

Impact of MGNREGA on Rural employment (specific study in panchayat kaepora of district Kupwara, Jammu and Kashmir)

¹ Basharat Bashir Bhat, ² Dr. P. Mariyappan

¹ Ph.D. Research Scholar Department of Sociology Annamalai University, Annamalainagar Chidambaram, Tamil Nadu

² Assistant Professor Department of Sociology Annamalai University, Annamalainagar Chidambaram, Tamil Nadu.

Abstract

To bring the livelihood security in the lives of rural poor, there have been several employment schemes in the past like Employment Assurance Schemes (EAS), National Rural Employment Programme (NREP), Jawahar Rozgar YoJana (JRY), Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY) etc. However the MGNREGA was passed on 23rd August 2005 by Indian Parliament with an aim to enhance the livelihood security in rural areas by providing at least 100 days of employment in a financial year to the rural households who are volunteer to do unskilled manual works. The State Jammu and Kashmir also adopted MGNREGA as an instrument of rural development and employment generation from the beginning of Eleventh Five Year Plan. The Act was extended to the state Jammu and Kashmir from 11th May 2007 and was implemented in various phases; however in April 2008 the Act covered the whole state. The present study throws the light by adopting descriptive research design on the employment provided by MGNREGA and its impact in the Kahipora Panchayat of Kupwara district, state Jammu & Kashmir.

Keywords: livelihood security, Rural Employment etc.

Introduction

Employment is a social issue and main source of livelihood in India. Lack of access to employment leads challenge to basic needs of individual and family. Unemployment lowers self-esteem and can direct towards social instability. Therefore, it is important to work in conditions of freedom, equity, security and human dignity for all men and women. In country like India over half the work force continues to depend on the agriculture. This creates a huge gap in productivity and incomes between agriculture and non-agriculture sectors. This is mainly due to insufficient growth of productive employment opportunities outside agriculture. Agricultural labourers do not get employment throughout the year and they are subject to unemployment and underemployment during off seasonal employment.

Government of India has already launched anti-poverty programmes in order to decrease rural poverty and increase level of employment, income and standard of living of rural poor people. Most of them have failed to bring any livelihood security to the rural poor people. However in recent years Central Government of India introduced Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA), passed by Indian Parliament on 23rd August 2005. The Act is designed to provide job guarantee for minimum 100 days and if employment is not provided within 15 days, an unemployment allowance has to be paid. Under this Act 100 days of guaranteed wage employment is provided in a financial year to every rural household whose adult members (above 18 years of Age) volunteer to do unskilled manual work. 100 days of work can be shared within the household. More than one person in the household can be employed simultaneously or at different times. A period of employment shall ordinarily be at least 14 days continuously with not more

than 6 days in week. MGNREGA was primarily called the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) but was renamed on 2nd October 2009. MGNREGA mandates 33 per cent participation for women. Even though MGNREGA succeeds to decline the level of rural unemployment by providing a legal guarantee to work and labourers cannot count on employment being provided to them during the lean season. An employment guarantee gives labourers more confidence in the prospect of local employment, and discourages seasonal migration. Schemes may come and go and can be trimmed and cancelled by an official order whereas MGNREGA requires an amendment in parliament because it is not merely a scheme but an Act under which the workers have durable legal right and have to learn how to claim their due. Hence marks a paradigm shift from all earlier and existing welfare wage employment programmes. Bulk of unemployed labourer and disparities among agricultural labourers are main research problem discovered in the study area. The employment status of block Rajwar has been visualised by self-employed in agricultural sector, self-employed in non-agriculture sector, employed as regular wage/salaried employees in agriculture sector, and employed as regular wages/salaried employees in non-agriculture sector.

