

Impact of rural employment guarantee act in Kanpur district

ASHA YADAV

Department of Home Science Extension Education and Communication Management, C.S. Azad
University Agricultural and Technology, KANPUR (U.P.) INDIA
(Email : asha.yadav.2009@gmail.com)

ABSTRACT : District Kanpur was deliberately selected for the purpose as the research hailed from this place. Two blocks were selected in this study. Three villages were selected from each block and 30 male and 30 females from each village thus 180 respondents in age group of 18 to 60 years were selected from this study area. 61.1 per cent respondents belonged to 18 to 35 years age group, whereas, 76.1 per cent respondents were illiterate. About 63.3 per cent respondents belonged to SC/ST category. According to material possession, majority of respondents had radio as the source of information about NREGA, 50.0 per cent male and 50.0 per cent female got the information from the neighbours.

KEY WORDS : Achievement, Awareness, Impact, Implementation, Opinion

View Point Article : Yadav, Asha (2014). Impact of rural employment guarantee act in Kanpur district. *Internat. J. Home. Sci. Extn. & Comm. Mgmt.*, 1 (2): 76-79

Article History : Received : 20.01.2014; Revised : 13.05.2014; Accepted : 28.05.2014

INTRODUCTION

Government of Indian has recently introduced the world's one of the largest development programme in human history, the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS) This flagship programme was enacted by the Government of India the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) in Sept., 2005 (Sanyal, 2011; GOI, 2008 and Sankaran, 2011). The Act aims at "enhancing livelihood security of households in rural areas of the country by providing at least one hundred days of guaranteed wage employment in a financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work (Kohli, 2009)."

An initial report of the evaluation studies of NREGA by various institutions and individuals has documented

the processes of revival and resurgence largely driven by the NREGA as an axis of struggle by the rural poor. It has neither been claimed nor was envisaged that NREGA is the key to successful rejuvenation of rural areas of the country that have remained marginalized in the growth process of the country. This requires many such efforts particularly towards understanding the loopholes in the effective implementation of this scheme which can transform rural areas as engines of growth (Transforming Rural India) (Ahuja *et al.*, 2011; Mohanraj and Karthikeyan, 2012; Roy *et al.*, 2013; Sarkar *et al.*, 2011; Swamy, 2013 and Tiwari, 2011). The NREGS came into effect on a pilot basis, in February 2006 in 200 economically disadvantaged districts of the country. In the second phase of implementation, it was extended to 130 additional districts and the remaining districts were covered in the third phase on April 1, 2008.

Kurukshetra (2008); Kumar (2011); Pratiyogita Darpan (2006) and Deshmukh (2000).

This social welfare programme is primarily intended to enhance the livelihood securities of the people in rural areas supplementing wage employment opportunities to the unskilled labour force. Pratmal (2007); Manidipally (2009) and Roy *et al.* (2009). The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act of 2005 covered 200 districts-known as Phase I districts, and in 2006-07 this was extended to cover 130 additional districts known as the Phase II districts. During 2006-07 against the total available funds of Rs. 12073.56 Crore with the states, Rs. 8823.36 Crore was utilised. The average fund utilisation per district was Rs. 44.12 Crore in 2006-07. For 2007-08 the government made a budget provision of Rs. 12000 Crore. Out of this Rs. 8303.82 Crores have been released up to 14th November 2007. Out of this, Rs. 5365.99 Crore have been released to the Phase I 200 districts and Rs. 2937.92 Crore have been released to the Phase II 131 districts.

METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in Kanpur district. Two blocks namely, Kalyanpur and Chaubepur were selected. Three villages were selected from each block. Thus, six villages were

selected in this study area. 30 male and 30 female were selected from each village. Thus, total sample sizes selected was 180. Dependent and independent variables were used such as age, caste, education, impact of NREGA and constraints etc. The statistical tool were used as t' test, per cent and χ^2 weight and age mean.

OBSERVATION AND ASSESSMENT

It is evident from Table 1 that 61.1 per cent workers belonged to 18 to 35 years age group whereas 36.1 per cent workers were in age group of 35-50 years.

2.8 per cent workers were in 50 and above age group. It means that workers when become young aged they generally get involved themselves in NREGA activity. This is found to be that in Indian culture, 18 to 35 years age group workers involve more in NREGA activity. The observed value χ^2 (18.327**) was significant at 1 per cent level of significances.

