

Impact of Mgnrega on Socioeconomic Conditions of Beneficiaries of Srikakulam District of Andhrapradesh

*A.PRASANNA RANI; **Dr. JAHANARA

*M.Sc. Agricultural Extension, Department of Agricultural Extension and Communication, SHUATS, Allahabad, U.P. India

**Head of Department of Agricultural Extension and Communication, SHUATS, Prayagraj – 211007, (U.P.), India

Abstract:- The study was conducted purposively Selected Pathapatnam block in Srikakulam district of Andhra Pradesh. Six villages selected purposively and from each selected village 20 respondents were selected randomly thus 120 respondents constituting the sample size for present study. Ex- post facto research design was followed and data was collected by using personal interview method. The collected data were tabulated, analyzed and interpreted with the appropriate statistical tools. It was found that Majority of the respondents were middle aged (36-40 yrs) with beneficiaries (46.66%) and non-beneficiaries (48.33%). Majority of the respondents of the beneficiaries high school belong to (31.66%) and non-beneficiaries (21.66%). Majority of the beneficiaries (80%) having more than five members and non-beneficiaries (18.33%). Majority of the beneficiaries income level 41,000-80,000 medium (71.66%) and non-beneficiaries (68.33%). majority of the respondents of beneficiaries of mass media medium level (53.33%) and non-beneficiaries (21.66%). Majority of the respondents of beneficiaries of extension contact level (41.66%) and non-beneficiaries (38.33%). Majority of the respondents of beneficiaries of livestock category (35%) and non-beneficiaries of the respondents (28.33%). majority of the beneficiaries had most favorable attitude towards MGNREGA as compared to non-beneficiaries. it was also concluded that majority of the beneficiaries had a much better empowerment level as compared to non-beneficiaries. Majority of the beneficiaries had agreed that purchasing capacity had been improved as compared to non-beneficiaries.

Keywords:- Level of Attitude, MGNREGA

I. INTRODUCTION

Mahatma Gandhi national rural employment guarantee act (MGNREGA) is a job guarantee scheme for rural Indians. Villagers comprise the core of Indian society and also represent the real India. It has a great significance for a country like India where majority of the population around 65.00 % of the people lives in rural areas. The present strategy of rural development in India mainly focuses on poverty alleviation, better livelihood opportunities, provision of basic amenities and infrastructure facilities through innovative programmes of wage and self employment. A majority of poor and landless population in rural areas of the country depend mainly on

the wages they earned through unskilled, casual and manual labour. Inadequate labour demand or unpredictable crisis that may be general in nature, like natural disaster or personal like ill-health, all those have adverse impact on their employment opportunities. In a context of poverty and unemployment, work fare programmes have been important interventions in developed as well as in developing countries for many years. These programmes typically provide unskilled manual works with short-term employment on public works such as irrigation infrastructure, reforestation, soil conservation and rural connectivity. MGNREGA is also one of such interventions. Though Government of India implemented several employment programmes no one was adequate enough to fulfill the needs of rural people. By considering all the short comings in earlier programmes, Government of India designed another scheme to provide employment to the rural people *i.e.* National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme. This scheme is different from earlier employment programmes and launched by Government of India as it is on one hand demand driven, on the other treats employment as a right of the rural households. (Kantharaju, C.N. 2011) Therefore the present study” IMPACT OF MGNREGA ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF BENEFICIARIES OF SRIKAKULAM DISTRICT OF ANDHRAPRADESH.

➤ *COMPARE THE ATTITUDE OF MGNREGA BETWEEN BENEFICIARIES AND NON-BENEFICIARIES.*

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in Srikakulam district of Andhra Pradesh during the year 2017-19. The State of Andhra Pradesh was selected purposively as it is one of the leading state in providing maximum employment generation through MGNREGS and also researcher belongs to this state and well familiar with the area and local language *i.e.* Telugu, which would be helpful to build quick rapport and also facilitates to obtain relevant information. The India map showing Andhra Pradesh state was presented Srikakulam district was purposively selected based on criteria of maximum employment generation under MGNREGS during the year 2017-19. “Ex-post facto” research design was employed in the study. The ex-post facto research design was defined as any systematic empirical inquiry in which the independent variables have not directly manipulated because they have already

occurred. The independent variables considered in the study have already occurred and are not directly manipulated by the researcher. Keeping in view the adaptability of the proposed design with respect to the type of variables under consideration, sample size and the phenomenon to be studied, the selected design was considered to be appropriate.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

