



Asian Journal of Management and Commerce

E-ISSN: 2708-4523
P-ISSN: 2708-4515
AJMC 2022; 3(1): 43-46
© 2021 AJMC
www.allcommercejournal.com
Received: 25-11-2021
Accepted: 08-01-2022

Ram Narain Meena
Associate Professor,
Department of Economics,
Government Collage Bassi,
Jaipur, University of
Rajasthan, India

Kapil Meena
Department of Economics,
Seth Mangal Chand
Choudhary Government
College, Abu Road, Sirohi,
Rajasthan, India

Correspondence
Ram Narain Meena
Associate Professor,
Department of Economics,
Government Collage Bassi,
Jaipur, University of
Rajasthan, India

An Analysis of MGNREGA in Jaipur District of Rajasthan

Ram Narain Meena and Kapil Meena

Abstract

Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) under the 'Ministry of Rural development' strives for the enhancement of rural livelihood by providing at least one hundred days of guaranteed wage employment in every financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work. It has been launched on February; 2006. The outcome of the study is based on Primary field survey in the village of Rajasthan. This paper is an attempt to examine how the programme has been implemented in two different villages. More specifically, my objective is to investigate which section of the rural people of the villages namely, Patan and Banskho has been benefited from the programme. It also tried to look at the MGNREGS participation rate across different land holding and income classes. This study shows that MGNREGS has been implemented more properly in Banskho panchayat compared to Patan panchayat.

Keywords: MGNAREGA, participation, implementation, performance, person-days

Introduction

The wages employment Schemes under NREGA, 2005, is called National Rural employment guarantee Scheme (NREGS).NREGS, which was launched on February 2, 2006 in 200 most backward districts in the first phase, has been expanded to 330 district in the second phase. The remaining 226 districts have been notified on September 28, 2007 where the scheme has come in to effect from April 1, 2008. As per NREGA Act 2005, "An Act to provide for enhancement of livelihood security of the households in rural areas of the country by providing at least one hundred days of guaranteed wages employment in every financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work and for matter connected these with or incidental thereto". Therefore NREGA is an Act to provide a legal guarantee of 100 days of wage employment in a financial year to every rural household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work. She/he will set the minimum wage rate notified for agriculture labour in the state until the central government notifies a minimum wage rate, which in any case shall not be less than Rs. 60 per day. Women are empowered through provision of one-third women reservation under NREGA.

In the form of that development, in India, an ambitious National Rural Employment Scheme (NREGS) came into force in February 2006. The scheme is based on the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) which was passed by the Indian parliament in September 2005. This new scheme has renewed interest in evaluating the effectiveness of such welfare through workfare programmes in terms of providing an economic safety net to the rural poor. Since the scheme has been established relatively recently, there is little research that has been conducted on its effectiveness in terms of meeting its stated goals. This paper examines the performance of MGNREGA in Rajasthan. The analysis is at the household (HH) level and relies on data collected from 100 households located in Jaipur District of Rajasthan.

Review of Literature

Chakrabarti, (2013) ^[14], the MGNREGA promised the empowerment of the rural masses to deliver work as a constitutional right, a ban on contractors and capital intensive machinery for carrying out works, administrative transparency and most importantly, people's right to carry out open social audits. Now, if we put the question that is it good policy for generating employment: The answer must be in positive sign. So let us discuss the effectiveness of the policy.

Fundamentally the MGNREGA Programme leads to asset creating work which has both demand side and supply side effect on both rural farm and non-farm sector. We can say that if the implementation of MGNREGA is perfect then rural farm and non-farm sector will achieve benefit. The MGNREGA programme emphasis the improvement of rural people by helping them through roads, creating asset, good irrigation etc. From the view point of rural farm side, MGNREGA can create communication and as a result agricultural farmer can easily sell their products at their nearest market in one hand and on the other hand due to MGNREGA work the immediate result is the shortage of agricultural labour in farm sector and then due to this fact agricultural wage may rise. These two have the supply side effects. On the other hand due to MGNREGA, the poor people can earn money and consequently the demand for agricultural products will rise which leads to the demand side effects. These in term will have an obvious impact on rural non-farm sector.

