An Evaluative Micro Level Study on the Impact of MGNREGA in Arunachal Pradesh

Bai Koyu[1], A. Sarkar[2], R. J. Singh[3]

1. M. sc. Scholar, 2. Professor, 3. Assistant Professor
1 & 3 College of Post-Graduate Studies, Central Agricultural University, Umiam, Meghalaya.
2 College of Fisheries, Central Agricultural University, Lembucherra, Tripura.
Corresponding author e-mail: bai.koyu07@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The present study conducted in Lower Subansiri districts and West Siang district of Arunachal Pradesh, has examined the micro level impact of MGNREGA. The study is based on 135 respondents comprises of beneficiaries, non-beneficiaries and government & panchayat officials selected from the four gram panchayat selected from two randomly selected blocks in the district. The profile of MGNREGA beneficiaries revealed that all possessed job cars, majority of the respondents had medium level of awareness, on an average all the beneficiaries were getting 7.87 days of employment per year, payment schedule was extremely erratic, no provision of unemployment allowance, none of the respondents received wages on time and neither were they sure about correct entries of job days in their job cards, saving pattern of the respondents was not affected by MGNREGA in any way. Socio-personal attributes like status of self reliance, self confidence, self esteem, social participation and social inclusiveness were reflective of no statistically significant change. Among beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, significant difference could be observed in terms of educational status of family members, expenditure pattern, extent of cosmopoliteness and social mobility pattern to mean that MGNREGA could not make any impact on those counts. In case of consumption pattern, there was significant difference in terms of pulses and vegetables consumption while in cases of cereals and protein (meat and fish) the differences between mean values were found to be insignificant. Main source of information for MGNREGA was their respective Gram Panchayats.

Keywords: Impact; Socio-personal attributes; Beneficiaries; Non-beneficiaries

India is one of the fastest-growing economies in the world. GDP grew by 9.6% in 2006-07 and at an estimated rate of 9% in 2007-08. As a result of the rapid growth in recent years, the percentage of people living below poverty line has declined from 55 % in 1973-74 to 36% in 1993–1994 to 27.5% in 2004–2005. The decline in the percentage of people living below poverty line in the rural areas in the corresponding period was from 56.4% to 37.3% to 28.3%. However, despite the steady growth and strong macroeconomic fundamentals, the gains have not been inclusive enough. Poverty and unemployment continue to be the central challenges confronting policymakers (GOI, 2008). Besides 74 per cent unemployed population were hailing from rural India (Sanyal, 2011). This widespread poverty and unemployment across the country compelled the Government of India to take an initiative like Mahatma Gandhi National rural employment Guarantee Act to curb the prevailing problem of poverty and unemployment especially in rural areas. The National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS) came into existence with the enactment of a Parliamentary Act "NREGA" on September 7, 2005. The scheme was first launched at Anantpur district of Andhra Pradesh. Since October 2, 2009 it was re-named as Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA or popularly MNREGA). Providing one hundred days of guaranteed wage employment in a financial year on demand to the families below poverty line, creation of durable assets and strengthening of livelihood resource base of the rural poor had also constituted to be its vital objectives. (GoI, 2013)

In the recent past several studies had been conducted to assess the impact of the programme on rural-urban migration, rural livelihood, rural poverty alleviation, socio-economic aspects, and women empowerment (Jacob, 2008; Kareemulla et al., 2010; Singh, 2013; Krishnan and Balakrishnan 2014; Dhkar, 2012; Arora et al., 2013). Since its commencement MGNREGA had shown diverse responses in terms of its impact. Significant positive changes were also found in the level of aspiration, self confidence and self reliance of the respondents after commencement of the scheme (Roy and Singh, 2010). Significant changes in the food security, income security, habitat security, health security and environmental security of the respondents had been observed, whereas no significant changes could be found on the educational security as well as on social security of the respondents before and after MNREGA (Roy, 2011). The scheme was successful in terms of asset creation, watershed development, prevention of drought, large scale administration of rural public works and reduction in large scale migration (Shah and Mohanty, 2010). Though NREGA had brought changes in the quality of life of beneficiaries especially from economically and socially backward communities, a lot more had still to be done to achieve the expectations of the society at large (Thomas and Bhatia, 2012). The scheme could not be able to keep its commitment of providing 100 days employment in a year to the rural workers and it failed to create assets; but it seemed to have paid good political dividends for the governments. The scheme was also found to have an adverse effect on availability of labourers for agricultural operation (Bordoloi,

