IMPACT OF MGNREGA ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF BENEFICIARIES OF SRIKAKULAM DISTRICT OF ANDHRAPRADESH

A.PRASANNA RANI*; Prof. Dr. (Ms.) 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
Email: prasannaraj.ampili@gmail.com
Mobile: 8707002502

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. Majority of beneficiaries (46.66 per-cent) was under the age group of 40 and above years. (48.33)per-cent non beneficiaries was exposed to magazines which was translated into local dialect. It was found from the present study that had an annual income of above 35000.It was noted that socio-economic status of beneficiaries was better than non-beneficiaries. 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 which shows MGNREGA has played an important role in upliftment of economic status of the MGNREGA labours. Majority of the respondents faced the problem of delayed payment and bias attitude of panchayat members. On the whole it can be concluded that MGNREGA plays an effective developmental role in the lives of rural villagers.
Keywords: Socio economic profile, Level of Knowledge, MGNREGA

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.

1. To find out and to compare the socio- economic profile of the MGNREGA beneficiaries and non- beneficiaries.

2. To determine knowledge of the respondents towards MGNREGA programme

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.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

1. To find out and to compare the socio- economic profile of the MGNREGA beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.

1. Age:

Age was operationalised as the number of years completed as reported by the MGNREGS respondent at the time of interview. Under MGNREGS the beneficiary should be minimum 18 years old. The table 3.1.1 indicated that beneficiaries of Age category 43.33% of the respondents belong to young aged(20-35), whereas 46.66% of the respondents belong to middle aged(36-40), while 10% of the respondents belong to old aged(>50). And in case of non-beneficiaries of Age category 43.33% of the respondents belong to young aged (20-35), while 48.33% of the respondents belong to middle aged (36-40), whereas 8.33% of the respondents belong to old aged(>50).

Distribution of respondents according to their age:

S.No.	Age (in years)	Beneficiaries		Non Beneficiaries	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Young age (20-35)	26	43.33	26	43.33
2	Middle age (36-40)	28	46.66	29	48.33
3	Old age (>50)	6	10.00	5	8.33
	Total	60	100.00	60	100.00

2. Education:

Education was operationalised as the MGNREGS beneficiarie's ability to read, write and the amount of formal education received by him/ her. Scoring was done on the basis of Socio-Economic Status (SES) and the respondents were categorized according to their literacy level.

Distribution of respondents according to their education:

S.No.	Education	Beneficiaries		Non Beneficiaries	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Illiterate	17	28.33	6	10
2	Primary	15	25	7	11.66
3	Upper primary school	8	13.33	10	16.66
4	High school	10	16.66	2	3.33
5	Intermediate	3	5	12	20
6	Under graduation	01	1.66	11	18.33
7	Post graduation	6	10	12	20
	Total	60	100	60	100

The table 3.1.2 indicated that the beneficiaries of education category 28.33% belong to illiterate, whereas 25% of the respondents belong to primary school, 13.33% of the respondents belong to upper primary school, while 16.66% of the respondents belong to high school,5% of the respondents belong to intermediate, while 1.66% of the respondents belong to Under graduation, 10% of the respondents belong to post graduation, whereas in case of non-beneficiaries of education category 10% of the respondents belong to illiterate, whereas 11.66% of the respondents belong to primary school, while 16.66% of the respondents belong to u.p school, 3.33% of the respondents belong to high school, 20% of the respondents belong to intermediate, 18.33% of the respondents u.g, 20% of the respondents belong to post graduation

3. Occupation:

Occupation refers to the family workforce engaged in nature of works the table 3.1.3 indicated that the beneficiaries of occupation category.26.66% beneficiaries belong to agriculture and 73.33% beneficiaries belong to agriculture. 26.66% non- beneficiaries belongs to agriculture and 73.33% non-beneficiaries belongs to agriculture.

Distribution of respondents according to their occupation:

S.No.	Occupation	Beneficiaries		Non Beneficiaries	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Agriculture	16	26.66	10	26.66
2	Subsidiary	44	73.33	50	73.33
	Total	60	100	60	100

4. Annual income:

Annual Income was operationalised as the total income earned by the MGNREGS beneficiary respondent from different sources of agricultural and allied occupations like farming, dairy & poultry and MGNREGS wages *etc*.