Ajit. K. Ghose (2012) has authored a paper discussing challenges related to employment and argued that there are two ways in which MGNREGS would increase money incomes of the rural people. First it should directly increase the income of poor rural households and secondly, it should increase the demand for casual labour and consecutively should increase the wage rate in rural areas by paying the minimum wages. The article appeared in Business Standard (2012) highlights on the decision of Ministry of Rural Development on including construction of 'Aanganwadis' in the list of permissible work. The article says that the NREGA workers will build over 3 Lakh Aanganwadis in near future. These Aanganwadis will serve the dual purpose. Firstly they will be the meeting centers for women Self Help Groups formed under National Rural Livelihood Mission and more importantly they will serve the purpose of crèches for children of women workers of MGNREGA.

Khera (2011) ^[6] initially, in the absence of proper self as well as child care facilities at the worksites such as drinking water, child care, and shade for periods of rest, and first aid, in most cases children in the age of 3-5 years were sent to the school or anganwadi. At the same time, even with child care facilities at sites, most women having children do not bring them to the worksites as it is not seen as a safe place for them, apart from hazards of being left untended in the open. Women are also worried about the heat and sometimes harassed when they spend more time with the child. However, despite all the problems of child care and others as reported, the dynamic presence of women has acted as a stimulating factor in the progress of NREGS in the country. Women were found actively participating in the social audits, creation of muster rolls etc.

Pankaj and Tankha (2010) examine the empowerment effects of the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme on rural women in Bihar, Jharkhand, Rajasthan and Himachal Pradesh. It argues that women workers have gained from the scheme primarily because of the paid employment opportunity, and benefits have been realised through income-consumption effects, intra-household effects, and the enhancement of choice and capability. Women have also gained to some extent in terms of realisation of equal wages under the NREGS, with long-term implications for correcting gender skewness and

gender discriminatory wages prevalent in the rural labour market of India. Despite the difficulties and hurdles for women, prospects lie, inter alia, in their collective mobilisation, more so in laggard states. Scholars have also tried relating the NREGS employment as a distinct case creating multiplier effects, with significant linkages between employment, income generation output and investment sectors. Such multiplier effects of NREGS have the potential of contributing significantly to long-run development of farm and non-farm sectors and effectively alleviating poverty and vulnerabilities. While the number of people who depend on NREGS employment would steadily rise over time, the expenditure incurred on NREGS.

Narayanan (2008) The high rates of women participation as found in many states, especially, in the southern states of Tamilnadu, Kerala and Andhra Pradesh have been reflective of the huge potential that NREGS employment in promoting the socio-economic wellbeing of the households. But at the same time, a serious casualty of the increased presence of women in the NREGS employment sphere has been the gross neglect of child care, as women had to be away from home for about 8-10 hours. It was reported that in Rajasthan, women started work and walked approximately 5-6 kilometers every day to get work at 6 a.m. and they continued on work site till 2 pm when work stop for the day. As a result, child caring has turned a major issue for rural poor women.

Kiran Bhatta (2006) it is seen in a small district of Rajasthan called Durgapur, after two years of NRERS, a Padyatra was made for the implementation and social audits, by the poor people of the districts. It is also seen that in spite of the fact that child care is a serious problem a high participation of women in this districts that is a large scale of women were involved in this scheme. In this state women work approximately 5-6 kilometers every day to get to work at 6 a.m. and stay on site still till 2 p.m when work stops for the day. Because of that in this districts child careering is a severe problem for rural poor women.

Objectives of the Study

- To examine the Performance of MGNREGS across different land holding class.
- To examine the impact of MGNARGA on income of the household across different land holding class.