2011). MGNREGA was still a distant dream of achieving for what it was meant with special reference to that state of Jammu & Kashmir. The scheme was identified to be flooded with a lot of operational loopholes from planning to the implementation of the Act (Ahmad, 2012). In North-Eastern states MNREGA had positive impact on employment pattern of women, who were benefitted both as individual and community (Das, 2012). Based upon the above mentioned findings, the present researcher had tried to throw some light in terms of impact of MGNREGA on its beneficiaries on the selected study area.

METHODOLOGY

Expost-facto research design was adopted for the study. The study was conducted in West Siang district and Lower Subansiri district of Arunachal Pradesh. Two blocks from each of the selected districts namely Aalo East and Aalo West from West Siang districts and Ziro-I and Ziro-II blocks were selected randomly for the study purpose. Four Gram Panchayat had been selected each from each four selected block based on lottery method of selection. All the list of gram panchayat from each of the blocks was put together and chit picking was carried out to get the required number of gram Panchayat namely Pulo Uru, Passa, Aalo East and Aalo West. A total of 120 respondents were selected through probability proportionate to size sampling from the four gram panchayat selected, so as to adequately compensate for the Gram panchayat having a lower number of job card holding households. Further 15 numbers of officials (from all levels of state hierarchy) were selected to give a total of 135 respondents. The data was collected using well-structured and pre-tested interview schedule. Relevant data pertaining to the study was collected, analyzed using standard statistical techniques like arithmetic mean, standard deviation, coefficient of variation, frequency and percentage as well as z-test. Estimation of grass root level performance of MGNREGA across selected areas was studied with the help of 19 perceived explaining variables. In order to see how MGNREGA has impacted on the lives of people of Arunachal Pradesh.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Awareness about MGNREGA

The awareness level towards the various provisions as laid down under the Act was perused, it appeared that majority of the respondents had medium level of awareness as it could be seen from Table 1. Moreover, all the respondents reported that main source of information for MGNREGA was their respective Gram Panchayats.

Table 1.
Awareness on MGNREGA (n=80)

Sl. No.	Category	Score	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents
1	High	41-51	16	20.00
2	Medium	33-40	49	61.25
3	Low	17-32	15	18.75

Nature of associations with MGNREGA

As beneficiaries, all the respondents had job cards under MGNREGA, of which, 32.50 per cent, 35.00 per cent and 32.50 per cent were found to be issued with job cards in the year 2008, 2009 and 2010 respectively (Table 2). While the Block Development Officer (BDO) was expressed to be the job card issuing authority, it was the respective sarpanch who were identified by the respondents to be the work distributing authority among the villagers. As reported by all the beneficiaries interviewed, rural connectivity across their respective locality was the major work undertaken in MGNREGA.

Table 2.
Issuance of job cards to the respondents under study (n=80)

Year of job cards issuance	Percentage of respondents
2008	32.50
2009	35.00
2010	32.50

Employment and income pattern

Since the inception of MGNREGA, on an average all the beneficiaries were getting 7.87 days of employment per year (Table 3.).

Table 3.
Employment scenario over the period under study

Year	Days of employment
2009-10	6.13
2010-11	7.87
2011-12	8.60
2012-13	9.11
2013-14	7.27
Overall	7.87

It was also expressed univocally by all the respondents that due to getting job for fairly insignificant number of days in a year under MGNREGA, the scheme did not make any change for both their monthly income as well as household food insecurity (Table 4).