S.No.	Income	Beneficiaries		Non Beneficiaries	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	35,000-40,000	4	6.66	8	13.33
2	41,000-80,000	46	76.66	41	68.33
3	1,00,000-1,50,000	7	11.66	7	11.66
4	>1,50,000	3	5	4	6.66
	Total	60	100	60	100

The table 3.1.4indicated that the beneficiaries of income category 6.66% of the respondents belong to 35,000-40,000, whereas 76.66% of the respondents belong to 41,000-80,000, while 11.66% of the respondents belong to 1,00,000 to 1,50,000, 5% of the respondents belong to >1,50,000 acre, and in case of non-beneficiaries of income category 13.33% of the respondents belong to 35,000-40000, while 68.33% of the respondents belong to 41,000-80000, whereas 11.66% of the respondents belong to 1,00,000 to 1,50,000, 6.66% of the respondents belong to >1,50,000.

5. Mass Media:

Sl.no	Mass media	Beneficiaries		Non Beneficiaries	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Low	21	35	46	76.66
2	Medium	32	53.33	13	21.66
3	High	7	11.66	1	1.66
		60	100	60	100

The table 3.1.5 indicated that the beneficiaries of the mass media category 35% of the respondents belong to low category, whereas 53.33% of the respondents belong to medium category, while 11.66% of the respondents belong to high category. And in case of non-beneficiaries category 76.66% of the respondents belong to low category, 21.66% of the respondents belong to medium category, 1.66% of the respondents belong to high category.

6. Extension Contact:

The table 3.1.6 indicated that the beneficiaries of the extension contact category 3.33%of the respondents belong to low category, whereas 41.66% of the respondents belong to medium category, while55% of the respondents belong to high category. And in case of non-beneficiaries category 53.33% of the respondents belong to low category, 38.33% of the respondents belong to medium category, 8.33% of the respondents belong to high category.

Sl.no	Extension contact	Beneficiaries		Non Beneficiaries	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Low	2	3.33	32	53.33
2	Medium	25	41.66	23	38.33
3	High	33	55	5	8.33
	Total	60	100	60	100

2. To determine knowledge of the respondents towards MGNREGA programme.

The knowledge of the respondent about MGNREGA, the scores were divided into three categories fully correct, partially correct, not correct The table 3.1.7 indicated that the beneficiaries of Knowledge category 33.33% of the respondents belong to low category, where as 53.33% of the respondents belong to medium category, while 13.33% of the respondents belong to high category and in case of non-beneficiaries of knowledge category 21.66% of the respondents belong to low category, 53.33% of the respondents belong to medium category, 25% of the respondents belong to high category.

Sl.no	Knowledge	Beneficiaries		Non Beneficiaries	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Low	20	33.33	13	21.66
2	Medium	32	53.33	32	53.33
3	High	8	13.33	15	25
		60	100	60	100

Table3.1.8 Relationship between socio-economic Characteristics and knowledge level of MGNREGA programme beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.

Sl.No.	Characteristics	"r" value(beneficiaries)	"r" value(non-beneficiaries)
1.	Age	0.168*	0.151*
2.	Education	0.183*	0.175*
3	Family size	0.299*	0.194*
4	Annul income	0.019NS	0.009NS
5	Mass media	0.293*	0.193*

