



Performance of MGNREG programme in Karnataka: An overview

Dr. VA Chowdappa¹, Basavaraj S Benni²

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Vijayanagara Sri Krishnadevaraya University, Post Graduate Centre, Nandihalli-Sandur, Ballari District, Karnataka, India

² Professor of Economics, Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences, Vijayanagara Sri Krishnadevaraya University, Post Graduate Centre, Koppal, Karnataka, India

Abstract

MGNREGA is the most significant act in the history of Indian polity in many ways like grass-root level participation of every citizen in the country and beneficiary through democratic process, multi-layered social audit and transparency mechanism by involvement of civil society, comprehensive planning at village level towards sustainable and equitable development etc. in this backdrop the main objective of the study is to evaluate the performance of MGNREGS based on the experiences and opinion of the beneficiaries of the scheme in the study area. To collect the data stratified random sampling method is applied and data collected from 2500 respondents in the study area. Suitable descriptive statistical techniques have been applied. The study found that the beneficiaries expressed happiness towards with regard to the registration process, issue of job cards, choice of work, time and selection of work, relevancy of work while they expressed dissatisfaction about information about the scheme and facilities given at work place.

Keywords: unemployment, wage, MGNREGP

Introduction

National Rural Employment Guarantee Act - 2005 was enacted on 25 August 2005, assuring 100 days of employment in a fiscal year to any rural household whose adult members are keen to do unskilled manual work. The Act has come into force with effect from February 2, 2006 in 200 districts primarily and later on extended to all the rural districts of India from the fiscal year 2008-09. NREGA has been the first ever law internationally, this law guarantees wage employment at an unprecedented scale. The primary aim of the Act is expanding wage employment. This was initially called the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) but it was renamed as Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) on 2 October 2009.

MGNREGA is the most significant act in the history of Indian polity in many ways like grass - root level participation of every citizen, beneficiary through the democratic process, multi-layered social audit, a transparency mechanism by involvement of civil society, comprehensive planning at village level towards sustainable and equitable development etc. The important salient feature of the Act is to amplify the quality of life of rural families who are vulnerable to out-migration in search of daily wage employment by channelizing the wage workforce towards developmental activities at the village level itself.

Review of Literature

A study of literature places a substantial purpose in making the background for any research work. It is felt that the justification of the present study can be made by reviewing the available literature on the topic. MGNREGA has attracted a considerable sum of academic interest because of its characteristics, size and implications for rural India. The

main purpose of the review pertaining to the evaluation of performances of MGNREGP is to give a proper orientation and perspective to the present work.

Pankaj K. Ashok (2008) in his study reported that works of water conservation and harvesting, irrigation and rural connectivity constitute the bulk of schemes undertaken in Jharkhand and Bihar states. Both the state has very low irrigated areas low density of road and particularly in Jharkhand, plenty of land available for development. The nature of works undertaken in various district of these two states suggest that the MGNREGA can contribute significantly to the creation of much needed infrastructure. This report concluded that majority of the beneficiaries were happy with the MGNREGA and found it to have helped in improving their economic condition but more than that an overwhelming number of the beneficiaries demanded that its coverage dimensions should be increased.

Krishnan *et al.* (2012) study found that found that 77% of the respondents spent more than 50% of their MGNREGA earned income for food ingestion and also reported that they are in a place to meet their basic demands. In the study area 80 % of the respondents were described to be that they saving less than 25% of their earnings due to their poor economic conditions. further they stated that the water preservation works undertaken under this scheme and this provided employment, also increased paddy cultivation from 54 hectares to 71 hectares and this improved the income and food security of the villagers.

Kumar (2013) has examined the 'Empowerment of Rural People through MGNREGA in Morigaon, Assam.' Their paper tries to analyse the degree of women through their participation in MGNREGA activities in Morigaon district of Assam after it is set up in 2006. The analysis is built on the base of primary data gathered from 600 respondents in

the area. They found that economic, social and political impacts are positively on them.