International J. of Exten. Edu. Vol. XIII:36-45, 2017   ISSN : 2319-7188

38

Table 4.
Perceived change in income and household
food security after working under MGNREGA (n=80)

Criteria	Considerably increased (3)	Somewhat increased (2)	No change (1)
Monthly income	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	80 (100.00)
Household food insecurity	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	80 (100.00)

Note: Figure in the parenthesis indicates percentage in respect of total respondents

Payment schedule

Payment schedule was reported to be extremely erratic by cent per cent of the beneficiaries of the study as they were not getting their wages on time (Table 5). The daily wage rate under MGNREGA was reported as 155/- by the beneficiaries.

Table 5.
Perception of beneficiary respondents on payment related issues (n=80)

Criteria	Yes	No	Not sure
Erratic payment	0 (0.00)	80 (100.00)	0 (0.00)
Existence of MGNREGA account	80 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
Whether money was spent on opening the account	0 (0.00)	80 (100.00)	0 (0.00)
Cash as mode of receiving wages	80 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
Works got specified on the cards	80 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
Cross checking	0 (0.00)	80 (100.00)	0 (0.00)
Erroneous entries in job cards	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	80 (100.00)
Lodging complaint to resolve the problem of less employment/erratic payment	35 (43.75)	45 (56.25)	0 (0.00)

Note: Figure in the parenthesis indicates percentage in respect of total respondents

Saving pattern

The payment received from MGNREGA was so less for the respondents that it did not make any difference to their saving amount (Table 6).

Table 6.
Saving pattern of the beneficiaries (n=80)

Criteria	Before	After
Saving account	80 (100.00)	80 (100.00)
Bank as saving institution	80 (100.00)	80 (100.00)
Years of saving i.e. more than 5 years	80 (100.00)	80 (100.00)
Not able to save monthly	80 (100.00)	80 (100.00)
Frequency of saving i.e. quarterly saving	80 (100.00)	80 (100.00)

Note: Figure in the parenthesis indicates percentage in respect of total respondents

Before-after comparative assessment of some selected explaining variables

Here an effort was made to find out whether the changes in the mean values of nine of the identified explaining variables viz. income pattern, consumption pattern (cereals, pulses, vegetables and protein), expenditure pattern, material possession, self reliance,

self confidence, self esteem, social participation, and social inclusiveness, were either statistically significant or not through z-test. Apart from the said z-test, in cases of income pattern, consumption pattern (cereals, pulses, vegetables and protein), expenditure pattern and material possession, before-after percentage change in those counts were also estimated.

There was a significant difference in the mean values for variables like income pattern, expenditure pattern and material possession. In case of consumption pattern there were significant difference in case of cereals, vegetables and protein (meat and fish) while the difference was insignificant in the case of pulses.

Table 7.
Before-after comparative assessment and percentage change of selected explaining variables (n=80)

Variable	Mean		'z' value	% change
	B	**A**		
Income pattern (₹/month)	3456.88	3938.75	4.11*	12.23
Consumption pattern (gms/capita/day) Cereals	502.80	425.97	4.83*	-18.03
Pulses	40.18	36.34	1.60	-10.56
Vegetables	377.65	321.11	3.30*	-14.94
Protein (meat and fish)	147.22	105.26	9.98*	-39.86
Expenditure pattern (₹)	3257.50	4091.13	6.91*	13.78
Material possession status	15.51	19.54	3.81*	20.62

*Significant at 0.05 level; B- Before, A- After

Income pattern

There was a significant difference in the mean values for income pattern as the calculated value was found to be more than that of the critical value i.e. 1.96 (two-tailed test). Simultaneously, although income of the beneficiaries was found to have increased by 12.23 per cent over the 5 years spanning between 2009-10 and 2013-14, it might still be inferred that this was not due to the contribution of MGNREGA (Table 7). As discussed earlier, on an average the beneficiaries received less than 8 days of work per year and with daily wage of ` 155/- under MGNREGA, it was not enough to make any impact on their income. Because of this situation, they had been forced to look for other sources of income like wage labour, farming, **etc**. Further inquisition by the researcher revealed that the daily wage rate at private level was around ` 400/- including perquisites which was much higher than the prevailing minimum wage rate as per state Govt. standards. This also was assumed to have significantly contributed to the increase of absolute income of the beneficiaries.