Review of Literature

In India various studies have been done on various rural development programmes. Therefore, on MGNREGA different and unlimited literature is available. Sequentially to find a research gap and understand the impact of MGNREGA on rural employment following literature are sighted. Moitri (2010) ^[3] investigated the national rural employment guarantee act (NREGA) and explore that in the era Globalisation everyone is talking about socio economic

changes and in India the Liberalisation, Privatisation and Globalisation (LPG) era is characterized by a high economic growth rate (at 6%) which is termed as the jobless era with only 1% of job growth. Under such conditions NREGA is trying to address the issue of unemployment in rural areas where unemployment is higher. NREGA has a vital role to play because of its human approach and NREGA is the only Act which gives its rural people such a right in this era of LPG. Ahuja *et al.* (2011) [1] studied the impact of MGNREGA on rural employment and migration. The study revealed that the farmers who have small land and livestock resources are more inclined to work in MGNREGA and their participation is also more as compared to the farmers owning large size of landholdings and more number of livestock. Thus, MGNREGA is providing livelihood security to the resource-poor rural people. Chitra, Ganesan (2013) [2] examined the implication of MGNREGA activities in rural employment opportunities. The study exposed that MGNREGA helps to the agricultural labourers in the off season but wages and number of days of employment provided are very low. So, it is necessary to increase the wage rate and number of days of employment. Further the agricultural labourers are not able to get employment throughout the year so government institutions and social organisations should come forward to establish rural based industries like coir and cottage industries to provide employment to agricultural labourers throughout the year.

Methodology

To study the impact of MGNREGA on rural employment, Panchayat Kahipora of Block Rajwar, District Kupwara, State Jammu and Kashmir has been selected. The Panchayat Kahipora includes a hamlet namely Krumhoora and consists of 438 total number of registered persons under MGNREGA. Among which 361 are Male workers and 77 are Female workers. Descriptive research design and primary data has been adopted for this study in keeping view the following objectives.

1. To examine satisfaction of respondents concerning with employment provided by the MGNREGA.
2. To analyse the availability of work under MGNREGA.
3. To assess the impact of MGNREGA on other unskilled manual work.
4. To measure the perception of respondents about the work opportunity and wages provided by other agency

Researcher with the help of stratified random sampling method selected 16% i.e. 70 respondents of total registered workers. The responses of respondent were collected with the help of interview schedule and observation techniques. Review schedule includes both open and close ended questions to understand the perception of respondents.

Analysis and Interpretation

As a part of analysis and interpretation, collected data has classified, analysed and tabulated in a simplified manner. Simple percentage method and Chi-square test has adopted in present study to measure the association between respondents and employment provide by MGNREGA.

Table 1: Socio Economic background of the Respondents

Gender	No. of the Respondents	Percentage
Male	55	78.6%
Female	15	21.4%
Total	70	100%
Monthly Income	No. of the Respondents	Percentage
2000 – 3000	10	14.3%
3001 – 4000	28	40%
4001 – 5000	19	27.1%
501 – 6000	13	18.6%
Total	70	100%

From the field investigation it has been found that MGNREGA is functioning for strengthen the rural livelihood by providing employment opportunity to rural households without any discrimination of caste, religion and sex. Table-1 depicts major part (78.6%) of the MGNREGA workers are male members and the participation of female members (21.4%) seems below mandatory level. Reason behind this low participation is that in the study area usually male members are working for their family and women mostly doing household works. Further it has been found that majority (40%) of respondent occupies monthly income group of 3001- 4000 and lowest (14.3%) of respondent lives in the income group of 2000 - 3000.

Table 2: Gender wise Respondents view on satisfaction of employment

Gender	Employment provided by MGNREGA			Total
	Satisfied	Partially Satisfied	Unsatisfied	
Male	8 (61.54 %)	34 (94.44 %)	13 (61.90 %)	55 (78.5 %)
Female	5 (38.46 %)	2 (5.56 %)	8 (38.10 %)	15 (21.43 %)
Total	13 (18.57 %)	36 (51.43 %)	21 (30.00 %)	70 (100 %)

X^2 Calculated value = 11.03

Degrees of freedom = 2

X^2 table value 5 % = 5.99

Table-2 presents gender wise satisfaction of respondents with employment provided by MGNREGA. Majority (94.44%) of male respondents are partially satisfied. (61.90%) of male respondents are unsatisfied and the rest of male respondents are satisfied with employment opportunity provided by the MGNREGA. Among female respondents greater part (38.46%) are satisfied. However (38.10%) of female respondents are unsatisfied and rest of them are satisfied. Both male and female respondents are of the view that 100 days of employment in a year are not sufficient to meet the basic needs of their family as day by day the family needs are increasing. However the percentage of female satisfaction is more than male satisfaction, it is only because female respondents experience more security and equity under MGNREGA.