➤ *Compare The Attitude of MGNREGA between Beneficiaries and Non-Beneficiaries:*

| S. NO | CATEGORY | BENEFICIARIES | | | NON-BENEFICIARIES | | |
|-------|--|---------------|-----------|---------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|
| | | PA | SWA | DA | PA | SWA | NA |
| 1. | MGNREGA has led to the increase in the income of the workers. | 30 (50.00) | 17(28.33) | 13 (21.66) | 3 (5.00) | 35(58.33) | 22(36.66) |
| 2. | Decision making ability has increased. | 20 (33.33) | 23(38.33) | 17 (28.33) | 5 (8.33) | 28(46.66) | 27(45.00) |
| 3. | Social status has been increased. | 21 (35.00) | 24(40.00) | 15 (25.00) | 0 (0) | 27(45.00) | 33(55.00) |
| 4. | Purchasing capacity has developed. | 29 (48.33) | 23(38.33) | 8 (13.33) | 2 (3.33) | 30(50.00) | 29(48.33) |
| 5. | Health consciousness has aroused. | 14 (23.33) | 23(38.33) | 23 (38.33) | 0(0) | 25(41.66) | 35(58.33) |
| 6. | Children are getting better education. | 8 (13.33) | 27(45.00) | 25 (41.66) | 1 (1.66) | 28(46.66) | 31(51.66) |
| 7. | Standard of living has improved. | 12 (20.00) | 25(41.66) | 23 (38.33) | 7 (11.66) | 24(40.00) | 29(48.33) |
| 8. | Availability of daily labours increased after the introduction of MGNREGA . | 13 (21.66) | 15(25.00) | 34 (56.66) | 6 (10.00) | 24(40.00) | 30(50.00) |
| 9. | More wages paid to male/female workers. | 13 (21.66) | 30(50.00) | 17 (28.33) | 16 (26.66) | 25(41.66) | 19(31.66) |
| 10. | MGNREGA staffs are unaware of rural problems. | 14 (23.33) | 22(36.66) | 24 (40.00) | 16 (26.66) | 24(40.00) | 20(33.33) |
| 11. | Rural people are getting more profit from MGNREGA due to unemployment. | 18 (30.00) | 23(38.33) | 19 (31.66) | 17 (28.33) | 25(41.66) | 18(30.00) |
| 12. | There is nothing wrong in working under MGNREGA to increase income. | 25 (41.66) | 21(35.00) | 14 (23.33) | 21 (35.00) | 21(35.00) | 18(30.00) |
| 13. | Treated differently by sponsored family and villages for working/not working on MGNREGA. | 14 (23.33) | 24(40.00) | 22 (36.66) | 21 (35.00) | 22(36.66) | 17(28.33) |
| 14. | MGNREGA helps to generate moving throughout the year. | 12 (20.00) | 26(43.33) | 22 (36.66) | 14 (23.33) | 21(35.00) | 25(41.66) |

Table 1

PA= Partially Agree, SWA= somewhat agree, DA= Disagree,

➤ Compare the Attitude of MGNREGA between Beneficiaries and Non-Beneficiaries.

| Sl.no | Attitude | Beneficiaries | | Non Beneficiaries | |
|-------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------|
| | | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| 1 | Low | 10 | 16.66 | 29 | 48.33 |
| 2 | Medium | 20 | 33.33 | 19 | 31.66 |
| 3 | High | 30 | 50 | 9 | 15 |
| | Total | 60 | 100.00 | 60 | 100.00 |

Table 2

The results 4.1.13 indicated that the beneficiaries of attitude category 16.66% of the respondents belong to low category, where as 33.33% of the respondents belong to medium category, 50% of the respondents belong to high category, and in case of non-beneficiaries of attitude category 48.33% of the respondents belong to low category, where as 31.66% of the respondents belong to medium

category, while 15% of the respondents belong to high category.

➤ Relationship between Socio-Economic Characteristics and Attitude Level of MGNREGA Programme Beneficiaries and Non-Beneficiaries.

| S.No. | Characteristics | “r” value(beneficiaries) | “r” value(non-beneficiaries) |
|-------|-------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. | Age | 0.199* | 0.183* |
| 2. | Education | 0.195* | 0.175* |
| 3. | Family size | 0.093* | 0.196* |
| 4. | Annual income | 0.009NS | 0.006NS |
| 5. | Mass media | 0.173* | 0.143* |
| 6. | Extension contact | 0.229* | 0.195* |
| 7. | Livestock | 0.297* | 0.254* |

Table 3

* = Significant at p = 0.005

The correlation coefficient ‘r’ between the variable age and attitude level of respondents about MGNREGA is revealed to be 0.199* for the beneficiaries. For non-beneficiaries, the correlation coefficient ‘r’ between age and the adoption level of respondents is revealed to be 0.183*. It can be concluded that the variable age is significant in affecting attitude of the respondents about MGNREGA for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.

respondents about MGNREGA for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.