Consumption pattern

Change in consumption pattern of the beneficiaries before and after working under MGNREGA was studied focusing on cereals, pulses, vegetable and protein (Table 7). There was significant difference in the cases of consumption of cereals, vegetables and protein as the calculated 'z' value was more than the corresponding critical value for those cases. Contrary, in case of pulses the consumption pattern was observed to be insignificant. As regards percentage change that had occurred for consumption of cereals, it was found

to have declined by 18.03 per cent for the respondents following the national trend where 7.00 per cent decrease in consumption of cereal in rural India was found from 1993-94 onwards (Anonymous, 2014). Similarly, although daily average consumption of vegetables and protein was found to be statistically significant as revealed from table 7, in reality, it was reduced by 14.94 per cent and 39.86 per cent respectively. In case of pulse consumption also, 10.56 per cent reduction could be noticed. As a matter of fact, although 12.23 per cent average increase in monthly income of the beneficiary families was recorded during the five year period spanning between 2009-10 and 2013-14, in actual rupee value it was around ` 482.00 per month only. So, contextual to soaring market price of all food and other consumable items **vis-a-vis** ever increasing cost of living in a costly state like Arunachal Pradesh, reduction in consumption seemed to be quite normal.

Expenditure pattern

Since the calculated value was more than the critical value i.e. 1.96 (two-tailed test), so significant difference was there in the before-after mean values of expenditure pattern (Table 7). Moreover, 13.78 per cent change was observed in the expenditure pattern of the respondents from 2009-10, when they first started working under MGNREGA. This increase again was felt to be natural in the backdrop of inflation rate and increased price of commodities and it is opined that MGNREGA did not have much to contribute in this regard through provisioning of meager income from few days of work only.

International J. of Exten. Edu. Vol. XIII:36-45, 2017   ISSN : 2319-7188

40

Material possession

Table 7 indicated significant difference in the before-after situation of material possession as the calculated value was more than that of corresponding critical value. Material possession of the respondents was found to have increased by 20.62 per cent but, as indicated by the beneficiaries, MGNREGA was having no contribution in it. To state further that the major contributing factor behind such increase was chiefly due to the addition of mobile phones in the households which has by now almost become to be an common utility item in lieu of what it was in 2009-10 from when the change in material possession due to MGNREGA

got studied. Earlier, mobile phones were considered as luxury items due to their high cost and hence their availability in rural households was virtually non-existent.

Other socio-personal attributes

Socio-personal attributes like status of self reliance, self confidence, self esteem, social participation and social inclusiveness was perceived for the present study to be having relationship with MGNREGA. So, here also effort was made through z-test to find out whether there occurred any significant change in the mean values of those attributes in before-after situation.

Table 8.
Before-after comparative assessment of selected socio-personal attribute (n=80)

S.No.	Variables	Mean		'z' value
		B	A	
1.	Status of self reliance	2.89	3.01	0.78
2.	Status of self confidence	2.90	3.00	0.78
3.	Status of self esteem	2.79	2.85	0.57
4.	Status of social participation	2.07	2.16	1.21
5.	Social inclusiveness status	30.40	30.76	1.80

* Significant at 0.05 level; B- Before, A- After

It became evident from perusal of Table 8 that there occurred no significant change amongst the beneficiaries after being associated with MGNREGA. It was fairly explained by the fact that on an average work under MGNREGA was available for only around eight days a year and since the respondents had virtually no involvement with the scheme, as a quite natural case, it did not have any significant effect on the respondents' socio-personal attributes.

