



A STUDY ON IMPLEMENTATION OF MGNRES IN ANANTAPURAMU DISTRICT



Dr. Poliki Chinnurappa¹

¹Postdoctoral Fellow in Economics, Sri Krishnadevaraya University, Ananthapuramu – 515003

Andhrapradesh, India.

ABSTRACT

In a rural agrarian labour surplus economy, sections of rural population depend on the wages they earn through unskilled, casual, manual labour. They are vulnerable to the possibility of sinking from transient to chronic poverty in the event of inadequate labour demand or in the face of unpredictable crises that may be general in nature, like natural disasters or personal, like ill-health, all of which adversely impact their employment opportunities. In this research paper an attempt has been made to achieve the objectives: (i) To review the pros and cons various wage employment programmes that are implemented in India before launching of MGNREGS. (ii) To understand the various provisions of the MGNREGS and their implementation at field level. To collect the data from the respondents. The schedule sought data on socio-economic profile of the respondents like, family details, housing condition, income and expenditure pattern, assets possessed like land owned livestock and household durables, loans, migration, social participation of members, awareness about NREGA. The number of working households declined from 2010-11. During the six years of its implementation the percentage of working households also registered gradual increase except 2010-11 and 2011-12. In the same way there is a corresponding increase in the total household man days, which also enhanced total wage amount during last 4 years of study. During the first four years of implementation, the total number of household days increased by 5.9 times, whereas wage amount increased by 6.5 times. As such the average household wages also registered positive growth in the state. Table 6 that the households which worked for statutory minimum 100 days are gradually increasing except in 2008-09 and 2010-11. In 2006-07, around 6.07 households got minimum 100 days employment. It increased to 9.75 per cent in 2007-08 but it declined to 8.27 per cent in 2008-09. By the year 2009-10, it sharply raised

to 23.54 per cent. It means that within four years the households which got 100 days employment increased more than four times. But again it declined to 19.59 per cent in 2010-11. But once again it increased to 32.29 per cent in 2011-12.

KEY WORDS: MGNRESS, Wage, Employment, Implementation

INTRODUCTION

A major problem in rural areas is seasonal unemployment and under employment. A large number of people depend on wage employment for their livelihood as they have no assets or grossly inadequate assets. So people have virtually no source of income during the lean agricultural season when employment opportunities shrink.

Planning in India focused at realizing a high rate of growth of output in the long term. A basic assumption was that shortage of capital goods in relation to employable persons constituted a fundamental constraint on growth in the economy. Therefore the planning process made no attempt to define an independent employment strategy; the focus on economic growth was viewed as essential for improving the employment situation. Initially, labour force expansion was not seen as a problem to be contented with. Thus, in the Five Year Plans, the generation of employment was viewed as part of the process of development and not as a goal in conflict with, or to be pursued independently of economic development.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Vaidhyanathan (2005) considers that at the drafting stage of the NREGA itself, the role of the GPs been highlighted. The NREGS is designed as a programme with a decentralized structure with GPs endowed with participation of the local people. The GPs are also accountable to their communities for the performance of the scheme. He considers that Research on the efficiency and ability of the GPs to fulfil their requirements is still at an incipient stage.

Bela Bhatia and Jean Dreze (2006) revealed that there are great lacunae in the

institutional set up of the programme. They find that there is little difference between NREGA and the earlier employment programmes as National Food For Work Programme (NFFWP), Sampoorna Grameen Rojgar Yojana (SGRY) and the basic purpose of providing employment on demand at the statutory minimum wage is not close to being achieved.

Dreze (2007) looks at the corruption in rural employment programs in Orissa and how this has continued in NREGS as well. However, he believes that there is tremendous potential of NREGA in the survey areas. Where work was available, it was generally found that workers earned close to (and sometimes more than) the statutory minimum wage of Rs.70 per day, and that wages were paid within 15 days. This is an unprecedented opportunity for the rural poor, and there was evident appreciation of it among casual labourers and other disadvantaged sections of the population. There is the hope among workers that NREGA would enable them to avoid long-distance seasonal migration. Further, there is plenty of scope for productive NREGA works in this area, whether it is in the field of water conservation, rural connectivity, and regeneration of forest or improvement of private agricultural land.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The specific objectives of the present study are as follows.

1. To review the pros and cons various wage employment programmes that are implemented in India before launching of MGNREGS.
2. To understand the various provisions of the MGNREGS and their implementation at field level.

METHODOLOGY

The study has employed inductive method to address the objectives laid down. Both primary and secondary data were collected. To begin with, a thorough review of the secondary data related to the NREGS at the district, and mandal levels was undertaken and documented. A comprehensive household survey was done mainly to ascertain the outcome and impact of the project in the light of project interventions. A pretested interview schedule was administered to collect the data from the sample beneficiaries. Qualitative methods such as focus group discussion, case study and interview with key informants were used to supplement and complement the inferences drawn from the survey data.

