGNREGS Vs. Place of Residence

Place of Residence	Who encouraged you to join MGNREGS				Total
	Friends & Relatives	NGOs	Village leaders	Self-Motivation	
Duvvur	15	22	27	26	90
	16.7%	24.4%	30.0%	28.9%	100.0%

Kalasapadu	21	20	27	22	90
	23.3%	22.2%	30.0%	24.4%	100.0%
Ramapuram	17	22	26	25	90
	18.9%	24.4%	28.9%	27.8%	100.0%
Total	53	64	80	73	270
	19.6%	23.7%	29.6%	27.0%	100.0%

$\chi^2=1.563$, $df=6$, $P < 0.955$, Not Significant at 0.01 level

Motivation is the dynamic force in mobilizing people towards a particular activity. Several factors particularly Officials, Non-officials. Office of the MPDO, Field Assistants, Village Leaders. Friends and Relatives, Self-Motivation have encouraged the people relating to their families to join as member of MGNREGS to get the benefits. The table 6.3 shows that 29.6 per cent of them encouraged by village leaders followed by 23.7 per cent are NGOs encouraged and 27.0 per cent in self-motivation remaining 19.6 per cent are encouraged friends and relatives.

In Duvvur mandal, of the total 90 respondents, 16.7 per cent respondents said that they encouraged by their friends and relatives and 24.4 per cent respondents said that they encourage by NGOs and 30.0 per cent respondents said that they encourage by village leaders and 28.9 per cent respondents said that they joined by their self motivation in the MGNREGS.

In Kalasapadu mandal, of the total 90 respondents, 23.3 per cent respondents said that they encouraged by their friends and relatives and 22.2 per cent respondents said that they encourage by NGOs and 30.0 per cent respondents said that they encourage by village leaders and 24.4 per cent respondents said that they joined by their self motivation in the MGNREGS.

In Ramapuram mandal, of the total 90 respondents, 18.9 per cent respondents said that they encouraged by their friends and relatives and 24.4 per cent respondents said that they encourage by NGOs and 28.9 per cent respondents said that they encourage by village leaders and 27.8 per cent respondents said that they joined by their self motivation in the MGNREGS.

The chi-square table indicates that the relationship between place of residence and Motivated to join in MGNREGS. There is no difference of perceptions by mandal wise (place of residence) on Motivated to join in MGNREGS ($P= 0.955$) at 0.01 levels.

Table-3: Reasons to join this MGNREG Scheme Vs. Place of Residence

Place of Residence	Reasons to join this MGNREG Scheme				Total
	Assured work days	Improve irrigation source	Due to drought condition	To develop own land	
Duvvur	15	23	27	25	90
	16.7%	25.6%	30.0%	27.8%	100.0%
Kalasapadu	12	16	33	29	90
	13.3%	17.8%	36.7%	32.2%	100.0%
Ramapuram	15	19	30	26	90
	16.7%	21.1%	33.3%	28.9%	100.0%
Total	42	58	90	80	270
	15.6%	21.5%	33.3%	29.6%	100.0%

$\chi^2=2.629$, $df=6$, $P < 0.854$, Not Significant at 0.01 level

MGNREGS is a voluntary and grassroots level programme for meeting requirement of the rural poor for their social security. The scheme makes economic and social advancement through participation in the programme. In this context, the respondents were asked to explain "the reasons for joining as MGNREGS beneficiary and the responses received are presented in table. It is indicated that 15.6 per cent of the respondents joined for assured work days followed by 21.5 per cent joined for improve irrigational sources. About 33.3 per cent joined due to drought conditions and 29.6 per cent joined for to develop their own land under this scheme.

In Duvvur mandal, of the total 90 respondents, 16.7 per cent respondents expressed that they joined in MGNREGA for assured work days of employment and 25.6 per cent respondents expressed that they joined in MGNREGA for improve irrigational sources. About 30.0 per cent expressed that they joined in MGNREGA due to drought conditions and 27.8 per cent expressed that they joined for develop their own land.

In Kalasapadu mandal, of the total 90 respondents, 13.3 per cent respondents expressed that they joined in MGNREGA for assured work days of employment and 17.8 per cent respondents expressed that they joined in MGNREGA for improve irrigational sources. About 36.7 per cent expressed that they joined in MGNREGA due to drought conditions and 32.2 per cent expressed that they joined for develop their own land.

In Ramapuram mandal, of the total 90 respondents, 16.7 per cent respondents expressed that they joined in MGNREGA for assured work days of employment and 21.1 per cent respondents expressed that they joined in MGNREGA for improve irrigational sources. About 33.3 per cent expressed that they they joined in MGNREGA due to drought conditions and 28.9 per cent expressed that they joined for develop their own land.