Comparative assessment of socio-personal attributes between beneficiaries and non beneficiaries

As the MGNREGA was clearly expressive of bettering the poverty of rural poor, it was felt necessary to examine as to how far this had occurred. Having assessed the before-after scenario of the beneficiaries, therefore, an effort was then made to compare as to whether there existed any difference in the mean values

of the identified explaining variables like consumption pattern, expenditure pattern and socio-personal attributes between the beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries (who were having greater resource endowment as APL families and acted as the social control group) to gain better understanding of the impact of MGNREGA. And for this purpose, z-test was employed.

Consumption pattern

Consumption patterns, studied under daily per capita consumption of cereals, pulses, vegetables and protein (meat and fish) showed varied difference (Table 9). In case of consumption pattern, there was significant difference in terms of pulses and vegetables consumption at 0.05 per cent level of significance since the calculated value was more than that of the corresponding critical values.

Table 9.
Comparative assessment and percentage change in consumption pattern between beneficiaries and non beneficiaries (n=80 for B & n=40 for NB)

Sr. No.	Variables	Mean		'z' value
		B	NB	
1.	Consumption pattern (gm/capita/day)			
2.	Cereals	425.97	412.30	0.89
3.	Pulses	36.34	50.65	4.49*
4.	Vegetables	321.11	389.30	3.05*
5.	Protein (Meat and fish)	105.26	110.97	0.93

* Significant at 0.05 level; B- Beneficiaries, NB- Non-beneficiaries

In cases of cereals and protein (meat and fish) the differences between mean values were found to be insignificant as it was less than that of the corresponding critical values. Even though the

beneficiary and non-beneficiary group did not have significant difference in terms of cereal consumption, however, in terms of actual quantum of consumption, it requires to be pointed out that the beneficiary group

was observed to be consuming more cereals compared to their non-beneficiary counterparts. Though apparently this might seem erratic, it nevertheless appeared to be quite logical to the present researcher in the sense that the poor people are having a general tendency, of course due to their financial constraints, to compulsorily remain over-dependent on cereals in order to fill up their appetite. Also, it was felt to be

happening so due to the fact that being staple food of the region and its comparatively lower price as well, cereal is the major source of food to the beneficiaries belonging to the BPL category. The non-beneficiaries, belonging to the resource rich APL category, on the other hand have diverse source of food and need not to depend solely or highly on cereals.

Comparative assessment of change in expenditure pattern, educational status, cosmopoliteness and social mobility

Table 10.
Comparative assessment between beneficiaries and non beneficiaries in terms of expenditure pattern, educational status, cosmopoliteness and social mobility pattern (n=80 for B & n=40 for NB)

Sr. No.	Variables	Mean		'z' value
		B	NB	
1.	Expenditure pattern (in ₹)	4091.13	8843.75	10.21*
2.	Educational status of family members	2.31	3.10	5.10*
3.	Extent of cosmopoliteness	20.62	21.10	3.07*
4.	Social mobility pattern	18.85	24.02	11.50*

* Significant at 0.05 level; B- Beneficiaries, NB- Non-beneficiaries

Significant differences could be observed in terms of expenditure pattern, educational status of family members, extent of cosmopoliteness and social mobility pattern since the non-beneficiaries were from APL category and having had more access to resources (Table 10).

Inter sub-caste favouritism

The study revealed existences of no inter sub-caste favouritism in issuance of job card or distribution of work (Table 11).

Table 11.
Inter sub-caste favouritism related to MGNREGA activities (n=80)

Sl. No.	Statements	A (3)	SWA (2)	DA (1)
1	I think the Job cards is being distributed unfairly	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	80 (100.00)
2	I think that there is discrimination in distribution of Job card based on sub-caste	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	80 (100.00)
3	Since I don't have a cordial relationship with the issuing authority so I feel deprived	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	80 (100.00)

A-Agree, SWA-Somewhat Agree, DA-Disagree
Note: Figure in the parenthesis indicates percentage in respect of total respondents

Perceived work load

As indicated from the preceding discussions of primary data, work received by respondent under MGNREGA per year since its inception had been negligible and consequently, the work load under the scheme is much less than expected.

