A STUDY ON IMPACT OF MAHATMA GANDHI NATIONAL RURAL EMPLOYMENT GUARANTEE SCHEME IN THE EMPOWERMENT OF SCHEDULED CASTE COMMUNITY

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

Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) seeks to enhance the livelihood security of the households in rural areas of the country by providing at least 100 days of guaranteed wage employment in every financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work.

Employment is fundamental pre-requisite to raise per capita income and eradicate household poverty. Poor employment opportunity is one of the key reasons for the endurance of poverty in India. After independence and particularly from the Fifth Five Year Plan onwards, Government of India has initiated several rural development programmes for raising rural employment for the alleviation of rural poverty. National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) is one amongst them.

The impact of MGNREGS on rural poor in changing the quality of life of the MGNREGS beneficiaries. Hence, an attempt is made to know the attitude of the SC beneficiaries towards the impact of MGNREGS in the process of empowerment and overall development of the SC community.

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:

MGNREGS and Change in the Living Conditions

Sl.No	Statement	Yes	No	Total N=270
1	Clearing debts	76.7	23.3	100.0
2	Providing food security	75.6	24.4	100.0
3	Improve of Live stock	55.2	44.8	100.0
4	Helping children education	59.6	40.4	100.0
5	Improved health and nutrition	66.7	33.3	100.0
6	Purchased home needs	68.1	31.9	100.0
7	Maintaining vehicles/Bike	14.1	85.9	100.0
8	Migration decreased	64.1	35.9	100.0
An average total percentage		**60.0**	**40.0**	**100.0**

It is observed that due to implementation of MGNREGS, significant changes have been taken place in the living conditions of the rural people. About 76.7 per cent of the respondents agreed that they cleared the debts after joining in the MGNREGS, 75.6 per cent of the respondents agreed that they have been Providing food securityafter joining in the MGNREGS, 55.2 per cent of the respondents agreed that they have been Improved Live stock after joining in the MGNREGS, 59.6 per cent of the respondents agreed that it has been helping children education after joining in the MGNREGS, 66.7 per cent of the respondents agreed that they have been Improved health and nutrition after joining in the MGNREGS, 68.1 per cent of the respondents agreed that they have been purchased home needs after joining in the MGNREGS, 14.1 per cent of the respondents agreed that they have been maintaining bike after joining in the MGNREGS, 64.1 per cent of the respondents agreed that migration has been decreased after joining in the MGNREGS.

An overall average percentage 60.0 per cent of the respondents agreed that they change their living conditions after joining of the MGNREGS and 40.0 per cent are not agreed that change their living conditions.

ANOVAs Descriptive table-2:

Ho: There is no significant difference of living conditions among male and female after joining in MGNREGS.

MGNREGS and Change in the Living Conditions Vs. Sex

Statement	Sex	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F Value	P Value
Clearing debts	Male	251	1.2231	.41716	2.086	.150
	Female	19	1.3684	.49559		
	Total	270	1.2333	.42374		
Providing food security	Male	251	1.2430	.42977	.038	.845
	Female	19	1.2632	.45241		
	Total	270	1.2444	.43056		
Improve of Livestock	Male	251	1.4343	.49665	2.789	.096
	Female	19	1.6316	.49559		
	Total	270	1.4481	.49823		
Helping children	Male	251	1.3904	.48882	2.613	.107

Statement		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	P
education	Female	19	1.5789	.50726		
	Total	270	1.4037	.49155		
Maintaining vehicles/Bike	Male	251	1.8645	.34290	.819	.366
	Female	19	1.7895	.41885		
	Total	270	1.8593	.34840		
Improved health and nutrition	Male	251	1.3426	.47554	1.384	.240
	Female	19	1.2105	.41885		
	Total	270	1.3333	.47228		
Purchased home needs	Male	251	1.3187	.46691	.001	.979
	Female	19	1.3158	.47757		
	Total	270	1.3185	.46677		
Migration decreased	Male	251	1.3625	.48170	.167	.683
	Female	19	1.3158	.47757		
	Total	270	1.3593	.48067		

The descriptive Anova's table 2 portrays Changes of Living Conditions after joining in MGNREGS by their sex.The ANOVA table shows the summary on Clearing debts(P=0.150), Providing food security (P=0.845), Improve of Livestock (P=0.096), Helping children education (P=0.107), Maintaining Bike(P=0.366), Improved health and nutrition(P=0.240), Purchased home needs(P=0.979), and Migration decreased(P=0.683) revealed that male and female opinions are same and mean and standard deviation scores are very similar. Hence, there is no statistical difference change of living conditions after joining in MGNREGS among the male and female at 0.05 level. Hence, there the null hypothesis was accepted and the research hypothesis was rejected.