TOOLS OF ANALYSIS

The study is descriptive and analytical in nature. Therefore, the collected data has been presented in the form of tables, charts and appropriate graphs for analytical purpose.

DATA COLLECTION

As indicated, an interview schedule was administered to collect the data from the respondents. The schedule sought data on socio-economic profile of the respondents like, family details, housing condition, income and expenditure pattern, assets possessed like land owned, livestock and household durables, loans, migration, social participation of members,

awareness about NREGA, registration, employment and wage under NREGA, effects of NREGA, the impact of NREGA and the respondent's perception about the functioning of NREGA and so on.

SAMPLING DESIGN

The MGNREGS programme has been extended to all sections of the society irrespective of rural families' economic, social and political status. All the revenue villages, hamlets in the district are covered by the programme. For effective study of the impact of the programme on beneficiaries, purposeful random sampling method was followed. In Anantapur district there are three revenue divisions. For the collection of respondents' views and ideas on the impact of the MGNREGS scheme, one Mandal from each revenue division namely Putlur from Anantapur revenue division, Bommanahal from Dharmavaram revenue division and Rolla from Penukonda revenue division is selected by taking into account the financial, caste, demographic factors of the beneficiaries. From each selected Mandal 100 MGNREGS beneficiaries were selected by random sampling technique. So the universe of the sample constitutes 300.

GROWTH OF MGNREGS IN ANDHRA PRADESH

Table 1 gives the phase wise expansion of the programme in the state.

Table – 1 Phase wise Coverage of Districts under MGNREGS in Andhra Pradesh

Sl.No.	Phases	Month and Year	Districts Covered
1	Phase-I	February 2006	Adilabad, Anantapur, Chittoor, Kadapa, Karimnagar, Khamam, Mahaboob Nagar, Medak, Nalgonda, Nizamabad, Ranga Reddy, Vijayanagaram, Warangal
2	Phase-II	May 2007	East Godavari, Kurnool, Guntur, Nellore, Prakasam and Srikakulam
3	Phase-III	April 2008	Krishna, Visakhapatnam, West Godavari

Source: Ministry of Rural Development, Government of Andhra Pradesh.

Table 1 show that during the first phase the MGNREGS was launched in 13 districts of Andhra Pradesh, out of which all nine districts are from Telangana region of the state. In Rayalaseema region 3 districts and in coastal Andhra only one district was covered. The fundamental reason for the inclusion of large number of districts in Telangana and Rayalaseema region is that these districts are not well developed, when compared to other

coastal districts of the state. During the second phase the scheme extended to 6 districts of the state, in which 5 districts are from coastal Andhra and one from Rayalaseema region. In the last phase 3 districts of coastal Andhra were covered under the scheme. In all 22 out of 23 districts were covered by the scheme. As this scheme is intended to provide employment for the rural poor, the district of Hyderabad is not covered under this scheme.

Table- 2 Caste-Wise House Hold Employment Analysis in Andhra Pradesh

Particulars	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
No of HHs issued Job	13325449	13325449	13325449	13325449	13325449	13325449
No of HHs working	2174798	4685014	5704026	6076171	5988035	4875930
% of HHs working	16.32	35.16	42.81	45.60	44.94	36.59
SC HHs working	625053	1252036	1478032	1539380	1505964	1300971
% of SC HHs working	19.27	38.61	45.58	47.47	46.44	40.12
ST HHs working	288212	560055	695532	773687	764693	647061
% of ST HHs working	19.02	36.96	45.90	51.06	50.46	42.70
BC HHs working	1038619	2298593	2810805	3054440	3015645	2385884
% of BC HHs working	16.28	36.02	44.05	47.87	47.26	37.39
Others HHs working	222914	574330	719657	708664	701733	542014
% of Others HHS	10.20	26.27	32.91	32.41	32.09	24.79

Source: Ministry of Rural Development, Government of Andhra Pradesh.

As per table 2 the number of households working under MGNREGS in the state has gradually increased during first 4 years of study. The number of working households declined from 2010-11. During the six years of its implementation the percentage of working households also registered gradual increase except 2010-11 and 2011-12. During the second year of study the percentage of SC households working under MGNREGS is

nearly doubled. On the other hand, during the last two years of study they registered negative growth. The percentage of ST working households has also registered upward growth during the four years of study. During the last two years of study the STs Participation rate is decreased slightly. On the other hand the BC and others participation rate under MGNREGS works in state showing same trends.

