

Impact of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme on the Tribal Farmer Beneficiaries

Anand M. Chavai^{1*} and Shrishkumar V. Valvi²

ABSTRACT: The study revealed that 55.38 per cent of MGNREGS tribal farmers belonged to 36 to 55 years age group, 69.23 per cent of them were male, 55.38 per cent had medium family size, 67.69 per cent of were having Farming + Laborers as their occupation, 50.11 per cent were marginal farmers, 68.86 per cent were belonged to Rs.9171 to 19206 income group, 72.32 per cent had low social participation, 63.07 per cent were using medium level of sources of information and 69.23 per cent of them had favorable attitude. Regarding impact due to the implementation of MGNREGS increased average employment opportunities (61.27 days/ year), increase average annual income. (6004.61 Rs. / year) and increased purchasing capacity of beneficiaries. The constraints perceived by beneficiaries during the implementation of MGNREGS were payment scale not known, late payment of wages, non-payment of wages in the form of grains, non-provision of 100 days' work. The suggestions made by MGNREGS tribal beneficiaries were timely payment of wages, Payment of wages in cash and grains. Fulfillment of 100 days employment guarantee.

KeyWords : Impact of MGNREGA, Tribal beneficiaries, profile.

INTRODUCTION

The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) was notified on September 5, 2005. Although the focus is on augmenting wage employment, it is ambitious in scope and aims to accomplish a number of things. Amongst other things, the Act envisaged that the works under taken as part of the programme would strengthen natural resource management and address causes of chronic poverty like drought, deforestation and soil erosion, thereby encouraging sustainable development. The objective of the MGNREGS is to provide additional resources related to Soil and Water Conservation, Plantation, Forestry related activities, Plantation and Management of NTFPs, Land Development Works, Rural Connectivity Works and B.P.L/ST/SC/Individual Beneficiary Assets. The state of Maharashtra has the second largest tribal population in the country next only to that of Madhya Pradesh. The tribal peoples number 85.77 lakhs and constitute 8.9 per cent of the state's

population (2011). The major tribal communities are the Bhils, Gonds, Mahadev Kolis, Warlis, Koknas and Thakars, while the Katkaris, Kolam and Madia Gonds are classified as primitive tribes. The present study attempts to understand the implementation procedures of MGNREGS and its impact on tribal livelihoods. In view of this the present study was conducted in the year 2014 with the objectives objectives to study the socio-economic profile and impact of MGNREGS on the tribal beneficiaries, to study the constraints and suggestion by the tribal beneficiaries of MGNREGS.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The present study was undertaken in tribal district Nandurbar of Maharashtra, India. The two tahsils viz. Akrani and Navapur were purposively selected on the basis of maximum numbers of working days under MGNREGS and 10 beneficiaries from each villages thus making a total sample of 130 beneficiaries were selected for the study. Primary

¹ Assistant Professor of Agril. Extension and T.O. to V.C.,MPKV, Rahuri, M.S

² M.Sc.(Agri.) Student, Deptt. of Extension Education, MPKV, Rahuri, M.S.

* Email : anandchavai.2009@gmail.com

data were collected with the help of pretested interview scheduled specially designed in local language for the purpose. Simple statistical tools like mean, percentage, mean standard deviation and Karl Pearson's correlation coefficient were used for the analysis of data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Socio-economic Profile of the tribal farmer beneficiaries

A result of the study depicted in Table 1. pointed out that majority of MGNREGS tribal farmer beneficiaries (55.38 per cent) belonged to middle age group, 69.23 per cent of them were male, 55.38 per cent had medium family size, 67.69 per cent of were having Farming + Laborers as their occupation, 50.11 per cent were marginal farmers, 68.86 per cent were belonged to medium income group, 72.32 per cent had low social participation and (76.92 per cent) of beneficiaries had under partial knowledge, A majority (63.07 per cent) of the Tribal beneficiaries were using medium level of sources of information, 69.23 per cent of them had favorable attitude.

IMPACT OF MGNREGS ON THE TRIBAL FARMER BENEFICIARIES

Change in Annual Income

It is evident from Table 5. that before introduction of MGNREGS, the 66.15 per cent of tribal respondent had their income between Rs. 9171 to 19206/- followed by 18.46 per cent were Rs.19206 and above and 15.39 per cent had their income generation upto Rs.9170/-. While, after introduction of MGNREGS, majority 65.38 per cent of beneficiaries had their income between Rs.14725 to 25660/-category followed by 18.46 per cent of them had their income upto Rs. 14724/- category and the 16.16 per cent had their income Rs. 25661 and above category. It indicated that change in annual income upto average Rs. 6005.29/year after implementation of MGNREGS.