Table 12.
Perceived work load related to MGNREGA activities (n=80)

Sl. No.	Statements	A (3)	SWA (2)	DA (1)
1	I feel work load is too heavy	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	80 (100.00)
2	I feel that working environment is not up to the mark	54 (67.50)	16 (20.00)	10 (12.50)
3	I feel that Contractor/Panchayat is putting too much pressure for early completion of work	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	80 (100.00)

| 4 | I feel that I am performing the job of two or more than two person at a time | 0 (0.00) | 0 (0.00) | 80 (100.00) |

A - Agree   SWA - Somewhat Agree   DA – Disagree
Note: Figure in the parenthesis indicates percentage in respect of total respondents

The responses of the beneficiaries were also indicative of the fact that the work load under MGNREGA was not heavy at all and there was no pressure on the part of Contractor/Panchayat for early completion of the work (Table 12).

Problems related with MGNREGA

As evident from the above discussion, MGNREGA could not be able to make any significant change in life or livelihood of the beneficiaries in the study area and a number of their perceived problems were recorded and ranked in order of their assigned importance through Table 13.

Table 13.
Ranking of the problems as perceived by the MGNREGA beneficiaries (n=80)

Sr. No.	Problem statement	Total	Overall rank
1.	Corruption	78 (97.50)	I
2.	No provision of worksite facilities	78 (97.50)	I
3.	Delay in payment	78 (97.50)	I
4.	Wage rate should be increased	77 (96.25)	II
5.	Lack of 100 days of work	76 (95.00)	III
6.	Not aware of unemployment allowance	48 (60.00)	IV
7.	Distribution of funds on percentage basis	16 (20.00)	V

Note: Figure in the parenthesis indicates percentage in respect of total respondents

As high as 97.50 per cent of the respondents identified corruption, lack of work site facilities and delay in wage payment to be the most important problems (Table 13) being followed by wage rate to be increased and so on.

Perception of implementing functionaries on performance of MGNREGA

Different officials of the government (total 8 in number) and functionaries of the panchayat (total 7 in numbers) involved with MGNREGA were interviewed in order to gain further insight for the purpose.

Table 14.
Responses from the functionaries involved with MGNREGA (n=15)

Sl. No.	Criteria	Yes	No
1.	Work was carried out in community land	15 (100.00)	0 (0.00)
2.	Local resources were used in the process of work	15 (100.00)	0 (0.00)
3.	Work was demand driven	15 (100.00)	0 (0.00)
4.	Households were provided with 100 days of work	0 (0.00)	15 (100.00)
5.	On being approached by beneficiaries whether work was provided to them	0 (0.00)	15 (100.00)
6.	Awareness about unemployment allowance*	8 (100.00)	7 (100.00)
7.	Awareness about worksite facilities	15 (100.00)	0 (0.00
8.	Whether worksite facilities was made available	15 (100.00)	0 (0.00)

Note: Figure in the parenthesis indicates percentage in respect of total respondents excepting the case of sl.no. 6

* As amongst the total functionaries 8 were from govt. side and 7 from panchayat side and all the govt. as well as panchayat functionaries responded in affirmative and negative manner respectively, 8 no. for govt. officials and 7 no. of panchayat functionaries were considered to be 100% against the respective cases.

Overall perception

It became evident from Table 15 that overall perception of beneficiaries about MGNREGA was fairly unfavourable due to the appalling performance of the scheme in the state of Arunachal Pradesh.