It is clear from Table 2, that 63.3 per cent workers belonged to SC/ST category, whereas 36.7 per cent were of OBC category and none was from the general caste. NREGA programme efficiently treated through relating them with different aspects of village life rather than treating them through direct probing. NREGA sessions on different aspects of village life are related

Age group	Male	Female	Total
Up to 35 years	41(22.8)	69(38.3)	110(61.1)
35-50 years	45(25.0)	20(11.1)	65(36.1)
50 years and above	4(2.2)	1(0.6)	5(2.8)
Total	90(100.0)	90(100.)	180(100.0)
χ^2	18.327**		P<0.01

** indicate significance of value at P=0.01

Caste	Male	Female	Total
Upper caste	-	-	-
OBC	46 (25.6)	20 (11.1)	66 (36.7)
SC/ST	44 (24.4)	70 (38.9)	114 (63.3)
Total	90 (100.0)	90 (100.0)	180 (100.0)
χ^2	16.172**		P<0.01

** indicate significance of value at P=0.01

Education	Male	Female	Total
Illiterate	59 (32.8)	78 (43.3)	137 (76.1)
Primary	23 (12.8)	9(5.0)	32 (17.8)
Secondary	4 (2.2)	2(1.1)	6 (3.3)
High School	3 (1.7)	1 (0.5)	4 (2.2)
Intermediate and above	1(0.5)	-	1 (0.5)
Total	90 (100.0)	90 (100.0)	180 (100.0)
χ^2	11.030**		P<0.01

** indicate significance of value at P=0.01

to caste and religion. The observation value of χ^2 (16.172**) was significant at 1 per cent level of significance with 1 d.f.

Data presented in Table 3 indicate that majority (76.1%) of workers were illiterate whereas, 17.8 per cent workers were educated up to Primary, 3.3 per cent workers have educated upto Secondary whereas, 2.2 per cent workers were educated upto High School and 0.5 per cent workers have education up to Intermediate and above. The observation value of χ^2 (11.030**) was significant at 0.01 level of significance.

It can be observed from Table 4, that 50.0 per cent male and 50.0 per cent female got the information from the neighbours whereas, 27.8 per cent male and 33.3 per cent female gained information about NREGA from radio, 22.2 per cent male and 16.7 per cent female did not have the radio, whereas, 10.6 per cent male and 7.8 per cent female got the information about NREGA by television, some 39.4 per cent male and 42.2 per cent female did not have resource of television and 4.4 per cent male and 3.3 per cent female got the information by posters and 45.6 per cent male and 46.7 per cent female did not get the information by the poster. Whereas, 6.7 per cent male and 3.9 per cent female were aware of the information about NREGA from newspaper and 43.3 per cent male and 46.1 per cent female have not resource of newspaper. About 3.9 per cent male and 2.8 per cent female got the information from magazine and 46.1 per cent male and 47.2 per cent female have not resource of magazine.

Findings of Table 5 reveal that the various opinion statements of selected beneficiaries regarding NREGA further show that opinion about 1, 4,5,6 ,9 and 11, took place in the first position in rank order having means score of 2.00, second position was occupied by opinion 2, 7, having mean score of 1.99, third position was occupied by opinion 2 having mean score of 1.97, whereas fourth position was occupied by opinion 10 having mean score 1.20. Thus, maximum workers gave the positive opinion about NREGA.

Recommendation :

On the basis of data it may be said that most of beneficiaries were reported from middle age category. Most of beneficiaries were illiterate and dominance of SC and OBC was reported in the scheme and male beneficiaries were also dominant.

In many of the worksites, provision of facilities is done by women. In some places, where the water availability is not adequate, women have to walk far of places. In such cases, trolleys are used for bringing water to worksites to reduce drudgery.

To encourage more women participation, collection of non-timber forest produce and processing (e.g. leaf plate making, de-seeding and de-fibrin of the tamarind manually) may be considered as permissible activity under the NREGA.

SC/ST can be given priority in other skill training such as in

Table 4 : Distribution of workers according to information

Source of information	Male		Female		χ^2
	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Neighbour	90(50.0)	-	90(50.0)	-	-
Radio	50(27.8)	49(22.2)	60(33.3)	30(16.7)	2.338
Television	19(10.6)	71(39.4)	14(7.8)	76(42.2)	0.928
Poster	8(4.4)	82(45.6)	6(3.3)	84(46.7)	0.310
News paper	12(6.7)	78(43.3)	7(3.9)	83(46.1)	1.471
Magazine	7(3.9)	83(46.1)	5(2.8)	85(47.2)	0.357