In order to find significance of difference in the change in annual income of beneficiaries before and after MGNREGS, the data was subjected to 'Z' test and the results obtained are furnished in Table 6. Calculated 'Z' value 6.17 of Table 6 was found significant at 1 percent level of probability indicating that there existed a significant difference in income generation of beneficiaries before and after MGNREGS. These findings are similar to the findings of Argade (2010) and Bannerjee (2009).

Table 1
Distribution of the respondents according to their socio-economic profile

Sr. No.	Particulars	Frequency (N = 130)	Percentage
1.	<i>Age</i>		
i.	Young (Up to 35 years)	32	24.61
ii.	Middle (36 to 55 years)	72	55.38
iii.	Old (56 and above years)	26	20.01
2.	<i>Gender</i>		
i	Male	90	69.23
ii	Female	40	30.77
3.	<i>Education (Std.)</i>		
i.	Illiterate	40	30.77
ii.	Primary Education (1 st to 4 th)	26	20.00
iii.	Secondary Education (5 th to 10 th)	45	34.61
iv.	Higher Secondary Education (11 th to 12 th)	17	13.08
v.	Graduation and Post Graduation (Above 12 th)	02	01.54
4	<i>Size of Family</i>		
i.	Small (Up to 4 members)	34	26.16
ii.	Medium (5 to 8 members)	72	55.38
iii.	Large (9 and above members)	24	18.46
5.	<i>Occupation</i>		
i.	Landless Labourer	42	32.31
ii.	Farming + Labourer	88	67.69
6	<i>Annual Income (Rs.)</i>		
i	Low (Up to Rs. 9170)	20	15.39
ii	Medium (Rs.9171 to Rs.19206)	86	66.15
iii	High (Rs. 19207 and above)	24	18.46
7	<i>Social Participation</i>		
i.	Low (Up to 1)	94	72.32
ii.	Medium (2 to 5)	18	18.84
iii.	High (6 and above)	18	18.84
8.	<i>Sources of Information</i>		
i.	Low (Up to 4)	30	23.07
ii.	Medium (5 to 12)	82	63.07
iii.	High (13 and above)	18	13.86
9.	<i>Attitude</i>		
i.	Less favorable (Up to 87)	24	18.46
ii.	Favorable (88 to 103)	90	69.23
iii.	More favorable (104 and above)	16	12.31
10.	<i>Size of land holding</i>		
i.	Landless(No land)	42	32.32
ii.	Marginal(upto1.0 to 2.0)	50	38.48
iii.	Small(1.01 to 2.0)	30	23.07
iv.	Semi-medium-(2.01 to 4.0)	07	5.38
v	Medium(4.01 to 10.0)	01	0.75
vi	Large(10.01 and above)	00	0.00
11.	<i>Sources of information</i>		
i.	Relatives	128	98.46
ii.	Friends/Neighbour	126	96.92
iii.	Gram Sevak	120	92.30
iv.	Television	72	55.38
v.	Radio	53	40.76

Table 2
Comparative distribution of the respondents according to their income

Sr. No	Annual Income (Rs.)	Before MGNREGS (N = 130)		Annual Income (Rs.)		After MGNREGS (N = 130)	
		Freq.	Percentage			Freq.	Percentage
1.	Low (Upto 9170)	20	15.39	Low (Upto 14724)	24	18.46	
2.	Medium (9171 to 19206)	86	66.15	Medium (14725 to 25660)	85	65.38	
3.	High (19206 and above)	24	18.46	High (25661 and above)	21	16.16	
Total		130	100.00		130	100.00	

Table 3
Significance of difference in the change in annual income of respondents

Annual income	Mean (Rs./year)	SD(Rs./year)	'Z' value
Before MGNREGS	14187.69	5018.04	6.17**
After MGNREGS	20192.30	5467.98	

** Significant at 0.01 level of probability

Change in Employment Generation

Employment generation was operationally defined as the additional days of employment gained by the beneficiaries' family due to MGNREGS works. It is evident from Table 4. that, 56.92 per cent of the respondents had gained 113 to 233 man days employment followed by 25.00 per cent had gained upto 112 days and 18.33 per cent had gained above 234 man days employment . After the introduction of MGNREGS, 58.46 per cent of respondents had gained the 166 to 303 man days employment followed by upto 165 man days (26.16 per cent) and 314 and above man days (16.67 per cent) employment generation. It indicated that employment generation upto average 61.27 man day per year.

In order to find significance of difference in employment generation of beneficiaries before and after MGNREGS, the data was subjected to 'Z' test and the results obtained are furnished in Table 8. Calculated 'Z' value 6.24 of Table 5 was found significant at 1 percent level of probability indicating that there existed a significant difference in employment generation of beneficiaries before and after MGNREGS. These findings are similar to the findings of Gupta and Sadhu (1995) .

