

Impact Analysis of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Programme in Dhalai District of Tripura

Jayanta Roy ¹, K. Narayana Gowda ²

1. Agriculture Officer, Animal Resource Development Department, Govt. Of Tripura, M : 08131957583
jayanta19roy@rediffmail.com

2. Ex-Vice-Chancellor, University of Agriculture Sciences, G.K.V.K Bangalore, M : 09449866900
Corresponding author e-mail : knarayanagowda@yahoo.co.in

ABSTRACT

The study was carried out in Dhalai District of Tripura State during 2010-2011 to know the impact of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) on the standard of living of beneficiaries. The overall mean value of standard of living of beneficiaries before MGNREGA programme was found to be 36.5 as compared to the overall mean value of 60.1 after the implementation of MGNREGA programme. There is an enhancement of mean value in the standard of living of beneficiaries by 65 per cent indicating significant increase due to MGNREGA.

Keywords : Impact, Analysis, MGNREGA

The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Programme was notified on 7th September, 2005. The Act came into force on February, 2006 and was implemented in a phased manner. In phase one, it was introduced in 200 most backward districts of the country. It was implemented in an additional 130 districts in phase two during 2007-2008. To bring the whole nation under its safety net and keeping in view of the demand, the Act was extended to the remaining 285 districts of India from April 1st, 2008 in phase three (Anonymous, 2009). MGNREGA marked a paradigm shift from the previous wage employment programmes with its rights-based approach that makes the Government legally accountable for providing employment to those who demand it. The Act aims at enhancing livelihood security of households in rural areas of the country by providing up to one hundred days of guaranteed wage employment in a financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work. The primary objective is augmenting wage employment. Its auxiliary objective is strengthening natural resource management through works that address causes of chronic poverty by encouraging

sustainable development. Against this background, the present study was taken up with the following specific objectives:

1. To analyse the standard of living of MGNREGA beneficiaries before and after MGNREGA implementation.
2. To understand the association between the selected personal and socio-psychological characteristics of MGNREGA beneficiaries.

METHODOLOGY

A sample of 50 MGNREGA beneficiaries (who were working in MGNREGA programme since 2006-2007) each from Netajinagar, Ramratan para and Thankurpally villages were randomly selected for the study. Thus, the total sample for the study was 150 MGNREGA beneficiaries from three villages of Kulai gram panchayat in Ambassa Block of Dhalai district in Tripura state.

Based on the mean and standard deviation of annual income, the respondents were classified as follows.

| Category | Criteria | Before MGNREGA (Rs.) | After MGNREGA (Rs.) |
|----------|----------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Low | < Mean-1/2SD | < 4981.70 | < 10956.15 |
| Medium | Mean± 1/2SD | 4981.70 to 7361.10 | 10956.15 to 14792.71 |
| High | > Mean + 1/2SD | > 7361.10 | > 14792.91 |

Annual net income (ANI) was measured using the below formula

$$\text{ANI} = \text{Gross income} - \text{total cost of expenditure.}$$

Based on the mean and standard deviation of employment generation, the respondents were classified as follows.

| Category | Criteria | Before MGNREGA (man days) | After MGNREGA (man days) |
|----------|---------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Low | < Mean-1/2SD | <38.65 | <107.23 |
| Medium | Mean ± 1/2SD | 38.65 to 51.39 | 107.23 to 154.61 |
| High | >Mean + 1/2SD | >51.39 | >154.61 |

Based on the mean and standard deviation of social status, the respondents were classified as follows:

| Category | Criteria | Before MGNREGA | After MGNREGA |
|----------|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| Low | < Mean -1/2SD | < 1.00 | <7.29 |
| Medium | Mean± 1/2SD | 1.00 to 4.40 | 7.29 to 10.35 |
| High | >Mean +1/2 SD | >4.40 | >10.35 |

Social status index (SSI) was calculated by using the following formula.

$$SSI = \frac{\text{Actual score}}{\text{Possible score}} \times 100$$

Based on the total score of the respondent on overall reinvestment pattern of MGNREGA beneficiary respondents were classified into three categories viz., low, medium and high using mean and standard of deviation as measure of check

| Category | Criteria | Before MGNREGA (Score) | After MGNREGA (Score) |
|----------|---------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Low | < Mean - ½ SD | < 9.71 | < 14.79 |
| Medium | Mean± 1/2SD | 9.71 to 13.29 | 14.79 to 18.35 |
| High | >Mean + ½ SD | > 13.29 | > 18.35 |

Computation of standard of living index

The four components of standard of living (annual income, employment generation, social status and reinvestment pattern) have been measured and expressed in different units. Hence, all the values were converted into unit values or standard scores by using Thorndike standard score (McCall, 1922) as followed in the case of reinvestment pattern.

Based on the total score of the respondent on overall standard of living of MGNREGA beneficiary respondents were classified into three categories viz., low, medium and high using mean and standard of deviation as measure of check.

| Category | Criteria | Before MGNREGA (score) | After MGNREGA (score) |
|----------|---------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Low | < Mean - ½ SD | < 36.97 | < 57.03 |
| Medium | Mean± ½ SD | 36.97 to 40.77 | 57.03 to 61.29 |
| High | >Mean + ½ SD | > 40.77 | > 61.29 |

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

It is observed from Table 1 that 31.3 per cent of the respondents were belonging to low level of standard of living before the implementation of MGNREGA programme. It is interesting to note that only 16.0 per cent of the respondents were falling under low level of standard of living after the implementation of MGNREGA programme.

Table 1 also revealed that 40.6 per cent of the respondents were falling under medium level of standard of living before the implementation of MGNREGA programme, while 44.6 per cent of the respondents belong to medium level of standard of living after the implementation of MGNREGA programme.