The correlation coefficient ‘r’ between the variable education type and the attitude level of beneficiaries respondents about MGNREGA is revealed to be 0.195*. The correlation coefficient ‘r’ for the variable Education type and Knowledge level of non-beneficiaries is 0.175*. The values of the variables for both the beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries are positive, and it is significant. It can be concluded that education type does have effect on the attitude of the respondents about MGNREGA for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.

The correlation coefficient ‘r’ between the variable annual income and the attitude level of beneficiaries about MGNREGA is revealed to be 0.009NS. For non-beneficiaries, the correlation coefficient ‘r’ between annual income and attitude level is 0.006NS. The values of the variable for both the beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries are positive, but are non-significant. Hence, it can be concluded that annual income does not affect the attitude level of the respondents about MGNREGA for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.

The correlation coefficient ‘r’ between the variable family size and the attitude level of beneficiaries respondents about MGNREGA is revealed to be 0.093*. The correlation coefficient ‘r’ for the variable family size and attitude level of non-beneficiaries is 0.196*. The values of the variables for both the beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries are positive and it is significant. It can be concluded that family size does not affect the attitude of the

The correlation coefficient ‘r’ between the variable mass media exposure and the attitude level of the beneficiaries about MGNREGA is revealed to be 0.173*. For the non-beneficiaries, the correlation coefficient ‘r’ between the variable mass media exposure and attitude level about MGNREGA is revealed to be 0.143*. The values are positive and significant. It can be concluded that media exposure does have effect on the attitude level of the respondents about MGNREGA for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.

The correlation coefficient ‘r’ between the variable extension contact and the attitude level of the beneficiaries about MGNREGA is revealed to be 0.229*. For the non-

beneficiaries, the correlation coefficient 'r' between the variable extension contact and attitude level about MGNREGA is revealed to be $r = 0.195^*$. The values are positive and significant. It can be concluded that does have effect on the attitude level of the respondents about MGNREGA for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.

economic impact Analysis of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme in Andhra Pradesh. *International Journal of Development Research*. 3 (10): 76-86.

The correlation coefficient 'r' between the variable livestock type and the attitude level of the beneficiaries about MGNREGA is revealed to be 0.297^* . For the non-beneficiaries, the correlation coefficient 'r' between the variable livestock type and attitude level about MGNREGA is revealed to be 0.254^* . The values are positive and significant. It can be concluded that does have effect on the attitude level of the respondents about MGNREGA for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.

IV. CONCLUSION

MGNREGA (Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee act) is providing vital employment opportunities to the rural poor people and is helping to review the local economy of the indian villages. Empowerment of rural women has emerged as an unintended consequence of MGNREGA. The scheme has been launched to supplant the error and gaps of all previous schemes with the involvement of Panchayats, civil society and local administration. Poor families were targeted to get benefits of employment and livelihood to supplement their family income with saturation concept. MGNREGS was achieving its desired goal that is empowerment of the rural people. It is concluded that the socio-economic status of the respondents was at medium level. The knowledge level of the MGNREGS was medium level. And as well as the attitude of MGNREGS is at medium level.

REFERENCES

- [1]. **Chhabra, S and Sharma, G.L. 2010.** National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS): Realities and challenges. *LBS Journal of Management and Research*. 2 (6): 64-72.
- [2]. **Dadabahu, A.S and Gopikrishna, T. 2013.** Sustainable rural livelihoods for small and marginal farmers through employment generation in Maharashtra. *International Journal of Scientific Research*. 2 (5): 581-583.
- [3]. **Kantharaju, C.N. 2011.** Impact of MGNREGA on employment generation an assets creation in Tumkur district of Karnataka state. *M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis*. University of Agricultural Sciences, Bengaluru, India
- [4]. **Pankaj, A and Tankha, R. 2010.** Empowerment effects of NREGS on women workers: A study in four states. *Economic & Political Weekly*. 14: 45-55.
- [5]. **Sitarambabu, V., Rao, D.V.S., Reddy, G.R., Vijayabhinandana, B and Rao, V.S. 2013.** Socio