Table 5
Significance of difference in the employment generation of respondents before and after MGNREGS

Employment Generation	Mean (days/year)	SD (days/year)	'Z' value
Before MGNREGS	172.88	61.07	6.24**
After MGNREGS	234.15	68.74	

** Significant at 0.01 level of probability

Change in Material Possession

Material possession was operationally defined as assets owned by the individual beneficiaries before and after implementation of MGNREGA. It is evident from Table 9 that 67.69 per cent of respondent had medium material possession followed by low (16.93 per cent) and high (15.38 per cent) material possession before introduction of MGNREGS. After introduction of MGNREGS, 57.70 per cent of respondent had medium material possession followed by (high 30.76 per cent) and low (11.54 per cent) material possession. It indicated that (average 6.03) increasing parching power of beneficiaries after implementation of MGNREGS. These findings are similar to the findings of Jaffer (2007) and Soundarapandian (1992).

In order to find significance of difference in material possession of beneficiaries before and after MGNREGS, the data was subjected to 'Z' test and the results obtained are furnished in Table 10. Calculated 'Z' value 9.07** of Table 10 was found significant at 1 per cent level of probability indicating

Table 4
Comparative distribution of the respondents according to their employment generation before and after MGNREGS

Sr. No.	Employment Generation (Mandays/year.)	Before MGNREGS (N = 130)		Employment Generation (Mandays/year.)		After MGNREGS (N = 130)	
		Freq.	Percentage			Freq.	Percentage
1.	Low (up to 112)	32	24.62	Low (Upto 165)	34	26.16	
2.	Medium (113 -233)	74	56.92	Medium (166 to 303)	76	58.46	
3.	High (234 and above)	24	18.46	High (304 and above)	20	15.38	
Total		130	100		130	100	

Table 6
Comparative distribution of the respondents according to their material possession before and after MGNREGS.

Sr. No	Material Possession(Number)	Before MGNREGS (N= 130)		Material Possession	After MGNREGS (N= 130)	
		Freq.	Percentage		Freq.	Percentage
1	Low (Upto 6)	22	16.93	Low (Upto 12)	15	11.54
2	Medium (7 to 11)	88	67.69	Medium (13 to 17)	75	57.70
3	High (12 and above)	20	15.38	High (18 and above)	40	30.76
Total		130	100		130	100

Table 7
Significance of difference in the material possession of respondent before and after MGNREGS

Material Possession	Mean	SD	'Z' value
Before MGNREGS	8.5	2.06	9.07**
After MGNREGS	14.53	2.58	

** Significant at 0.01 level of probability

that there existed a significant difference in material possession of respondent before and after MGNREGS.

The constraints perceived by the tribal beneficiaries

The Table 9. clearly showed that the constraints perceived by MGNREGS beneficiaries during the implementation of MGNREGS were Payment scale not known and Late payment of wages 93.84 per cent, Non-payment of wages in the form of grains 89.23 per cent, Non-provision of 100 days' work.69.23 per cent, Long distances of work sites 67.69 per cent Delay in allotment of work 61.53 per cent, Non-payment of 10% extra wages for works outside the 5Km. radius 60.00 Per cent, Non-provision of Crèche facility 57.69 per cent, Poor Work site facilities 53.84 per cent, No opportunity to get employment more than 100 days 52.30 per cent, Delay in disposal of beneficiaries complaints 42.30 per cent, Registration is not open in the Gram Panchayat on an ongoing basis 34.61per cent, Migration of labourers due to non-provision of works under MGNREGS 23.07per cent, Non-payment of wages23.07per cent, Payment of same wages for all kinds of works19.23per cent, Low payment of wages11.53per cent, Non- payment of unemployment allowance 9.10 per cent, respectively. These findings are similar to the findings of Jaffer (2007) and Argade (2010).

Suggestions made by tribal beneficiaries to overcome the constraints

The Table 12 clearly showed that the suggestions made by MGNREGS beneficiaries to overcome the operational constraints by them during the implementation of MGNREGS were Timely payment

Table 8
Content analysis of Material possession before and after MGNREGS.

Sr. No.	Material Possession	Before MGNREGS (N = 130)		After MGNREGS (N = 130)	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
A. Furniture					
	Chair	43	33.07	68	52.30
	Table	33	25.38	41	31.53
	Cot	72	55.38	96	73.84
	Watch	61	46.92	82	63.07
B. Transport					
	Bullock cart	48	36.92	63	48.46
	Bicycle	81	62.30	109	83.84
	Motorcycle	42	32.30	54	41.53
C. Communicational					
	Radio	46	35.38	70	53.84
	Tape recorder	24	18.46	38	29.23
	Television-				
	(i) Black & White	18	13.84	21	16.15
	(ii) Coloured	32	24.61	58	44.61
	Telephone	12	9.23	18	13.84
	Mobile	88	67.69	105	80.76
D. Type of house					
	Hut	21	16.15	17	13.07
	Kuccha	75	57.69	76	58.46
	Kuccha cum				
	puccha	33	25.38	35	26.92
	Puccha	11	8.46	12	9.23
E. Drinking water					
	Tap	35	26.92	78	60.00
	Hapsa	53	40.46	38	29.23
	Well	35	26.92	20	15.38
F. Electricity					
	No electricity	62	47.69	37	28.46
	With electricity	68	52.30	93	71.53
G. Livestock possession					
	Cow	40	30.76	58	44.61
	Buffaloes	43	33.07	53	40.76
	Goat/sheep	55	42.30	69	53.07
	Poultry	43	33.07	62	47.69