Table 15.
Overall perception regarding MGNREGA by its beneficiaries (n=80)

Sr. No.	Vulnerability domains	Substantial change (3)	Moderate change (2)	No change (1)
1.	Income stability	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	80 (100.00)
2.	Household food security	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	80 (100.00)
3.	Capacity to bear the shocks of uncertainty	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	80 (100.00)
4.	Access to environmental resources	71 (88.75)	9 (11.25)	0 (0.00)
5.	Social inclusiveness	0 (0.00)	3 (3.75)	77 (96.25)

Note: Figure in the parenthesis indicates percentage in respect of total respondents

Conclusion and Suggestions

The findings of the study revealed that on an average, only around 8 days employment was provided per household annually. None of the respondents received wages on time and neither were they sure about correct entries of job days in their job cards. Saving pattern of the respondents was not affected by MGNREGA in any way. During the five years period between 2009-10 and 2013-14, consumption pattern was found to have decreased among the beneficiaries. Though expenditure pattern, income pattern and material possession had increased over those years, as per the views of the respondents themselves, MGNREGA had nothing to do in that regard. The before-after comparison of perceived socio-personal attributes like status of self reliance, self confidence, self esteem, social participation and social inclusiveness were reflective of no statistically significant change. Among beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries (who were chosen from comparatively resource endowed APL families), significant difference could be observed in terms of educational status of family members, expenditure pattern, extent of cosmopoliteness and social mobility pattern to mean that MGNREGA could not make any impact on those counts. In case of consumption pattern, there was significant difference in terms of pulses and vegetables consumption while in cases of cereals and protein (meat and fish) the differences between mean values were found to be insignificant. Cent per cent of the respondents were expressive that there occurred no change in their income security, household security and capacity to bear shocks of uncertainty. But substantial change had occurred in access to environmental resource (88.75%). In case of social inclusiveness, as high as 96.25 per cent of the respondents reported that no change had occurred consequent to MGNREGA. An overwhelming majority of 97.50 per cent of the respondents identified corruption, lack of work site facilities and delay in wage payment to be the most important problems associated with MGNREGA.

Works were indicated to be carried out in community land by the different rank and file of implementing govt. officials **vis-a-vis** panchayat functionaries. While cent per cent of the government officials were noted to be aware about unemployment allowance, all of the responding panchayat functionaries were recorded to be not made aware about unemployment allowance by govt. authority. No unemployment allowance was detected to be paid to the target beneficiaries even in face of providing only paltry days of employment (around 8 days per household per annum) to them.

The beneficiaries and functionaries of MGNREGA, being the closest associates of the scheme at the grass root level, were in the best position to suggest the most practical future course of action for the scheme to work as expected in the state so enhanced the future performance of MGNREGA. The recommendations thus recorded are now being presented hereunder through tables 16 and 17.

Table 16.
Recommendations made by MGNREGA beneficiaries for further improvement (n=80)

Sr. No.	Statements	Number of responses	Overall rank
1.	Provision of 100 days of work	80 (100.00)	I
2.	Accountability and transparency	79 (98.75)	II
3.	Smooth and timely flow of wages	57 (71.25)	III

4.	Increment of wage rate	47 (58.75)	IV
5.	Bettering of the performance of implementing agencies	42 (52.50)	V
6.	Full empowerment of Panchayat in handling MGNREGA fund	23 (28.75)	VI
7.	Augmentation of worksite facilities	21 (26.25)	VII
8.	Proper awareness drive on rights and privileges of MGNREGA	13 (16.25)	VIII
9.	Continuation of MGNREGA	4 (5.00)	IX

Note: Figure in the parenthesis indicates percentage in respect of total respondents

Table 17.
Recommendations made by MGNREGA functionaries for further improvement

Sr.No.	Statement	Frequency
1.	Government officials (n=8)	
2.	Integration of banking systems and internet facilities for timely entry on MIS	8 (100.00)
3.	Allocation of the fund based on the labour budget estimation and not on the past performance	8 (100.00)
4.	Panchayat functionaries (n=7)	
5.	Full power to Panchayat for handling funds	7 (100.00)
6.	Providing material costs under MGNREGA	7 (100.00)

Note: Figure in the parenthesis indicates percentage in respect of total respondents

Government officials involved in the execution of MGNREGA work felt that in Arunachal Pradesh tiny-tot schemes under MGNREGA faced problems for development. For hilly region like Arunachal Pradesh certain relaxation in providing sufficient fund as per demand for 100 days should be given. Also road communication, banking system, electrification and internet facilities should be improved so that entry in Management Information System can be made on time. At the same time the allocation of the fund should be based on the labour budget estimation and not on the past performance of the programme. Panchayat leaders involved with MGNREGA believed that in order to make it a success, panchayat should be given full power to handle the fund allocated under MGNREGA as it is a people's programme. Also, material cost under MGNREGA must be provided which had not been provided since the commencement of the programme in both the districts (Table 17).