Since the Chi-square test is applied for further discussion. It is hypothesised that there is no significant relationship between sex of respondents and the employment opportunity. The calculated Chi-square value of 11.03 with 2 degrees of freedom at 5 percent level of significance is more than the table value. Therefore formulated null hypothesis is rejected and it is concluded that there is a significant relationship between sex of respondent and employment opportunity provided by MGNREGA. Consequently it refers that MGNREGA's employment is influenced by sex of respondents.

Table 3: Income wise Respondents view on satisfaction of employment

Income (Per Month)	Employment provided by MGNREGA			Total
	Satisfied	Partially Satisfied	Unsatisfied	
2000 - 3000	2(15.38%)	4 (11.11 %)	4 (19.04 %)	10 (14.29 %)
3001 - 4000	2 (15.38 %)	22 (61.11 %)	4 (19.04 %)	28 (40.00 %)
4001 - 5000	3 (23.07 %)	6 (16.67 %)	10 (47.62 %)	19 (27.14 %)
5001 - 6000	6 (46.15 %)	4 (11.11 %)	3 (14.19 %)	13 (18.57 %)
Total	13 (18.57 %)	36 (51.43 %)	21 (30.00%)	70 (100 %)

X² Calculated value = 20.34

Degrees of freedom = 6

X² table value 5 % = 12.6

Table-3 explains income wise satisfaction of respondents with employment provided by MGNREGA. Major portion (61.11 %) of income group 3001–4000 is partially satisfied and (47.62 %) of income group 4001 –5000 is unsatisfied with employment provided by MGNREGA. Further great part (46.15 %) of income group 5001–6000 is satisfied and major (19.04 %) of income group 2000-3000 is unsatisfied with the employment opportunity provided of MGNREGA.

Chi square test is applied for further discussion. Hence it is hypothesised that there is no significant relationship between

monthly income of respondents and employment provided by MGNREGA. The calculated Chi-square value 20.34 with 6 degrees of freedom at 5 percent level of significance is more than table value. Therefore formulated null hypothesis stands rejected and it is concluded that there is a significant relationship between income of respondents and employment opportunity under MGNREGA. So it denotes that MGNREGA's employment differs as per income of respondents.

Table 4: Gender wise Respondents views on opportunity of work provided by MGNREGA

Gender	Opportunity of work provided by MGNREGA (Seasonally)			Total
	Lean season	Peak season	Both	
Male	33 (89.19 %)	10 (83.33 %)	12 (57.14 %)	55 (78.5 %)
Female	4 (10.81 %)	2 (16.67 %)	9 (42.86 %)	15 (21.43 %)
Total	37 (52.86 %)	12 (17.14 %)	21 (30.00 %)	70 (100 %)

X² Calculated value = 8.26

Degrees of freedom = 2

X² table value 5 % = 5.99

Table-4 illustrates gender and seasonal opportunity of work provided by MGNREGA. Majority (89.19 %) of male respondents are working in lean season, (83.33 %) of male respondents are working in peak season and rest of them are working in both lean and peak season. However among female respondents majority (42.86 %) are working in both peak and lean season, (16.67 %) of female respondents are working in peak season and rest of them are working in lean season under MGNREGA.

Since Chi-square test is applied for further discussion. It is hypothesised that there is no significant relationship between

the sex of respondents and the seasonal opportunity of work. Since the calculated value of Chi-square 8.26 is greater than table value with 2 degrees of freedom at 5 percent level of significance. Thus formulated null hypothesis is rejected and it can be concluded that there is a significant relationship between sex of respondents and seasonal opportunity of work provided by MGNREGA. It means MGNREGA's opportunity of work changes according to sex of respondents.