The study shows the results of the Chi-square test that there is no significant difference between place of residence and Reasons to join this MGNREG Scheme ($P= 0.854$) at 0.01 levels. The results show that there is no statistically significant difference in Reasons to join this MGNREG Scheme by their place of residence.

Table-4: Face any problems in getting the job card Vs. Place of Residence

Place of Residence	Do you face any problems in getting the job card		Total
	Yes	No	
Duvvur	8	82	90
	8.9%	91.1%	100.0%
Kalasapadu	11	79	90
	12.2%	87.8%	100.0%
Ramapuram	4	86	90
	4.4%	95.6%	100.0%
Total	23	247	270
	8.5%	91.5%	100.0%

$\chi^2=3.517$, $df=2$, $P < 0.172$, Not Significant at 0.01 level

The researcher asked whether they faced any problem in getting the job card, of the total 270 respondents, 8.5 per cent respondents faced problems in getting the job card and 91.5 per cent respondents did not face any problem in getting the job card.

In Duvvur mandal, of the total 90 respondents, 8.9 per cent respondents faced problems in getting the job card and 91.1 per cent respondents did not face any problem in getting the job card.

In Kalasapadu mandal, of the total 90 respondents, 12.2 per cent respondents faced problems in getting the job card and 87.8 per cent respondents did not face any problem in getting the job card.

In Ramapuram, of the total 90 respondents, 4.4 per cent respondents faced problems in getting the job card and 95.6 per cent respondents did not face any problem in getting the job card.

Thus, most of the respondents i.e., 91.5 per cent respondents did not face any problem in getting the job card.

The study shows the results of the Chi-square test that there is significant difference between place of residence and Face any problems in getting the job card ($P= 0.172$) at 0.01 levels. The results show that there is no statistically significant difference in Face any problems in getting the job card by their place of residence.

Table-5: Pay any price for obtain job card Vs. Place of Residence

Place of Residence	Do you pay any price (bribe) for obtaining the job card		Total
	Yes	No	
Duvvur	7	83	90
	7.8%	92.2%	100.0%
Kalasapadu	4	86	90
	4.4%	95.6%	100.0%
Ramapuram	2	88	90
	2.2%	97.8%	100.0%
Total	13	257	270
	4.8%	95.2%	100.0%

$\chi^2=3.071$, $df=2$, $P < 0.215$, Not Significant at 0.01 level

The respondents were asked whether they paid any money (bribe) for obtaining job card. Of the total 270 respondents, 4.8 per cent respondents paid money for obtaining job card and, 95.2 per cent respondents did not pay any money for obtaining job card.

In Duvvur mandal, of the total 90 respondents, 7.8 per cent respondents paid money in getting the job card and 92.2 per cent respondents did not pay money in getting the job card.

In Kalasapadu mandal, of the total 90 respondents, 4.4 per cent respondents paid money in getting the job card and 95.6 per cent respondents did not pay money in getting the job card.

In Ramapuram, of the total 90 respondents, 2.2 per cent respondents paid money in getting the job card and 97.8 per cent respondents did not pay money in getting the job card.

Thus, 95.2 per cent respondents did not pay any money for obtaining job card, and only 4.8 per cent respondents paid money.

The chi-square table indicates that the relationship between place of residence and Pay any price for obtain job card. There is no difference of perceptions by mandal wise (place of residence) on Pay any price for obtain job card ($P= 0.215$) at 0.01 levels.

Table-6: Time taken for providing employment Vs. Place of Residence

Place of Residence	How much time taken for providing employment under MGNREGS		Total
	7 - 10 days	11 - 15 days	
Duvvur	70	20	90
	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%
Kalasapadu	68	22	90
	75.6%	24.4%	100.0%
Ramapuram	70	20	90
	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%
Total	208	62	270
	77.0%	23.0%	100.0%

$\chi^2=0.167$, $df=2$, $P < 0.920$, Not Significant at 0.01 level

According to MGNREG Act a registered worker shall be provided with work with in fifteen days. When asked how much time has taken for providing work under MGNREGS, of the total 270 respondents, 77.0 per cent respondents work was provided with 7 to 10 days, 23.0 per cent respondents work was provided with in 11 to 15 days.

In Duvvur mandal, of the total 90 respondents, 77.8 per cent respondents said that work was provided with in 7 to 10 days, 22.2 per cent respondents said that work was provided with in 11 to 15 days.

In Kalasapadu mandal, of the total 90 respondents, 75.6 per cent respondents said that work was provided with in 7 to 10 days, 24.4 per cent respondents said that work was provided with in 11 to 15 days.