Research Methodology and Data Sources:

The present study will be analytical study to examine the implementation of MGNREGA scheme. This research study is based on primary data. The primary data will be collected with the help of structured questionnaire. The Jaipur district is purposively selected for the research work. For the purpose of analysis a sample of 100 households randomly selected. For the analysis purpose, this study uses simple tabulation, graphical, average and percentage methods.

Results and discussion of the present study

The present study has shown that how different sources of income vary in two different panchayat of study across different land holding class. First this study categorized the land holding status into four groups [0-2, 2.1-4, 4.01-6, <6 (all units are in bigha)]

Table 1: Different sources of Income across different land holding class

Land Size (Bigha)	Average Per HH agricultural income(RS)		Average Per HH Non-Farm income(RS)		Average Per HH MGNREGS Income(RS)	
	Banskho	Patan	Banskho	Patan	Banskho	Patan
0-2	11182	16400	55273	28080	3640	5421
2.01-4	22500	23538	47625	38385	3640	5460
4.01-6	42000	29000	46917	27280	3640	5365
> 6	73091	61333	23545	25500	3640	5438

Source: Primary filed survey, 2017

The above table 1 shows how different sources of income vary in two different panchayat of study across different land holding class. The table 1 reveal that most of the sample household (HH) in Patan panchayat belong to land status 4.01-6 Bigha where as for Banskho panchayat most of the sample household (HH) belong to 2.1-4 Bigha. It is also seen from the table that for the first two lands holding class average agricultural income is comparatively lower in Banskho panchayat but as the land holding status increases agricultural income is higher in Banskho panchayat compared to Patan panchayat. Now consider the Non-farm income then it shows that average non-farm income is higher in case of Banskho panchayat (except the highest land holding class) compare to Patan panchayat. It is also

interesting to note that the average non-farm income is comparatively higher in lower land holding class for both the panchayat. Now come to the MGNREGS income of two panchayat. It is a fact that Banskho panchayat has shown a better performance in terms of MGNREGS work compare to any other states. But our study has found something else. The above table 1 notifies that the MGNREGS income in all land holding class is comparatively high in Patan panchayat. There is also a known fact that as the land holding status increases the MGNREGS income falls. Because the people of higher land holding classes do not participate as much as the lower land holding class. But this study found that the MGNREGA income is almost same for every land holding class.

Table 2: Performance of MGNREGS working days in last three years across different land holding class (Banskho Panchayat)

Land Size (Bigha)	Average Per HH MGNREGS Working days 2014-15		Average Per HH MGNREGS Working days 2015-16		Average Per HH MGNREGS Working days 2016-17	
	Banskho	Patan	Banskho	Patan	Banskho	Patan
0-2	39	16	85	18	28	42
2.01-4	43	17	85	19	28	42
4.01-6	40	17	83	19	28	41
>6	42	17	89	19	28	42

Source: Primary filed survey, 2017

Table 2 shows the performance of MGNREGS in terms of providing average working days across different land holding classes. In the year of 2014-15 the average working days was overall around 40 in Banskho Village but in Patan village it was almost 17. So, it can be said from here that as the initial stage of self-employment Programme Banskho village provided more than double average working days compared to Patan village. Now come to the year of 2015-16. Here study got more interesting result. In this year Banskho village provided more than aver Banskho village Banskho village Banskho village age 80 MGNREGS working days in all land holding strata, but in the case of Patan village showed a very poor performance in terms of providing working days in MGNREGS. On an average Patan village provided 20 MGNREGA working days in that particular year. So, in Banskho village it is more than four times greater than the Patan village in terms of providing working days. Now in the year 2011-12 the average working days in MGNREGS are 28 for all land holding class in Banskho village. But in case of Patan village this particular year the average working days is more than 40 in all land holding classes. It is interesting to note that in year 2014-15 the working days was more than Patan village and in the year 2015-16 in Banskho village it was more than four times greater in terms of providing working days in MGNREGS compared to Patan village. This scenario of providing average working days has been changed in the year of 2016-17 where Patan village has shown better performance in terms of providing working

days compared to Banskho village. In Banskho village in the year of 2014-15 the working days in MGNREGS was more than 80 but just after this year the average working days in MGNREGS falls drastically. In the case of Patan village we got just opposite result of Banskho village. In the year of 2015-16 the average working days in MGNREGS was just around 18 but very next year it jumped to the more than 40.