Table 5: Income wise Respondents views on opportunity of work provided by MGNREGA

Income (Per Month)	Opportunity of work provided by MGNREGA (Seasonally)			Total
	Lean season	Peak season	Both	
2000 - 3000	2 (5.41 %)	3 (25.00 %)	5 (23.81 %)	10 (14.29 %)
3001 - 4000	19 (51.35 %)	4 (33.33 %)	5 (23.81 %)	28 (40.00 %)
4001 - 5000	13 (35.14 %)	2 (16.67 %)	4 (19.05 %)	19 (27.14 %)
5001 - 6000	3 (8.10 %)	3 (25.00 %)	7 (33.33 %)	13(18.57 %)
Total	37 (52.86 %)	12 (17.14 %)	21 (30.00%)	70 (100 %)

X² Calculated value = 14.0

Degrees of freedom = 6

X² table value 5 % = 12.6

Table-5 reveals income wise respondents view concerning with seasonal employment provided by MGNREGA. Majority (51.35 %) of income group 3001–4000 are working in the lean season and major part (35.14 %) of income group 4001–5000 is of same opinion. Further major segment (33.33 %) of

income group 5001–6000 is working in both seasons and great part (25.00 %) of income group 2000–3000 is working in peak season under MGNREGA

Chi-square test is applied for further discussion. Thus it is hypothesised that there is no significant relationship between

income of respondents and seasonal opportunity of work. The calculated Chi-square value 14.0 with 6 degrees of freedom at 5 percent significance level is greater than table value. Hence formulated null hypothesis is rejected and it is concluded that

there is a significant relationship between income of respondents and seasonal opportunity of work under MGNREGA. So it exposes that MGNREGA's employment differs as per income of respondents.

Table 6: Gender wise Respondents views on Impact of MGNREGA on other unskilled manual work

Gender	Impact on other unskilled manual work			Total
	Positive impact	Negative impact	Neutral	
Male	15 (65.22 %)	32 (94.12 %)	8 (61.54 %)	55 (78.5 %)
Female	8 (34.78 %)	2 (5.88 %)	5 (38.46 %)	15 (21.43 %)
Total	23 (32.86 %)	34 (48.57 %)	13 (18.57 %)	70 (100 %)

X² Calculated value = 9.6
 Degrees of freedom = 2
 X² table value 5 % = 5.99

Table-6 describes gender wise impact of MGNREGA on other unskilled manual work. Major part (94.12%) of male respondents express negative impact, (65.22%) of male respondents say positive impact and rest of them state neutral impact of MGNREGA on other unskilled manual work. On the other hand great part (38.46%) of female respondents declares neutral impact, (34.78%) of female respondents assert positive impact and rest of them stress negative impact of MGNREGA on other unskilled manual work. Chi-square test is applied for further examination. So it is hypothesised that there is no significant relationship between

sex of respondents and impact of MGNREGA on other unskilled work. The Chi-square calculated value 9.6 with 2 degrees of freedom at 5 percent significance level is higher than table value. Hence formulated null hypothesis is rejected which means there is a significant relationship between sex of respondents and impact of MGNREGA on other unskilled manual work. So it explains that MGNREGA's impact on other unskilled manual work differs according to sex of respondents.

Table 7: Income wise Respondents views on Impact of MGNREGA on other unskilled manual work

Income (Per Month)	Impact on other Unskilled manual work			Total
	Positive impact	Negative impact	Neutral	
2000 - 3000	2 (8.70 %)	4 (11.76 %)	4 (30.77 %)	10 (14.29 %)
3001 - 4000	16 (69.56 %)	10 (29.41 %)	2 (15.38 %)	28 (40.00 %)
4001 - 5000	3 (13.04 %)	14 (41.18 %)	2 (15.38 %)	19 (27.14 %)
5001 - 6000	2 (8.70 %)	6 (17.65 %)	5 (38.45 %)	13 (18.57 %)
Total	23 (32.86 %)	34 (48.57 %)	13 (18.57 %)	70 (100 %)