In Ramapuram mandal, of the total 90 respondents, 77.8 per cent respondents said that work was provided with in 7 to 10 days, 22.2 per cent respondents said that work was provided with in 11 to 15 days.

The chi-square table indicates that the relationship between place of residence and Time taken for providing employment. There is no difference of perceptions by mandal wise (place of residence) on Time taken for providing employment ($P= 0.920$) at 0.01 levels.

Table-7: Types of works are undertaken in MGNREGS Vs. Place of Residence

Sl.No	Statement	Yes	No	Total N=270
1	Water Conservation	88.9	11.1	100.0
2	Digging and Carrying Earth	94.8	5.2	100.0
3	Drought Proofing	87.8	12.2	100.0
4	Rural connectivity (Roads)	98.5	1.5	100.0

5	Land development	95.6	4.4	100.0
6	Farm Ponds	64.1	35.9	100.0
7	Works on lands of SC/ST/BPL/SMF	95.9	4.1	100.0
An average total percentage		89.4	10.6	100.0

The types of work offered under MGNREGS, the table 7 revealed that the type of work was provided to them. Further, 88.9 per cent of the respondents have undertaken the water conservation and water harvesting work, 94.8 per cent of respondents participated in digging and carrying earth work in the ponds and canals, 87.8 per cent of respondents are being provided drought proofing work, 98.5 per cent of the respondents have undertaken rural connectivity works of laying roads, 95.6 per cent of the respondents involved in land development works, 64.1 per cent are being provided from ponds work, 95.6 per cent of the respondents have undertaken the works on lands of SC/ST/ Small margin farmers and BPL families.

The overall the majority (89.4 per cent) have undertaken the different types of works under MGNREG scheme for development the rural areas. Whereas, 10.6 per cent are not taken different types of works.

**The ANOVAs Descriptive table -8:
Types of works undertaken in MGNREGS Vs. Sex**

Statement	Sex	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F Value	P Value
Water Conservation	Male	251	1.1076	.31046	.450	.503
	Female	19	1.1579	.37463		
	Total	270	1.1111	.31485		
Digging and Carrying Earth	Male	251	1.0518	.22205	.000	.987
	Female	19	1.0526	.22942		
	Total	270	1.0519	.22214		
Drought Proofing	Male	251	1.1235	.32967	.054	.816
	Female	19	1.1053	.31530		
	Total	270	1.1222	.32815		
Rural connectivity - Roads	Male	251	1.0159	.12548	.305	.581
	Female	19	1.0000	.00000		
	Total	270	1.0148	.12104		
Land development	Male	251	1.0438	.20511	.032	.858
	Female	19	1.0526	.22942		
	Total	270	1.0444	.20646		
Farm Ponds	Male	251	1.3625	.48170	.167	.683
	Female	19	1.3158	.47757		
	Total	270	1.3593	.48067		
Works on lands of	Male	251	1.0359	.18630	2.179	.141

SC/ST/BPL/SMF	Female	19	1.1053	.31530		
	Total	270	1.0407	.19806		

ANOVA descriptive table 8 discussed to find whether there is any significant difference between Types of works undertaken in MGNREGS by their sex. The ANOVA table shows that the Water Conservation $F=0.450$ and $P=0.503$, Digging and Carrying Earth $F=0.000$ and $P=0.987$, Drought Proofing $F=0.054$ and $P=0.816$, Rural connectivity $F=0.305$ and $P=0.581$, Land development $F=0.032$ and $P=0.858$, Farm Ponds $F=0.167$ and $P=0.683$ and Works on lands of SC/ST/BPL/SMF $F=2.179$ and $P=0.141$. It is inferred that there is no significant impact among male and female on Types of works undertaken in MGNREGS at 0.01 level.

Conclusions:

It can be concluded that MGNREGS is a good scheme with a very high potential to solve the problem of poverty among the people of rural areas mainly among the unprivileged sections of population like Scheduled Caste population in India.

References:

1. Government of India (GoI) (2013). The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act 2005 (NREGA), Operational Guidelines 2013 (4th edition). New Delhi: Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India. Holden
2. Reddy, N. D., Reddy, A. A., & Nagaraj, N. (2014, August). The Impact of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) on Rural Labor Markets and Agriculture. India Review Vol. 13, Iss.3.
3. Singh, T. B. (2014). An Impact Studies of MGNREGS in Thoubal District(A Case Study of Three Villages). CSSEIP, Manipur University, Working Paper, Vol.005, December 2015.
4. Thorat, S., & Katherine, N. (2010). Block By Caste : Economic Discrimination in Modern India. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.