Statement of the Problem

Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) with its wide potential has some direct and many indirect implications for the revival of agriculture as the nature of work on offer comprises of water conservation and water harvesting, drought proofing through afforestation, construction of micro and minor irrigation canals, land development for land owned by schedule castes and tribes, flood control and rural connectivity. Thus, the present study evaluation of the scheme as experienced by the beneficiaries of Mahatma Gandhi Rural Employment Guarantee programme in selected districts of Karnataka state. The need for such a study is imperative and relevant, and is continuous one and an ever-present challenge to sociologists and interdisciplinary.

Objective and Methodology of the Study

The main objective of the study is to evaluate the performance of MGNREGS based on the experiences and

opinion of the beneficiaries of the scheme. Based on the reports of MGNREGS from 3 phases 5 districts are selected for the study, from each district 2 taluks with each 2 Panchayats and in each Panchayath 2 villages are selected for the study. So over all 20 villages are selected for the study covering 10 taluks. Equal importance has been given to select backward and developed districts and geographical variations in the selection of universe. Accordingly, the study area comprises of Bellary, Davangere, Gulbarga, Mandya and Shimoga districts of Karnataka state. Stratified random sampling method is used in the study to collect the samples. Calculation of sample size is 500 samples X 5 districts = 2500 samples.

Analysis design

An analysis design of the study is prepared in accordance with the research design and the objectives set for the study. Further, the primary and secondary data obtained from different groups involved for the study is entered into the computer and processed and analysed with the help of SPSS package. Cross Tabulation and suitable statistical techniques relevant for the study is used to analyse the relationship among the variables under purview.

Analysis of the results

Table 1: Process of registration

Name of the Districts		Bellary		Davangere		Gulbarga		Mandya		Shimoga		Total	
SLNO	Process of registration	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Excellent	136	27.2	148	29.6	120	24	135	27	9	1.8	548	21.9
2	Good	324	64.8	332	66.4	332	66.4	326	65.2	77	15.4	1391	55.6
3	Satisfactory	40	8	20	4	48	9.6	39	7.8	333	66.6	480	19.2
4	Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	15.4	77	3.08
5	Worst	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0.8	4	0.16
Total		500	100	500	100	500	100	500	100	500	100	2500	100

Source: Field Work Survey

The Table-1 tries to elucidate the perception of beneficiaries regarding the process of registration. 55.64 percent (1391) beneficiaries opined that the process has been good, followed by 21.92 percent (548) opining as excellent, 19.2 percent (480) as satisfactory, 3.08 percent (77) as poor and 0.16 percent (4) as worst. It can be noted that, except in

Shimoga district, majority of the respondents from other four districts have replied that the process of registration has been good (around 65%) and excellent (around 27%). Out of 55.64 percent, highest is from Gulbarga and Davangere (66.4) followed by Mandya (65.2), Bellary (64.8) and the least from Shimoga (15.4).

Table 2: Issue of job cards

Name of the Districts		Bellary		Davangere		Gulbarga		Mandya		Shimoga		Total	
SL NO	Issue of job cards	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Excellent	70	14	70	14	72	14.4	70	14	12	2.24	293	11.72
2	Good	358	71.6	375	75	356	71.2	354	70.8	365	73	508	60.32
3	Satisfactory	56	11.2	39	7.8	58	11.6	55	11	35	7	543	21.72
4	Poor	16	3.2	16	3.2	14	2.8	21	4.2	83	16.6	150	6
5	Worst	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	5	0.2
Total		500	100	500	100	500	100	500	100	500	100	2500	100

Source: Field Work Survey

The Table No: 2 reveals the opinion of the beneficiaries regarding issue of job cards. While 60.32 percent (1508) have opined that the issue of job cards has been good, 11.72 percent (293) have replied as excellent, 21.72 percent (543)

as satisfactory, 6 percent (150) as poor and only 0.2 percent (5) as worst. Those who gave positive response, highest is from Davangere (75) followed by Shimoga (73), Bellary (71.6), Gulbarga (71.2) and the least from Mandya (70.8).