X² Calculated value = 20.1
 Degrees of freedom = 6
 X² table value 5 % = 12.6

Table-7 illustrates income wise impact of MGNREGA on other unskilled manual work. Highest (69.56%) of income group 3001-4000 state positive impact and major (41.18%) of income group 4001-5000 assert negative impact of MGNREGA on other unskilled manual work. In addition large section (38.45 %) of income group 5001-6000 say neutral impact and maximum (30.77%) of income group 2000-3000 also declares neutral the impact of MGNREGA on other unskilled manual work. For further discussion Chi-square test is applied. So it is hypothesised that there is no significant relationship between

income of respondents and impact of MGNREGA on other unskilled manual work. The calculated Chi-square value 20.1 is greater than table value with 6 degrees of freedom at 5 percent significance level. Thus formulated null hypothesis stands rejected and it can be concluded that there is a significant relationship between income of respondents and impact of MGNREGA on other unskilled manual work. Accordingly it infers that MGNREGA's impact on other unskilled manual work fluctuates according to income of respondents

Table 8: Gender wise Respondents views on more work and more wages by other agency

Gender	More work and more wages			Total
	To great extent	To some extent	Not at all	
Male	30 (93.75 %)	20 (74.07 %)	5 (45.45 %)	55 (78.5 %)
Female	2 (6.25 %)	7 (25.93 %)	6 (54.55 %)	15 (21.43 %)
Total	32 (45.71 %)	27 (38.57 %)	11 (15.72 %)	70 (100 %)

X² Calculated value = 11.7
 Degrees of freedom = 2
 X² table value 5 % = 5.99

Table-8 interprets gender wise response of respondents in relation to more work and more wages. Among male respondents great part (93.75%) say to great extent, (74.07%) declare to some extent and rest of them state not at all about more work and more wages provided by other agency. On other side large segment (54.55%) of female respondents claim not at all, (25.93%) affirm to some extent and rest of them insist to great extent regarding the more work and more wages provided by other agency. Since Chi-square test is applied for further discussion. Accordingly it is hypothesised that there is no significant

relationship between sex of respondents and more work and more wages provided by other agency. The calculated Chi-square value 11.7 with 2 degrees of freedom at 5 percent level of significance is greater than table value. Thus formulated null hypothesis is rejected and it is concluded that there is a significant relationship between sex of respondents and more work and more wages provided by other agency. It means that more work and more wages provided by other agency changes according to sex of respondents.

Table 9: Income wise Respondents views on more work and more wages by other agency

Income (Per Month)	More work and more wages			Total
	To great extent	To some extent	Not at all	
2000 - 3000	3 (9.38 %)	2 (7.41 %)	5 (45.45 %)	10 (14.29 %)
3001 - 4000	18 (56.25 %)	8 (29.63 %)	2 (18.18 %)	28 (40.00 %)
4001 - 5000	9 (28.12 %)	8 (29.63 %)	2 (18.18 %)	19 (27.14 %)
5001 - 6000	2 (6.25 %)	9 (33.33 %)	2 (18.18 %)	13 (18.57 %)
Total	32 (45.71 %)	27 (38.57 %)	11 (15.72 %)	70 (100 %)

X² Calculated value = 18.4
 Degrees of freedom = 6
 X² table value 5 % = 12.6

Table-9 depicts income wise distribution of respondents concerning with more work and more wages. Major part (56.25 %) of income group 3001-4000 assert to great extent and highest (45.45 %) of income group 2000-3000 claim not at all regarding more work and more wages provided by other agency. Further larger section (33.33 %) of income group 5001- 6000 state to some extent and great portion (29.63 %) of income group 4001-5000 also declares to some extent with reference to more work and more wages provided by other agency.

For further examination Chi-square test is applied. Therefore it is hypothesised that there is no significant relationship between income of respondents and more work and more wages provided by other agency. Since calculated Chi-square value 18.4 is more than table value with 6 degrees of freedom at 5 percent level of significance. Hence formulated null hypothesis is rejected and it can be concluded that there is a significant relationship between income of respondents and more work and more wages provided by other agency. As a result it infers that more work and more wages provided by other agency varies as per income of respondents

Important Findings

From present study it is openly observed that there is considerable gap in participation of male and female workers under the scheme MGNREGA. The participation level of female workers is very low i.e. only 21.4 percent. Main occupation of workers is agricultural work, most of respondents are married and large section of respondents has Rs 4001-5000 monthly income.