Table-3 Year-wise total Person Days and Average wages

Particulars	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Households registered	13325449	13325449	13325449	13325449	13325449	13325449
Households working	2174798	4685014	5704026	6076171	5988035	4875930
Households total days	66132625	201163044	228306017	392200822	304348749	287437442
Households total wage (in Lakhs)	53644.90	165751.80	188291.58	352792.83	292207.65	277053.56
Household avg. wage	81.12	82.40	82.47	89.95	96.01	96.39

Source: Ministry of Rural Development, Government of Andhra Pradesh.

Table 3 shows an increase in the total number of working households year after year during first 4 years of study. In the same way there is a corresponding increase in the total household man days, which also enhanced total wage amount during last 4 years of study. During the first four years of implementation, the total number of household days increased by 5.9 times, whereas wage amount increased by 6.5 times. As such the average household wages also registered positive growth in the state. It is regrettable to note that the participation rate from 2010-2011 showing downward trend in all aspects.

PROGRESS MADE UNDER NREGS IN ANANTAPUR DISTRICT

Anantapur District, which is located in the Rayalaseema region, is the biggest and driest of all the drought prone districts of A.P. In this district it is clearly estimated that the droughts visits at least thrice in a decade. The Irrigation Commission and other Central Commissions have been identified the whole district as drought prone. A single dry crop i.e. ground nut is raised under rain fed conditions in most parts of the district. Agriculture is the main source of economy of the district. The work

force engaged in agriculture is more than three fourth's of the total work force. The demand for labour in agriculture sector is highly uncertain and seasonal. This is leading to migration of labour in a large scale to the nearest cities. The drought conditions are creating an ecological imbalance and converting the district into a desert. Drought prone areas are more vulnerable to denude the forests and exhaust the natural resources like water, soil, minerals etc. By result the rivers and other streams dry up. Consequently the underground water levels vanish and the area under irrigation is declined. The instant result is the decrease in agriculture production. This is leading to food problem. All these uneven conditions are making the lives of agricultural labourer and farmers rigorous and not bearing. As a result the district has witnessed a number of farmers' suicides.

HOUSE HOLD WAGE EARNING ANALYSIS

The table 4 gives the details of year-wise House Hold Wage earning of wage seekers in Anantapur District.

Table-4-Year- wise House Hold Wage Earning Analysis in Anantapur District

Particulars	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Household Registered	7,47,711	7,47,711	7,47,711	7,47,711	7,47,711	7,47,711
Household Working	2,26,919	3,50,645	315255	343079	294758	231842
Household Total Days	90,50,874	1,74,55,903	13598280	23546692	14900126	18,901,004
Household Total wage (in Lakhs)	8182.52	14567	11846.65	22972.34	15091.05	20181.73
Household avg. wage	90.41	83.45	87.12	97.56	101.28	106.78

Source: District Water Management Agency, Anantapur

Table 4 indicates that the number of registered households in the district is constant throughout five years of study. The households working from the registered households are 30.35 per cent, 46.90 per cent, 42.16 per cent, 45.88 per cent, 39.42 per cent and 31.01 per cent in 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, 201011 and 2011-12 respectively. It means that

the working households never crossed 50 per cent- in the district. The total number of household days reached from 9050874 to 23546692 days by 2009-10. But they declined to 14900126 in 2010-11, and again increased to 18901004 days in 2011-12. The average wage per household in 2006-07 is Rs.90.41 and it gradually increased and reached the highest point of Rs.106.78 by 2011-12.

GENDER WISE PARTICIPATION IN MGNREGS

In MGNREGS works both men and women take equal part in the works. But women participation rate is higher than men at state

level as well as district level. This is because women are not getting high wages in outside works when compared to MGNREGS works. The table 5 gives the gender wise participation of labourers in the programme in Anantapur District.

Table - 5 Gender-Wise participation under MGNREGS in Anantapur District

Particulars	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Male Registered	962487	962487	962487	962487	962487	962487
Percentage of Male Registered	52.05	52.05	52.05	52.05	52.05	52.05
Female Registered	886790	886790	886790	886790	886790	886790
Percentage of Female Registered	47.95	47.95	47.95	47.95	47.95	47.95
Number provided Employment						
Male Working	167713	241891	265613	323021	310682	224266
Percentage of Male Employment	47.16	42.45	46.69	48.71	48.93	48.96
Female Working	187929	327988	303227	340191	324309	233772
Percentage of Female Employment	52.84	57.55	53.31	51.29	51.07	51.04
Wages						
Male wage Rs. in Lakhs)	3608.9	5169.4	5190.7	10971.9	9967.04	9740.98
Female wage (Rs. in Lakhs)	4291.3	9184.8	6477.8	11696.2	10667.2	10793.5
Male average	96.33	85.57	88.2	98.5	103.61	108.32
Female average	87.42	82.05	86.18	96.59	101.27	105.53

Source: District Water Management Agency, Anantapur

The data in table 5 shows that the registered men and women labourers under the scheme are constant during six years of study. The percentage of working males and females is not evenly distributed. In 2006-07, 47.16 per cent of male members are working; it decreased to 42.45 per cent in 2007-08. Again, it increased to 46.69 per cent in 2008-09 and gradually increased in the next to following three years. On the other hand the percentage of female working under MGNREGS in Anantapur District is out numbering the male members. During first two years of study there is a positive growth, i.e. 52.84 per cent to

57.55 per cent, but from third year of study it decreased from 57.55 per cent to 51.04 per cent by 2011-12. The fundamental reason for this phenomenon can be attributed that male workers taking other works as the wages under this programme is not sufficient to meet their needs. The average wage for each male labourer is higher than female labourers during six years of study.

HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYMENT

The NREGA guarantees 100 days of employment in a financial year for all rural households. Table 4.6 gives a clear picture of person days provided for each household.

Table-6 Distribution of Households by person days of Employment provided under MGNREGS in Anantapur District

Particulars	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
No of HHs working	226919	350645	315255	343102	327576	240076
No of HHs completed 100 days	13773	34183	26064	80768	64186	77525
% of HHs completed 100 days	6.07	9.75	8.27	23.54	19.59	32.29
No of HHs completed 75 - 100 days	12446	29102	24225	36385	39357	27023
% of HHs completed 75-100 days	5.48	8.3	7.68	10.6	12.01	11.25
No of HHs completed 50 - 75 days	26457	53308	45878	52265	57036	34992
% of HHs completed 50-75 days	11.66	15.2	14.55	15.23	17.41	14.51
No of HHs completed < 50 days	174243	234052	219088	173684	166997	100536
% of HHs completed >50 days	76.79	66.75	69.5	50.62	50.97	41.87
Average Wage days of employment Provided for HH	39.55	49.28	42.66	67.84	61.63	80.07

Source: District Water Management Agency, Anantapur



It is crystal clear from table 6 that the households which worked for statutory minimum 100 days are gradually increasing except in 2008-09 and 2010-11. In 2006-07, around 6.07 households got minimum 100 days employment. It increased to 9.75 per cent in 2007-08 but it declined to 8.27 per cent in 2008-09. By the year 2009-10, it sharply raised to 23.54 per cent. It means that within four years the households which got 100 days employment increased more than four times. But again it declined to 19.59 per cent in 2010-11. But once again it increased to 32.29 per cent in 2011-12.

The households which got employment for 75 to 100 days are 5.48 per cent in 2006-07 and it increased to 8.30 per cent in 2007-08. But it declined to 7.68 per cent in 2008-09. An upward trend of 10.60 per cent and 12.02 per cent is registered on 2009-10 and 2010-11. In case of 50 to 75 days employment per year the figure is 11.66 per cent in 2006-07, 15.20 per cent in 2007-08, 14.55 per cent in 2008-09, 15.23 per cent in 2009-10, 17.41 per cent in 2010-11 and 14.51 per cent in 2011-12. It is important to note that during first year of implementation in the district more than three-fourths (76.79 per cent) got less than 50 days of employment. In 2007-08 it is 66.75 per cent and in 2008-09 it is 69.50 per cent. But during the last year of study less than half of the households got 50 days of employment per year. It can be concluded that year by year there is improvement in number of man days for each households under the MGNREG scheme.

REFERENCES

1. Arora, R.C., *Integrated Rural Development*, New Delhi: S.Chand and Company, 1979, p.125.
2. Mishra. K.C. and Mishra. R.C. *Rural Development in India: Challenges and Task-Ahead*, *Southern Economist*, Vol.11, No.5. August 15, 2008, p.87.
3. R.C.Arora, *Integrated Rural Development*, S.Chand and Company, New Delhi, 1979, p.28.
4. Katar Singh, *Rural Development: Principles, Policies and Management*, Sage Publications, New Delhi, 1999, pp.155-156.
5. *Ibid*, p.159.
6. Dhurjati Mukherjee, "India's Rural Scenario: Development Priorities and Social Action", *Kurukshetra*, Vol. 55, No.10, August 2007, p.15.
7. Krishnan. S.M., *Myth and Reality of Some Rural Development Programmes*, *Southern Economist*, Vol.52, No.9. May 1, 2008, p.17.
8. Francis, C. "Rural Development, People's Participation and the Role of NGOs" *Journal of Rural Development*, Vol.12, 1993. P.209.
9. *Ibid*, p.211.
10. Sundaram, Satya I., *Rural Development*, Himalaya Publishers, (New Delhi), 1999, p.62.
11. World Bank, *World Development Report 1997: The State in a Chang-ing World*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1997.
12. Sundaram, Satya I., *Op.Cit*, p.58.
13. Lingaiah Karnati., *Rural Development in India*, Kalyani Publishers, (New Delhi), 2000, p.41.