Table 3: Choice for time of work

Name of the Districts		Bellary		Davangere		Gulbarga		Mandya		Shimoga		Total	
SL NO	Choice for time	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Excellent	27	5.4	25	5.2	27	5.4	24	4.8	29	5.8	131	5.24
2	Good	160	32	170	34	166	33.2	160	32	312	29.8	805	32.2
3	Satisfactory	258	51.6	270	54	251	50.2	260	52	149	62.4	1351	54.04
4	Poor	55	11	35	7	56	11.2	56	11.2	7	1.4	209	8.36
5	Worst	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0.6	3	0.12
Total		500	100	500	100	500	100	500	100	500	100	2500	100

Source: Field Work Survey

The Table- 3 draws opinion of the beneficiaries about the choice for time of work in the scheme. 54.04 percent (1351) of the beneficiaries have replied that the choice for time of work is satisfactory, followed by 32.2 percent (805) as being good, 8.36 percent (209) as poor, 5.24 percent (131) as excellent and last but not the least 0.12 percent (3) as worst. Those who responded as satisfactory, highest is from

Shimoga (62.4) followed by Davangere (54), Mandya (52), Bellary (51.6) and the least from Gulbarga (50.2). During the study it was found that majority were not that convinced about schedule of work as there was lack of continuous stretch of work and most of the time they got work when they themselves were busy with their economic activity.

Table 4: Choice for selection of works

Name of the Districts		Bellary		Davangere		Gulbarga		Mandya		Shimoga		Total	
SL NO	Choice for selection	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Excellent	17	3.4	10	1.82	16	3.2	14	2.8	35	7.0	92	3.48
2	Good	106	21.2	108	21.6	115	23	110	22	162	32.4	601	24.04
3	Satisfactory	274	54.8	273	54.6	276	55.2	276	55.2	273	54.6	1372	54.88
4	Poor	103	20.6	109	21.8	93	18.6	100	20	26	5.2	431	17.24
5	Worst	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0.8	4	0.16
Total		500	100	500	100	500	100	500	100	500	100	2500	100

Source: Field Work Survey

The Table-4 provides the opinion of the beneficiaries on the choice for selection of works. 54.88 percent (1372) have replied satisfactory, 24.04 percent (601) as good, 17.24 percent (431) as poor, 3.48 percent (92) as excellent and 0.16 percent (4) as worst. Those responded as satisfactory,

highest is from Gulbarga and Mandya (55.2 each) followed by Bellary (54.8), Davangere and Shimoga (54.6 each) being least. People were supposed to be happy with whatever work was allotted for them

Table 5: Information about the scheme

Name of the Districts		Bellary		Davangere		Gulbarga		Mandya		Shimoga		Total	
SL NO	Information about	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Excellent	38	7.6	33	6.6	40	8	34	6.8	9	1.2	154	6.16
2	Good	47	9.4	37	7.4	54	10.8	48	9.6	66	13.2	252	10.08
3	Satisfactory	209	41.8	207	41.4	199	39.8	211	42.2	296	59.2	1222	48.88
4	Poor	206	41.2	223	44.6	207	41.4	207	41.4	92	18.4	935	37.4
5	Worst	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	7.4	37	1.48
Total		500	100	500	100	500	100	500	100	500	100	2500	100

Source: Field Work Survey

The Table-5 extracts the opinion of the beneficiaries regarding the information about the scheme. While 44.88 percent (1122) of them opined that it has been satisfactory, 37.4 percent (935) replied to be poor, 10.08 percent (252) as good, 6.16 percent (154) as excellent and only 1.48 percent (37) as worst. From this, inference can be drawn that the

information about the scheme is not extensive and hence, measures can be taken to improve the same. Those who gave satisfactory as response highest is from Shimoga (59.2) followed by Mandya (42.2), Bellary (41.8), Davangere (41.4) and Gulbarga (39.8) is the least.

Table 6: Execution of work

Name of the Districts		Bellary		Davangere		Gulbarga		Mandya		Shimoga		Total	
SL NO	Execution of work	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Excellent	27	3.8	36	4	27	4.4	28	4	29	5.6	139	5.86
2	Good	151	30.2	143	28.6	141	28.2	146	29.2	162	32.4	743	29.72
3	Satisfactory	229	45.8	244	48.8	227	45.4	230	46	276	55.2	1206	48.24
4	Poor	93	18.6	77	15.4	105	21	96	19.2	31	6.2	402	16.08
5	Worst	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0.4	2	0.08
Total		500	100	500	100	500	100	500	100	500	100	2500	100

Source: Field Work Survey

The Table -6 elucidate the opinion of the beneficiaries regarding the execution of work. 48.24 percent (1206) of the beneficiaries opined that execution of work has been

satisfactory, 29.72 percent (743) as good, 16.08 percent (402) as poor, 4036 percent (109) as excellent and the remaining as worst.