6	Extension contact	0.198*	0.163*
7	Livestock	0.279*	0.193*
8	Source of irrigation	0.163*	0.153*

* = Significant at p = 0.005

The table 3.1.8 indicates above portrays the correlation coefficient between age, family type, family size, education, occupation, land holding, annual income, and Livestock possession, Mass media exposure, with the dependent variable 'Knowledge**.** The correlation coefficient 'r' between the variable age and knowledge level of respondents about the MGNREGA is revealed to be 0.168* for the beneficiaries. For the non-beneficiaries, the correlation coefficient 'r' between age and the Knowledge level of respondents is revealed to be r = 0.151*. It can be concluded that the variable age is significant in affecting the Knowledge of the respondents about MGNREGA for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. The correlation coefficient 'r' between the variable education type and the Knowledge level of beneficiaries respondents about MGNREGA is revealed to be r = 0.183*. The correlation coefficient 'r' for the variable Education type and Knowledge level of non beneficiaries is r = 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 affect on the Knowledge of the respondents towards Watershed for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. The correlation coefficient 'r' between the variable family size and the Knowledge level of beneficiaries respondents about MGNREGA is revealed to be r = 0.299*. The correlation coefficient 'r' for the variable family size and Knowledge level of non beneficiaries is r = 0.194*. The values of the variables for both the beneficiaries and non-non-beneficiaries are positive and it is significant. It can be concluded that family size does not affect the knowledge of the respondents about MGNREGA for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. The correlation coefficient 'r' between the variable annual income and the Knowledge level of beneficiaries is revealed to be r = 0.019NS. For non-beneficiaries, the correlation coefficient 'r' between annual income and knowledge level is r =0.009 NS. 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 Knowledge level of the respondents MGNREGA for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. The correlation coefficient 'r' between the variable mass media exposure and the Knowledge level of the beneficiaries about MGNREGA is revealed to be r = 0.293* . For the non-beneficiaries, the correlation coefficient 'r' between the variable mass media exposure and Knowledge level about MGNREGA is revealed to be r = 0.193*. The values are positive and significant. It can be concluded that media exposure does have affect on the Knowledge level of the respondents about MGNREGA for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. The correlation coefficient 'r' between the variable Extension contact and the Knowledge level of the beneficiaries about MGNREGA is revealed to be r = 0.198* . For the non-beneficiaries, the correlation coefficient 'r' between the variable mass media exposure and Knowledge level about MGNREGA is revealed to be r = 0.163*. The values are positive and significant. It can be concluded that media exposure does have affect on the Knowledge level of the respondents about MGNREGA for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. The correlation coefficient 'r' between the variable Livestock type and the

Knowledge level of beneficiaries respondents about MGNREGA is revealed to be $r = 0.279^*$. The correlation coefficient 'r' for the variable Livestock type and Knowledge level of non beneficiaries is $r = 0.193^*$. The values of the variables for both the beneficiaries and non-non-beneficiaries are positive and it is significant. The correlation coefficient 'r' between the variable Source of Irrigation type and the Knowledge level of beneficiaries respondents about MGNREGA is revealed to be $r = 0.163^*$. The correlation coefficient 'r' for the variable Source of Irrigation type and Knowledge level of non beneficiaries is $r = 0.153^*$. The values of the variables for both the beneficiaries and non-non-beneficiaries are positive and it is significant.

CONCLUSION:

A number of Centrally Sponsored Schemes have been implemented under Rural Development Mission for the welfare of the poor. However, MGNREGS is one of the unique experiment undertaken in India to eradicate poverty. 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 found that the income level and employment level of workers increased substantially and daily wage rate also increased. As a whole, MGNREGS is an important step towards realization of the right to work. It is expected to enhance people's livelihood security on a sustained basis by developing economic and social infrastructureIt is very interesting time in the history of independent India, when the government is taking steps to provide its citizens with rights that it has never given before through Acts like Right to Education, Right to Information, Right to Employment (MGNREGS) and Right to Food. However, proactive participation of people is of prime importance to make sure these laws are implemented properly through the programmes such as MGNREGS. in rural areas. Since the present study indicates that the MGNREGA Programme had a remarkable influence for the farmers. There was highly significant difference in the level of knowledge between beneficiaries farmers and non-beneficiaries farmers in relation to MGNREGA Programme.

REFERENCES

[1]. Chhabra, S and Sharma, G.L. 2010. National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS): Realities and challenges. *LBS Journal of Managementand Research*. 2 (6): 64-72.

[2]. Kumar, G.V. 2009. A critical study on Development of Women and Children in Rural Areas of Srikakulam district of Andhra Pradesh. *M. Sc. (Ag.) Thesis*. Acharya N G Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad, India.

[3]. Kantharaju, C.N. 2011. Impact of MGNREGA on employment generation and assets creation in Tumkur district of Karnataka state. *M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis.* University of Agricultural Sciences, Bengaluru, India.

[4]. Sitarambabu, V., Rao, D.V.S., Reddy, G.R., Vijayabhinandana, B and Rao, V.S. 2013. Socio economic impact Analysis of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme in Andhra Pradesh. *International Journal of Development Research.* 3 (10): 76-86.

[5]. Suneetha, B. 2004. Preference knowledge and opinion of young rural women about self-employment in Visakhapatnam district of Andhra Pradesh. *M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis.* Acharya N G Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad, India.