Table 5: Opinion of the workers about NREGA

Sr. No.	Opinion	Yes	No	Scores	Rank
1.	Livelihood security	180(100.0)	-	2.00	I
2.	Improve the social economic status	178(98.2)	2(1.1)	1.99	II
3.	Full employment of 100 days	175(97.2)	5(2.8)	1.97	III
4.	Good programme for rural development	180(100.00)	-	2.00	I
5.	Appropriate for the health	180(100.0)	-	2.00	I
6.	Provide enough wages to the workers	180(100.0)	-	2.00	I
7.	Solve the rural employment	178(98.9)	2(1.1)	1.99	II
8.	Age limit under NREGA	32(17.8)	128(71.2)	1.07	V
9.	Payment is satisfactory/unsatisfactory	180(100.0)	-	2.00	I
10.	Prescribed facility under NREGA	36(20.0)	144(80.0)	1.20	IV
11.	Providing by Gram Panchayat	180(100.0)	-	2.00	I

construction work, vermi-compost production, horticulture and drip irrigation systems etc. and the trainings may be done in convergence with SC/ST development corporations and concerned departments /agencies.

REFERENCES

Ahuja, U., Tyagi, Dushyant, Chauhan, Sonia Chauhan and Khyali Ram Chaudhary (2011). Impact of MGNREGS on districts of Haryana. *Agric. Econ. Res. Rev.*, **24**: 495-502.

Deshmukh, P.R. (2000). A study on implementation aspects of IRDP programme as perceived by the beneficiaries in relected flocks of Parbhani district. Ph.D. Thesis, Marathwada Agricultural University, Parbhani, M.S. (INDIA).

GOI (Government of India) (2008). The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act 2005 (NREGA): Operational Guidelines, 3rd Ed., Ministry of Rural Development, NEW DELHI, INDIA.

Kumar, S. Vijay (2011). *Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee act.* A review. Kurukshetra, Jan. 2011 - A.J. of Rural Development Published by Govt. of India.

Kurukshetra (2008). Ministry of Rural Development ,3-5

Mohanraj, K. and Karthikeyan, C. (2012). Socio-economic Impact of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) on beneficiaries: A case study in Coimatore district of Tamil Nadu. *Internat. J. Extn. Edu.*, **8**: 77-82.

Pratamal Devpura (2007). Rashtriya Gramin Rojgar Yojana Me Samazik Ankeshan December, **2**:37.

Pratiyogita Darpan (2006). Bharat Me Gramin Rojgar Ki Guarantee. **6** : 1290.

Ray, Aruna (2010). NREGA activists protest against the inefficient functioning of MORD and CEGC October, 2010, **1** : 45.

Roy, J., Gowda, K.N., Lakshminarayan, M.T. and Anand, T.N. (2013). Profile and problemsof MGNREGA beneficiaries. A study in Dhalai district of Tripura state. *Mysore J. Agric. Sci* **47** (1):124.

Sankaran, Kamala (2011). NREGA wages : Ensuring decent work. *Econ. & Politi. Weekly*, **66** (7) : 23-25.

Sanyal, S. (2011). Rural employment generation programme in India: An analytical review. *Kurukshetra*, **59** (3) : 15-17.

Sarkar, P., Kumar, Jagdish and Supriya (2011). Impact of MGNREGS on reducing rural poverty and improving socio-economic status of rural poor: A study in Burdwan district of West Bengal. *Agric. Econ. Res. Rev.*, **24**: 437-448.

Swamy, R.N. (2013) Social legislation and social security- A case study of MGNREGA. *Kurukshetra*, **61**(4):33-40.

Tiwari, Rakesh, Somashekhar, H.I., Ramakrishna, V.R., Murthy, Indu, K., Mohan Kumar, M.S., Mohan Kumar, B.K., Parate, Harshad, Verma, Murari, Malaviya, Sumedha, Rao, Ananya, S., Sengupta, Asmita, Kattumuri, Ruth and Ravindranath, N.H. (2011). MGNREGS for environmental service enhancement and vulnerability reduction: Rapid appraisal in Chitradurga district. *Karnatka, Econ. & Politi. Weekly*, **66** (20) : 39-47.

WEBLOGGRAPHY

Mamidipally Rajanna (2009). Agraharam district Karim Nagar, *mamidpaallyrajanna@gmail.com, gundetiramesh@yahoo.com, Kurukshetra*, 33-35.

Roy, Dipjoy Sen and Samanta Debabrata (2009). Good governance and employment Generation through NREGA. (www.ignou.ac.in).

Kohli, Meghna (2009). The National Rural Emploment Gurantee Act (NREGA), 2005 and its Impact on Economic Development, <http://jurisonline.in/2009/08the-national-rural-employment-gurantee-act-nrega-2005-and-its-impact-on-economic-development/>.

Transforming Rural India: Challenges and opportunity of NREGA organized by centre de Sciences Humaines, New Delhi and Institute for Human Development, New Delhi retrieved from http://www.csh-delhi.com/events/downloads/nrega-concept_note.pdf.

1st
Year

★★★★★ of Excellence ★★★★★