Table 7: Supervision of work at worksite

Name of the Districts		Bellary		Davangere		Gulbarga		Mandya		Shimoga		Total	
SL NO	Supervision of work	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Excellent	36	7.2	33	6.6	56	11.2	36	7.2	37	7.4	191	7.64
2	Good	145	29	122	24.4	136	27.2	143	28.6	94	18.8	640	25.6
3	Satisfactory	206	41.2	224	44.8	216	43.2	206	41.2	323	64.6	1175	47
4	Poor	113	22.6	121	24.2	92	18.4	115	23	44	8.8	485	19.4
5	Worst	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0.4	2	0.08
Total		500	100	500	100	500	100	500	100	500	100	2500	100

Source: Field Work Survey

The Table -7 extract the perception of beneficiaries about the supervision of work at worksite. About 47 percent (1175) of the beneficiaries replied that the supervision of work at worksite has been satisfactory, 25.6 percent (640) as good, 19.4 percent (485) as poor, 7.64 (191) as excellent and 0.08 percent (2) as worst. Those who gave as

satisfactory response were from Shimoga (64.6) followed by Davangere (44.8), Gulbarga (43.2), Bellary and Mandya (41.2 each) being the least. Thus we find with regard to supervision of work their response ranged from good to satisfactory.

Table 8: Facilities at work site

Name of the Districts		Bellary		Davangere		Gulbarga		Mandya		Shimoga		Total	
SL. NO	Facilities at work	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Excellent	13	2.6	11	2.2	12	2.4	13	2.6	87	17.4	136	5.44
2	Good	206	41.2	185	37	220	44	206	41.2	140	28	957	38.28
3	Satisfactory	57	10.4	61	12.2	44	8.8	57	11.4	133	26.6	352	14.08
4	Poor	224	44.8	243	48.6	224	44.8	224	44.8	108	21.6	1023	40.92
5	Worst	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	6.4	32	1.28
Total		500	100	500	100	500	100	500	100	500	100	2500	100

Source: Field Work Survey

The Table-8 draws the opinion of the beneficiaries about the facilities at the work site. 40.92 percent (1023) of them said it was poor. Out of which highest is from Davangere (48.6) followed by Bellary, Gulbarga and Mandya (44.8 each) and least from Shimoga (21.6). Of the remaining, 38.28 percent (957) replied as good, 14.08 percent (352) as satisfactory, 5.44 percent (136) as excellent and 1.28 percent (32) as

worst. It can be said that except from Shimoga district, respondents from other four districts have not been provided with proper facilities at the worksite. The same may be conveyed to the concerned authorities responsible for implementation of the scheme which may help in initiating corrective measures.

Table 9: Mode of distribution of wages

Name of the Districts		Bellary		Davangere		Gulbarga		Mandya		Shimoga		Total	
SL NO	Mode of wages	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Excellent	27	5.4	18	3.6	24	4.8	24	4.8	6	1.2	99	3.96
2	Good	415	83	422	84.4	423	84.6	419	83.8	58	11.6	1737	69.48
3	Satisfactory	4	0.8	3	0.6	12	2.4	4	0.8	344	68.8	367	14.68
4	Poor	54	10.8	57	11.4	39	7.8	53	10.6	87	17.4	290	11.6
5	Worst	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0.4	2	0.08
Total		500	100	500	100	500	100	500	100	500	100	2500	100

Source: Field Work Survey

The Table - 9 reflects the opinion of the beneficiaries regarding the mode of distribution of wages. 69.48 percent (1737) opined that the mode of distribution of wages has been good, 14.68 percent (367) replied as satisfactory, 11.6 percent (290) as poor, 3.96 percent (99) as excellent and remaining as worst. Here also the response as good is

highest is from Gulbarga (84.6) followed by Davangere (84.4), Mandya (83.8), Bellary (83) and the least from Shimoga (11.6). In almost all the district people were happy about the distribution of wages as the wages were given in time but sometimes took few days late due to unseen conditions.