Further in view of employment provided by MGNREGA major portion 94.44 percent of male workers are partially satisfied and major segment 38.46 percent of female workers are satisfied. However satisfaction of employment under MGNREGA among workers varies as per their monthly income, major portion 61.11 percent of workers in income group of 3001-4000 are partially satisfied and great part 46.15

percent of workers in income group of 5001-6000 are satisfied.

In addition major part 89.19 percent of male workers got employment in lean season and among female workers highest 42.86 percent got employment in both peak and lean season. Income group of 3001-4000 state first position 51.35 percent over availability of work in lean season.

Moreover large segment 94.12 percent of male workers shared negative impact and highest 38.46 percent of female workers expressed neutral impact of MGNREGA on other unskilled manual work. Major 69.56 percent of workers in income group of 3001-4000 avowed positive impact of MGNREGA on other unskilled manual work.

In respect of more work and more wages by other agency most of male workers 93.75 percent confirmed to great extent while as major part 54.55 percent of female workers declared not at all. Further in income group of 3001-4000 most of respondents 56.25 percent affirmed to get more work and wages outside MGNREGA.

Conclusion

Since independence various welfare programmes has become an issue of concern to strengthen the rural livelihood by providing an employment opportunity to rural poor. Unlike these welfare programmes MGNREGA stands at its different as it is an Act not only a scheme which provides 100 days of guaranteed wage employment in a financial year to every rural household whose adult members want to do unskilled manual work. This guarantee to work develops more confidence and self-esteem among labour workers especially among women labour workers. Agricultural labourers mostly remain out of work during lean season but at the same time they work under MGNREGA and defer the seasonal migration. Hence results in decline of unemployment by providing a local employment to rural people especially in the lean season.

Although MGNREGA do well to accomplish the rural unemployment since from its inception in study area but at the same time disparity in providing working days opportunity

and unemployment allowance generates gap between workers and MGNREGA. Participation of women still seems a distant dream of MGNREGA's achievement because participation of women is below the mandatory level (i.e. 33 % reservation). Therefore present study suggests that employment provided by MGNREGA should be given as per rules and regulations of the Act and unemployment allowance should be offered without any discrimination and delay. Further to attract more workers towards MGNREGA there is need to increase working days opportunity, wage rate and it is an obligation to spread awareness among village people to increase participation of women workers in the study area.

References

1. Ahuja Rani Usha, Tyagi Dushyant. eds, Conference on Impact of MGNREGA on Rural Employment and Migration: A Study in Agriculturally-backward and Agriculturally-advanced Districts of Haryana, Agricultural Economics Research Review. 2011, 24.
2. Chitra M, Dr Ganesan L, Dr Implication of MGNREGA Activities in Rural Employment Opportunities – A Micro Level Analysis, Shanlax International Journal of Economics. 2013,1.
3. Dey Moitri. National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) A Range of Possibilities, International Journal of Rural Studies, 2010; 17.
4. Kumar Sasi B, Rengasamy Kalaran. Participation of rural workers in the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act in India, International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 2012, 2.
5. Kanika, Nancy, Gupta PB. Dr, Impact of Narega on Rural Areas of Hoshiarpur, International Journal of Management & Information Technology, 2013, 4.
6. Koundal Virender Dr. Impact of MGNREGA on Scheduled Castes Employment Generation: A Case Study of Jammu Division (J&K), International Journal of Business Economics & Management Research, 2013, 3.
7. Panda Santanu, Majumder Arup. A Review Of Rural Development Programmes In India, International Journal of Research in Sociology and Social Anthropology, 2013, 1
8. Government of Jammu & Kashmir., Directorate of Economics & Statistics J&K., Economic Survey, 2013-14.
9. www.nrega.nic.in