Conclusion

This study tried to look at various aspect of MGNREGS programme. After a detail study and analyses the data this study found some interesting result that MGNREGS has some impact on the level of income across different land holding and income class. This study also found that in the first two years (2009-10 & 2010-11) Banskho village showed a wonderful performance in MGNREGS programme. But in last year (2011-12) Patan village also performed well, in fact, it is better than Banskho village. So far some policy implication about the MGNREGA can be stated here first, it is very essential to give some special attention in the implementation of this programme. The usefulness of this programme can improve from its various aspects through better implementation and consciousness about this programme.

References

1. Pinaki C. "Implementation of Employment Guarantee: A preliminary Appraisal", Economic and Political

- weekly. 2007;17(2):548-551.
2. Chhaya D. "Failure of NREGS in Maharashtra", Economic and Political weekly. 2007;25(8):3454-3457.
 3. Krishnamurty J. Employment Guarantee and Crisis response, Economic and Political weekly. 2006;11(3):784-790.
 4. Abhiroop M, Indira. "Rural Employment 1999-2005: who gained who lost", Economic and Political weekly. 2007;7:3116-3120.
 5. Auran J, Richard V, Prakash L. "Reasonable Beginning in Palakkad, Kerala and Birth pangs in Bihar", Economic and political weekly. 2006;2(12):4993-4947.
 6. Khara Reetika. "The UID Project and Welfare Schemes", Economic and Political Weekly. 2011;46(9):38-44.
 7. Doug Johnson. "Can Workfare Serve as a Substitute for Weather Insurance? The Case of NREGA in Andhra Pradesh", Institute for Financial Management and Research Centre for Micro Finance, Working Paper Series No. 32. 2009.
 8. Anil Kumar, B Kote, Dr. PM Honnakeri. "The Impact of MGNREGA Scheme on Rural-Urban Migration in Rural Economy with special Reference to Gulbarga District in Karnataka State", Indian Streams Research Journal, Vol.2, Issue. I/ Feb; 12pp.1-4. 2012.
 9. Pranati Gogoi Hazarika. "Promoting Women Empowerment and Gender Equality through the Right To Decent Work: Implementation of National Rural Employment Guarantee Program (NREGP) in Assam State (India): A Case Study", Graduate School of Development Studies, The Hague, The Netherlands. 2009
 10. Kim Bonner, Jennifer Daum, *et al.* "MGNREGA Implementation: A Cross-State Comparison", The Woodrow Wilson School's Graduate Policy Workshop, Princeton University. 2012.
 11. Diganta Mukherjee, Uday Bhanu Sinha. "Understanding NREGA: A Simple Theory and Some Facts", Working Paper No. 196, Centre for Development Economics Department of Economics, Delhi School of Economics. 2011.
 12. Subhasish Dey. Evaluating India's National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme: The Case of Birbhum District, West Bengal", Working Paper No. 490, Institute of Social Studies, The Netherlands. 2010.
 13. Ashok Gulati, Anjan K Jena. "Rural Prosperity No Mirage" The Economic Times. 2012;4(11):13.
 14. Saumya Chakrabarti. "National rural employment guarantee scheme: certain theoretical constraints", Working Paper Series, Volume-1, A.K. Dasgupta Centre for Planning and Development, Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan, India; New Delhi Publishers. 2013. ISBN: 9789381274-30-9.