It was also seen from Table 1 that 28.0 per cent of the respondents were in the categories of high level of standard of living before the implementation of MGNREGA programme. It is heartening to observe that 39.3 per cent of the respondents belonged to high level of standard of living after the implementation of MGNREGA programme.

The results of chi-square test in Table 1 revealed that there exists a positive and significant difference in the standard of living of beneficiaries before and after the implementation of MGNREGA programme.

Mean values of different dimensions of standard of living during before and after MGNREGA.

It is evident from the finding in Table 2 that employment generation increased (168%) between before and after the implementation of MGNREGA programme. Similar increase is observed in the response between before and after the implementation of MGNREGA programme with respect to dimensions, annual income (149%), food consumption (116%), investment on social functions (96%), investment on savings (91%) investment on assets (81%), social status (28%), value addition in education (20%) and health status (20%). The results also indicate that the overall mean value of before MGNREGA programme found to be 36.55 as compared to 60.16 after the implementation of MGNREGA programme. Hence, the enhancement of mean value was found to be 65 per cent indicating the effectiveness of benefits in

MGNREGA programme. The data subjected for statistical test reveals the enhancement in the mean values between before and after the implementation of MGNREGA programme for all dimensions under study was found to be highly significant at one per cent level.

Table 1
Distribution of MGNREGA beneficiaries based on their level of standard of living before and after MGNREGA

| Level of Standard of Living | Before MGNREGA (n=150) | | After MGNREGA (n=150) | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|
| | No | Per cent | No | Per cent |
| Low | 47 | 31.3 | 24 | 16.0 |
| Medium | 61 | 40.6 | 67 | 44.6 |
| High | 42 | 28.0 | 59 | 39.3 |
| Total | 150 | 100.0 | 150 | 100.0 |
| Mean | 38.87 | - | 59.16 | - |
| Standard deviation | 3.810 | - | 4.265 | - |
| Chi-square test value | 10.59 ** | | | |

** Significant at 1 per cent level.

Table 2
Mean values of different dimensions of standard of living before and after MGNREGA

| Sl. No. | Dimensions of standard of living | Mean values | | | |
|---------|--------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------------|---------|
| | | Before MGNREGA | After MGNREGA | Percentage of Increase | |
| 1. | Annual income (Rs) | 6171 | 15366 | 149.0 | 38.61** |
| 2. | Employment generation (Mandays) | 45 | 120.66 | 168.00 | 27.05** |
| 3. | Social status (Score) | 3.00 | 3.84 | 28.00 | 30.38** |
| 4. | Values addition in education (Score) | 5.00 | 6.00 | 20.00 | 18.10** |
| 5. | Food consumption pattern (Rs) | 5388 | 11638.00 | 116.00 | 22.44** |
| 6. | Health status (Score) | 3.00 | 3.60 | 20.00 | 16.32** |
| 7. | Investment on assets (Rs) | 0 | 810 | 81.00 | 10.15** |
| 8. | Investment on savings (Rs) | 0 | 910 | 91.00 | 11.18** |
| 9. | Investment on social function (Rs) | 410.00 | 803.60 | 96.00 | 98.57** |
| | Overall(units) | 36.55 | 60.16 | 65.00 | 51.80** |

** Significant at 1 per cent level.

The data subjected for statistical test indicated significant difference in the standard of living of MGNREGA beneficiaries before and after joining programme. It was found highly significant at one per cent level. The probable reason for the above result are timely need based information support system, better mass media exposure, social participation like village panchayat, co-operative society etc., Cosmopolitan nature of the beneficiaries and better linkage and establishment of need based local institutions that helped in improving their annual

income, employment generation, social status, value addition in education, food consumption pattern, health status, investment on assets, investment of savings and investment of social function. Further, close follow up and encouragement have together contributed for improved standard of living. The paired 't' test applied for the data, revealed that a highly significant difference at 1 per cent level before and after MGNREGA on different aforesaid dimensions of standard of living of beneficiaries (Table 2).

CONCLUSION

The 31.3 per cent of the respondents were belonging to low level of standard of living before the implementation of MGNREGA programme, while only 16.0 per cent of the respondents were falling under low level of standard of living after the implementation of MGNREGA programme. The 28.0 per cent of the respondents were falling in the category of high level of standard of living before the implementation of MGNREGA programme. Whereas, 39.3 per cent of the respondents belonged to high level of standard of living after the implementation of MGNREGA programme. A positive and significant difference was existing between the standard of living of beneficiaries before and after the implementation of MGNREGA

programme. The overall mean value of before MGNREGA programme was found to be 36.55 as compared to 60.16 after the implementation of MGNREGA programme indicating an increase of 65 per cent between before and after the implementation of the MGNREGA programme. The enhancement in the mean values of standard of living between before and after the implementation of MGNREGA programme was found to be highly significant at one per cent level.

Paper received on : November 17, 2016

Accepted on : December 04, 2016

REFERENCES

1. Anonymous, 2007, Eleventh Five years plan on Agriculture and Rural Development, Industry, Services and Physical Infrastructure (2007-2012), *Planning Commission, Govt of India*, (111): 86-90.
2. Anonymous, 2008, National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA), design process and impact, Ministry of Rural Development, *Govt of India*; 76-116.
3. Vanitha S.M., 2010, An economic analysis of MGNREGA programme in Mysore district of Karnataka, *M.Sc. (Agri) thesis (Unpub)*, UAS, GKVK, Bangalore.
4. Vinay Kumar.R, 2008, Impact of rural bio-resource complex on standard of living of its stake holders in Karnataka. *Ph.D (Agri) Thesis*, UAS, GKVK, Bangalore.