Table -3: Cooking amenities acquired after joining the MGNREGS

Sl.No	Statement	Yes	No	Total N=270
1	LPG	40.0	60.0	100.0
2	Mixer grinder	25.9	74.1	100.0
3	Cooker	19.3	80.7	100.0
An average total percentage		**28.4**	**71.6**	**100.0**

The table 3 shows that type of fuel the respondents used for cooking after joining in MGNREGS. About 40.0 per cent of the respondents acquired LPG connections in the place of firewood after implementation of the MGNREGS, 25.9 per cent acquired Mixer Grinders after joining in MGNREGS and 19.3 per cent of the respondents acquired the utensils of the cooker after implementation of the MGNREGS.

An overall average total percentage, 28.4 per cent of the respondents acquired the cooking amenities after implementation of the MGNREGS and 71.6 per cent are not acquired any cooking material.

ANOVs Descriptive Table -4:

Cooking amenities acquired after joining the MGNREGS Vs. Marital status

Statement	Marital status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F Value	P Value
LPG	Married	266	1.5940	.49201	2.714	.101
	Un married	4	2.0000	.00000		
	Total	270	1.6000	.49081		

		Married	266	1.7406	.43913		
Mixer grinder		Un married	4	1.7500	.50000	.002	.966
		Total	270	1.7407	.43904		
cooker		Married	266	1.8045	.39732		
		Un married	4	2.0000	.00000	.965	.327
		Total	270	1.8074	.39507		

The ANOVA test has been applied to find whether there is any significant difference between Cooking amenities acquired after joining the MGNREGS by their marital status. The descriptive table 4 displays the sample size, mean, standard deviation, F value and P value. The study shows the results of LPG F value (2.714), P Value (0.101), Mixer grinderF value (0.002), P Value (0.966), CookerF value (0.965), P Value (0.327), and its corresponding all P-values are not significant at 0.01 levels. The results show that there are no significant difference by acquiring cooking amenities among married and unmarried respondents.

Table -5: Savings after joining in MGNREGS

Sl.No	Statement	Yes	No	Total N=270
1	SHG	76.7	23.3	100.0
2	Banks	27.0	73.0	100.0
3	Post office	35.2	64.8	100.0
An average total percentage		**46.3**	**53.7**	**100.0**

The table revealed the savings of the respondents after joining in MGNREGS. As regards to savings 76.7 per cent of the respondents saving money in Self Help Groups (SHG) become a member in the SHG after joining in MGREGS, 27.0 per cent of the respondents saving money in Nationalised Banks, 35.2 per cent of the respondents are saving money in the post office after joining in the MGNREGS.

An overall average total percentage, 46.3 per cent of the respondents saving money in different sources after joining in the MGNREGS and 53.7 per cent are not saving any amount of money after joining in MGNREGS.

ANOVs Descriptive Table -6:

Savings after joining in MGNREGS Vs. Occupation

Statement	Occupation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F Value	P Value
SHG	Cultivation	57	1.3333	.47559	1.587	.178
	Agriculture Labour	130	1.2231	.41792		
	Wage labour	60	1.2167	.41545		
	Rural artisan	19	1.1053	.31530		
	Any other	4	1.0000	.00000		
	Total	270	1.2333	.42374		
Banks	Cultivation	57	1.8772	.33113	16.129	.000
	Agriculture Labour	130	1.8308	.37641		
	Wage labour	60	1.5667	.49972		
	Rural artisan	19	1.2632	.45241		
	Any other	4	1.0000	.00000		
	Total	270	1.7296	.44498		
Post	Cultivation	57	1.6140	.49115	1.691	.152

office	Agriculture Labour	130	1.6538	.47758		
	Wage labour	60	1.5833	.49717		
	Rural artisan	19	1.8421	.37463		
	Any other	4	2.0000	.00000		
	Total	270	1.6481	.47843		

ANOVA test has been applied to find whether there is any significant difference between Savings after joining in MGNREGS and occupation. The ANOVA table shows that the calculated F value and P values. Self Help Groups (SHGs) F=1.587 and P=0.178, Post office F=1.691, P=0.152 and there is any impact of occupation wise categories. So, it is inferred that there is no impact of occupation by saving money at 0.01 level.

Savings after joining in MGNREGS, the respondents saves money in bank by their occupation the F value is 16.129 and P value is 0.000 and there is impact of occupation on their saving in bank at 0.01 level.