of wages 93.84 per cent, Payment of wages in cash 89.23 per cent, Fulfillment of 100 days employment guarantee 69.23 per cent, Provision of works through Gram Panchayat nearer to the residence 67.69 per cent, Timely allotment of works 67.63 per cent, Payment of extra wages for long distance work sites

Table 9
Distribution of the respondents according to their constraints

Sl. No.	Constraints	Respondents (N=130)	Percentage
1	Late payment of wages.	122	93.84
2	Non-payment of wages in the form of grains.	116	89.23
3	Non- provision of 100 days' work.	90	69.23
4	Long distances of work sites.	88	67.69
5	Delay in allotment of work.	80	61.53
6	Non- payment of 10% extra wages for works outside the 5Km. radius.	78	60.00.
7	Non-provision of Crèche facility.	75	57.69
8	Poor Work site facilities.	70	53.84
9	No opportunity to get employment more than 100 days.	68	52.30
10	Delay in disposal of beneficiaries complaints.	55	42.30
11	Registration is not open in the Gram Panchayat on an ongoing basis.	45	34.61
12	Migration of labourers due to non-provision of works under NREGS.	30	23.07
13	Non-payment of wages.	30	23.07
14	Payment of same wages for all kinds of works.	25	19.23
15	Low payment of wages.	15	11.53
16	Non- payment of unem ployment allowance.	07	9.10

65.38 per cent, Provision of Crèche facility 60.76 per cent, Provision of necessary work site facilities 60.76 per cent, Provision of sufficient employment in own village 42.30 per cent, Extend the limit of 100 days employment guarantee 30.76 per cent, Grievance redressal mechanism should be nearer 29.23 per cent, Registration should be open in the Gram Panchayat on an ongoing basis 20.00per cent, Payment of wages should be according to kind of works 4.61per cent, Timely payment of unemployment allowance.1.53 per cent respectively.

These findings are similar to the findings of Jaffer (2007) and Soundarapandian (1992).

CONCLUSION

MGNREGS should be continued in all rural part of India for empowerment of rural people through employment generation. As it was revealed from the

Table 10
Distribution of respondent according to their suggestions to overcome the constraints perceived by them

Sl. No.	Suggestions	Respondents (N=130)	Percentage
1	Timely payment of wages.	122	93.84
2	Payment of wages in cash and grains.	116	89.23
3	Fulfillment of 100 days employment guarantee.	90	69.23
4	Provision of works through Gram Panchayat nearer to the residence.	88	67.69
5	Timely allotment of works.	80	67.63
6	Payment of extra wages for long distance work sites.	78	65.38
7	Provision of Crèche facility.	79	60.76
8	Provision of necessary work site facilities.	79	60.76
9	Provision of sufficient employment in own village.	55	42.30
10	Extend the limit of 100 days employment guarantee.	40	30.76
11	Grievance redressal mechanism should be nearer.	38	29.23
12	Registration should be open in the Gram Panchayat on an ongoing basis.	26	20.00
13	Payment of wages should be according to kind of works.	06	04.61
14	Timely payment of unemploy ment allowance.	02	01.53

study literacy level among the beneficiaries had become the major barrier for rural development, so both expansion and intensification of literacy programmes is necessary.

REFERNCES

- Argade, S.A. (2010), A study on National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme in Thane district of Maharashtra. M. Sc. (Agri.) Thesis (Unpublished), Acharya N G Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad (A.P.)
- Bannerjee, H. (2009), NREGA: A study in Andaman and Nicobar Islands. *Kurukshetra* **58**(2): 23-26.
- Gupta, M.D. and A.V. Sadhu. (1995), IRDP in hilly areas- A case studies of Jammu and Kashmir. *Journal of Rural Development*. **14**(21): 53-56.
- Jaffer, P.C. (2007), IASI India's National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS) -Localised implementation in Gulbarga district of Karnataka. www.nrega.nic.in.
- Soundarapandian, M. (1992), Problems of implementation of NREP in Kamarajar district of Tamil Nadu. *Journal of Rural Development* **11**(6): 827-838.

○○○