Table 10: Quality of works executed

Name of the Districts		Bellary		Davangere		Gulbarga		Mandya		Shimoga		Total	
SL NO	Quality of work	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%

1	Excellent	28	5.6	23	4.6	22	4.4	25	5	19	3.8	117	4.68
2	Good	404	80.8	427	85.4	390	78	410	82	119	23.8	1750	70
3	Satisfactory	64	12.8	47	9.4	72	14.4	61	12.2	348	69.6	592	23.68
4	Poor	4	0.8	3	0.6	16	3.2	4	0.8	14	2.8	41	1.64
Total		500	100	500	100	500	100	500	100	500	100	2500	100

Source: Field Work Survey

The Table -10 draws opinion of the beneficiaries towards the quality of the works executed. 70 percent (1750) of them have replied that quality has been good, 23.68 percent (592) as satisfactory, 4.68% (117) as excellent and the remaining 1.64 percent (41) as poor. Those districts who gave the

response as well is from Davangere (85.4) followed by Mandya (82), Bellary (80.8) Gulbarga (78) and the least from Shimoga (23.8). Here also the response ranged from good to satisfactory.

Table 11: Grievance Redressal

Name of the Districts		Bellary		Davangere		Gulbarga		Mandya		Shimoga		Total	
SL NO	Grievance Redressal	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Excellent	25	5	25	5	31	6.2	25	5	17	3.4	123	4.92
2	Good	139	27.8	135	27	124	24.8	137	27.4	120	24	655	26.2
3	Satisfactory	86	17.2	71	14.2	93	18.6	88	17.6	327	65.4	665	26.6
4	Poor	250	50	269	53.8	252	50.4	250	50	35	7	1056	42.24
5	Worst	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.2	1	0.04
Total		500	100	500	100	500	100	500	100	500	100	2500	100

Source: Field Work Survey

The Table -11 put forth the opinion of the beneficiaries about grievance redressal measures under the scheme. 42.24 percent (1056) have said that the grievance redressal has been very poor, 26.6 percent (665) as satisfactory, 26.2 percent (655) as good, 4.92 percent (123) as excellent and 0.04 percent (1) as worst. In comparison with the other four districts, it can be seen that in Shimoga the grievance redressal measures has been taken up very seriously and it seems that better services have been provided. In line with this, steps may be taken to extend the same across other districts too. Those who are said poor are highest is from Davangere district (53.8) followed by Gulbarga (50.4), Bellary and Mandya (50 each) and the least from Shimoga (7) district.

- Gopal KS. "NREGA Social Audit: Myths and Reality", Economic and Political Weekly. 2009; XLIV(03):70-75.
- Khera Reetika. "Empowerment Guarantee Act", Economic & Political Weekly. 2008; XLII(35):8-10.
- Prasanna V Salian, Leelavathi DS. "An economic analysis of the implementation of the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act a comparative study of Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh" Hyderabad, 2014.
- Trivedi BR, Aswal BS. Encyclopedia of NREGA and Panchayati Raj, Cyber Tech Publications, New Delhi, 2011.

Conclusion

The study found that the beneficiaries expressed happiness to satisfactory opinion with regard to the registration process, issue of job cards, choice of work, time and selection of work, relevancy of work while they expressed dissatisfaction about information about the scheme and facilities given at work place. A proper channelizing of information is the prime requisite so that information reaches every individual.

References

- Ashok Pankaj. "Process, institution and mechanism of implementation MGNREGA: Impact assessment report of Bihar and Jharkhand, Institute for Human Development, 2008.
- Borgohain Guarantee Employment, a bold vision, The Assam Tribune, 2013.
- Das Dinesh, "Examining India's Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA): Its Impact & Women's Participation", International Journal of Research in Management. 2012; 6(2):209-218.
- Das Pallav. "MGNREGA and Rural-urban Migration in India", Journal of Research in Commerce & Management. 2013; 2(2):43-47.