Table -7: Credit Loans after joining in MGNREGS

Sl.No	Statement	Yes	No	Total N=270
1	SHG	83.7	16.3	100.0
2	Banks	12.6	87.4	100.0
3	Money lender	31.5	68.5	100.0
4	Friends	31.1	68.9	100.0
An average total percentage		**39.7**	**60.3**	**100.0**

It can be observed from the table credit of the respondents after joining in MGNREGS. According to credits 83.7 per cent of the respondents taking loans from Self Help Groups (SHG) become a member in the SHG after joining in MGREGS, 12.6 per cent of the respondents taking loans in Nationalised Banks, only 31.5 per cent of the respondents are taking loan from money lenders after joining in the MGNREGS.

An overall average total percentage, 39.7 per cent of the respondents credits are improved in SHG and banks whereas, credits loans are decreased from money lenders after joining in the MGNREGS and 60.3 per cent are not taking any credit loans after joining in MGNREGS.

ANOVs Descriptive Table -8:

Credit Loans after joining in MGNREGS Vs. Education

Statement	Education	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F Value	P Value
SHG	Illiterate	129	1.0465	.21141	24.427	.000
	Primary	78	1.3462	.47882		
	Secondary	41	1.0000	.00000		
	Inter & above	22	1.5000	.51177		
	Total	270	1.1630	.37002		
Banks	Illiterate	129	1.8450	.36335	2.585	.054
	Primary	78	1.9231	.26819		
	Secondary	41	1.8049	.40122		
	Inter & above	22	2.0000	.00000		

	Total	270	1.8741	.33238		
Money lender	Illiterate	129	1.4186	.49525	8.448	.000
	Primary	78	1.1282	.33648		
	Secondary	41	1.2439	.43477		
	Inter & above	22	1.5000	.51177		
	Total	270	1.3148	.46530		
Friends	Illiterate	129	1.7287	.44637	.655	.581
	Primary	78	1.6538	.47882		
	Secondary	41	1.6341	.48765		
	Inter & above	22	1.6818	.47673		
	Total	270	1.6889	.46381		

ANOVA test has been applied to find whether there is any significant difference between credit of loans by their education. The ANOVA table shows that the calculated F value and P values. FriendsF=0.655 and P=0.581, So, it is inferred that there is no impact of education by taking loans from friends at 0.05 level.

The ANOVA table shows that the calculated F value and P values. SHG F=24.427 and P=0.000, Bank F=2.585, P= 0.054 and Money lender F=8.448, P= 0.000 So, it is inferred that there is impact of education by taking loans at 0.05 level.

Table -9: Income before and after joining in MGNREGS

Income before joining in MGNREGS				After Joining in MGNREGS	
Sl.No	Income	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	< - 10000	21	7.8	2	.7
2	10001 - 20000	62	23.0	14	5.2
3	20001 - 30000	140	51.9	33	12.2
4	30001 - 40000	19	7.0	104	38.5
5	40001 - 50000	16	5.9	96	35.6
6	50001 - >	12	4.4	21	7.8
Total		**270**	**100.0**	**270**	**100.0**

The table shows that Income before and after joining in MGNREGS. It can be seen from the table that 6 groups have been divided the income for the convenience of analysis. Before joining in MGNREGS the majority (51.9 per cent) of the respondents getting income in between Rs. 20001 – 30000 ranges, followed by 23.0 are getting income in between Rs.10001 – 20000 ranges, 7.8 per cent of them getting income Rs below Rs.10000, 5.9 percent of them getting income in between Rs 40001 – 50000 ranges and 4.4 per cent of the respondents getting income in between Rs 50001 and above and 7.0 per cent of the respondents getting income in between Rs. 30001 – 40000 ranges before joining the MGNREGS. The mean income before joining in MGNREGS Rs. 24462.9630.

After joining in MGNREGS, it can be observed the majority (38.5 per cent) of the respondents getting income in between Rs. 30001 – 40000 ranges, followed by 35.6 are getting income in between Rs.40001 – 50000 ranges, 12.2 per cent of them getting income in between Rs 20001 30000, 7.8 percent of them getting income in between Rs 50001 and above ranges, 5.2 per cent of them getting income in between Rs 10001 - 20000 and above and 0.7 per cent of the respondents getting income below Rs 10000 ranges after joining in MGNREGS. The mean income after joining in MGNREGS Rs. 37666.6667.