So based upon the above outcomes followings suggestions were made in order to make MGNREGA a success during the times to come like due policy intervention should be given in enhancing the rate of job creation per household, provision for providing non-existing worksite facilities as well as unemployment allowance should be made at the soonest, rigorous sensitization programmes on MGNREGA at village level towards information empowerment of the poor people regarding their rights and privileges associated with the scheme, panchayats and local communities should be made more involved and given autonomy in planning and decision making regarding types of works to be undertaken, fund allocation etc. and lastly financial monitoring system should be strengthening by engaging external agency for greater transparency and better accountability of the scheme.

REFRENCES

1. Ahmad, S.I. 2012. MGNREGA: Its drawback in J & K 2010. *Int. J. Res. Commer. Econ. Manage.,* 2(3): 158-161.

2. Anonymous. (2014). How food took 57% of the rural Indian's budget. https://makanaka.wordpress.com/2012/03/07/how-food-took-57-of-the-rural-indians-budget/.

3. Arora, V., Kulshreshtha, L.R., and Upadhyay, V. 2013. Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme: A unique scheme for Indian rural women. *Int. J. Econ. Practices and Theories,* 3 (2):108-114.

4. Bordoloi, J. 2011. Impact of NREGA on wage rates, food security and urban migration – A study in Assam. Agro-Economic Research Centre for North East India, Assam Agricultural University, Jorhat. http://www.aau.ac.in/classified/materials/Impact of NREGA.pdf.

5. Das, D. 2012. Examining India's Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MNREGA): Its impact and women's participation. *Int. J. Res. Manage.,* 6(2): 209-218.

6. Dkhar, D.S. 2012. Scio-economic study on Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) in East Khasi Hills district of Meghalaya. *M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis,* Central Agricultural University, Imphal.

7. GoI (Government of India). 2008. Poverty eradication in India by 2015. Ministry of Rural Development, New Delhi.

8. GoI (Government of India). 2013. Mahatma Gandhi National Employment Guarantee Act, 2005: Operational Guidelines, 4th edition, *Ministry of Rural Development, New Delhi.*

9. Kareemulla, K., Kumar, S., Reddy, K.S., Rao, C.A.R., and venkateswarlu, B. 2010. Impact of NREGS on rural livelihood and agricultural capital formation. *Indian J. Agri. Econ., 65*(3): 524-539.

10. Krishnan, S., and Balakrishnan, A. (2014). MGNREGA marching towards achieving the millennium development goals – an analysis. *J. Int. Acad. Res. Multidisciplinary, 2*(1):18-27.

11. Roy, S. (2011). MNREGA: Changing livelihood of the beneficiaries in West Bengal. *J. Community Mobilization Sust. Dev., 6*(1): 37-41.

12. Roy, S., and Singh, B. (2010). Impact of NREGA on Empowerment of the Beneficiaries in West Bengal. *Indian Res. J. Ext. Edu., 10* (2): 21-23.

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

14. Shah, D., and Mohanty, S. (2010). Implementation of NREGA during eleventh plan in Maharashtra: Experiences, challenges and ways forward. *Indian J. Agr. Econ., 65*(3): 540-551.

15. Singh, S. 2013. MGNREGA: 100 days Employment Guarantee in Bundelkhand (M.P.). *Int. J. Manage. Dev. Stud., 2*(4): 1-10.

16. Thomas, B., and Bhatia, R. 2012. Impact of NREGA scheme: A study on the overall quality of life of its beneficiaries. *Asia-Pac. J. Soc. Sci., 4* (2): 213-227.