Table -10: Paired Samples Statistics of Income before and after joining in MGNREGS

Paired Samples Statistics		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair	Before Income	24463.00	270	10409.30554	633.49016
	After Income	37667.00	270	9874.67942	600.95385

The table of paired sample statistics revealed that income before and after joining in MGNREGS of the beneficiaries per year. It shows the mean income before per year an average Rs.24463.00 and the mean income after joining in MGNREGS an average cost Rs. 37667.00 per year. There is also difference among the scores of standard deviations of income before and after joining in MGNREGS. Therefore, there is a difference of income among MGNREGS beneficiaries.

Table -11:

Ho: There is no significant difference of income among the respondents begore and after joining in MGNREGS.

Paired Samples difference of Income before and after joining in MGNREGS

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Before After Income	-13203.70	13742.69611	836.35385	-14850.33554	-11557.07186	-15.787	269	.000

The Paired sample test table 11 displays the difference of income before and after joining in the MGNREGS, an average mean difference income Rs. 13203.70 per year. It is the margin average income before and after joining in MGNREGS per year. Thus, there is a statically significant relationship between the income before and after joining in MGNREGS at 0.01 level. Hence, the research hypothesis was accepted and the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table–12:

Improvement of social status in the family and society after joining in MGNREGS

Mandal	Does your social status improve in the family and society after joining in MGNREGS		Total
	Yes	No	
Duvvur	48	42	90
	53.3%	46.7%	100.0%
Kalasapadu	49	41	90

	54.4%	45.6%	100.0%
Ramapuram	47	43	90
	52.2%	47.8%	100.0%
Total	**144**	**126**	**270**
	53.3%	**46.7%**	**100.0%**

χ^2=0.089, df=2, P < 0.956,   Not Significant at 0.01 level

The table 12 revealed that the improvement of social status in the family and in society after joining in MGNREGS. The majority (53.3 per cent) respondents said that increased the social status in the family and society after joining in the MGNREGS and 46.7 per cent said that they did not increased the social status in the family and society.

In Duvvur mandal, of the 90 respondents, 53.3 per cent respondents said that their social status has been increased and 46.7 per cent did not increased social status in the family and society after joining of the MGNREGS.

In Kalasapadu mandal, of the 90 respondents, 54.4 per cent respondents said that their social status has been increased and 45.6 per cent did not increased social status in the family and society after joining of the MGNREGS.

In Ramapuram mandal, of the 90 respondents, 52.2 per cent respondents expressed that MGNREGS may become more useful for society or people with some changes and 47.8 per cent respondents expressed that MGNREGS was not useful for society or people, because it is a threat to work culture.

The chi-square table indicates that the relationship between place of residence and Improvement of social status in the family and society after joining in MGNREGS. There is no difference of perceptions by mandal wise (place of residence) on Improvement of social status in the family and society after joining in MGNREGS(P= 0.956) at 0.01 levels. Hence, The null hypothesis is accepted and research hypothesis was rejected.

Conclusion:

The impact of MGNREGS in the empowerment of scheduled caste community. The changes have taken place after joining in the MGNREGS, the majority were improved their living conditions such as clearing debts, providing food security, and improve health and nutrition etc. They also purchased electronic gadgets, cooking amenities and most them made savings in bank and post offices. The majority of the respondents has increased their income after joining in the MGNREGS the mean income Rs. 24462.9630 per annum and the mean income Rs. 37666.6667 after joining in MGNREGS and also increased the purchasing power. They also increased their social status in the society and family after joining the MGNREGS.

References:

1. Bhupal, D.S. (2012), "Indian experience of sustainable and inclusive economic growth –an evaluation of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme", in, Review of Applied Socio- Economic Research, Vol.3, No. 1, pp. 22-32.
2. BhurelalPatidarand Dinesh Gupta (2012), "MGNREGA - Issues and Challenges", in, Golden Research Thoughts, Vol.2, No. 3, September, pp. 1-3.
3. Bigi Thomas and Ruby Bhatia (2012) "Impact of NREGA Scheme: A Study on the overall Quality of Life of Its Beneficiaries (A Study Undertaken among beneficiaries of 3 districts of Gujarat State)", in, Asia Pacific Journal of Social Sciences, Vol. IV, No. 2, July - Dec 2012, pp.213- 227.
4. Centre for Good Governance (2009) Social Audit of NREGS (AP) in Andhra Pradesh, Best Practice Notes on Social Accountability Initiatives in South Asia, pp. 1-7.

5. Government of Andhra Pradesh (2006), 'nndhra Pradesh Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme', G.O.Ms. No.27, dated 28.1.2006.

6. Government of India (GoI) (2008). The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act 2005 (NREGA), Operational Guidelines 2008 (3rd edition). New Delhi: Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India.