

An Evaluation and Monitoring of MGNREGA Functioning on Rural Development

Dr. Tek Singh^{1*}

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Himachal Pradesh University Summerhill, Shimla-171005 (Himachal Pradesh)

*Corresponding author's email: teksingh1177@gmail.com

Abstract

The National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS) is a flagship poverty alleviation programme of Government of India, which seeks to guarantee at least 100 days of employment every year to the rural poor or enhance livelihood security by 100 days of employment a year to one member of every rural unemployed family. In this paper, an attempt is made to study MGNREGA functioning by job card, MGNREGA wages, worksite and monitoring among the MGNREGA beneficiaries in the economy of Mandi district of Himachal Pradesh. Study showed that under MNREGA- jobs are not created for the MNREGA workers at the time of their requirement. There has been always a delay in job assignment to them and payment of their wages. The payment of their wages in their bank accounts is not in practice under MNREGA in the reference year. Further, it showed a higher performance of MNREGA on employment, income, education, work culture, women empowerment, rural infrastructure and consumption pattern as the positive factor improved due to MNREGA highly and a comparatively poor positive performance on horticulture, irrigation & health and road connectivity aspects. The high improvement in performance of positive factors and the weak position of negative factors resulted in strong positive impact of MNREGA. This shows MNREGA'S importance among the poor and its significant contribution in rural society.

Keywords: MGNREGA, job card, worksite,

JEL Codes: C80, C82, C83, H51, H52, I14, I15, J21, J61, R14.

Date of Submission: 28-06-2021

Date of Acceptance: 12-07-2021

I. Introduction

Government of India has undertaken a number of programmes to reduce poverty in rural areas. MGNREGA is one of the efforts in the country. The National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS) is a flagship poverty alleviation programme of the Government of India, which seeks to guarantee at least 100 days of employment every year to the rural poor or enhance livelihood security by 100 days of employment a year to one member of every rural unemployed family (Sontakki and Ahire, 2011, p. 40). MGNREGA has been a debatable and controversial issue in public, scholars and policymakers since its onset or inception. This programme is meant to correct the incorrect or unsuccessful efforts of rural development in India. It is now considered as one of the major component and fruitful dimensions of the rural development – a term which came in light during the 1980s or fifty-five-year plan in India. Rural development may be defined as structural changes in the socio-economic situation to achieve an improved living standard of the low-income population residing in rural areas. It is one of the main and important tasks of development planning in India (Kumar, 2006, p.83).

MGNREGA Act clearly states that preference should be given to development works that have a long-standing resource- building objective. To this end, it specifies the number of the environment- related works that can help to build the resource- base of the poorest, for example, drought-proof or flood-proof vulnerable areas. Watershed development through the construction of small, local-level bunds, the revival of water bodies, water-harvesting structures, afforestation and other measures to check soil erosion and improvement of soil quality in different ways should be some of the focus areas. MGNREGA in the existing frame has a great potential of transforming rural India if it is sincerely and effectively implemented. The launching of the programme has generated much hope in building rural society on a strong foundation for employment generation, empowerment of women and the creation of much- needed infrastructure. By introducing NREGS, India has acquired the distinction of having the world's most massive employment guarantee scheme and public works programme in place (Dutta, 2009, p. 33). The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act was notified by the Government of India on September 2005 and was made effective w.e.f. 2nd February 2006. In the 1st Phase, the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGA) was introduced in District

Chamba and Sirmaur on 2nd February 2006. In the second phase MGNREGA was started in District Kangra and Mandi w.e.f. 1-4-2007. In the third phase w.e.f. 1-4-2008, it covered all the remaining 8 districts of the State. During the year 2014-15 Central share amount to Rs. 28,569.29 lakh and State share amounting to Rs. 3,163.57 lakh have been credited in the State Employment Guarantee Fund Account. The total availability of funds with the Districts is Rs. 33,770.58 lakh is available in the State Employment Guarantee Fund account against which the funds were amounting to Rs. 31,533.94 lakh have been utilized, and 132.68 lakh person-days have been generated by employing 3,82,250 households (Government of Himachal Pradesh, 2015, p. 144).

This study proposed to measure rural development among MGNREGA'S beneficiaries in Mandi district of Himachal Pradesh where poverty is still abysmal in many regions. Unemployment is still increasing because educated and skilled individuals are not getting work. The present study has been undertaken to achieve the following objective were

- i. to study MGNREGA functioning with the help of job card, MGNREGA wages, worksite and monitoring,
- ii. to study the impact of MGNREGA on employment, income, horticulture, irrigation, health and road connectivity, etc., and
- iii. to study the performance of positive factors and negative factors on different aspects.

II. Methodology

In the present study, Mandi district has been selected purposively for conducting the present empirical verification on the impact of MGNREGA, mainly due to the reason that MGNREGA was started in Mandi district in Phase-II (1st April 2007) as well as this district represent diverse agro-climatic conditions, and the physical and financial performance of MGNREGA is moderate and close to the state average. The study is based on primary data. The required primary data have been collected with the help of pre-tested schedule from 300 sample households of 18 villages during 2007-08 and 2010-11 selected randomly from the two development blocks of the district, with the help of pre-tested schedule information, pertaining to age, and sex-wise family composition, educational status, consumer units as well as the data regarding income and consumption have been recorded from all the sample households used in the survey. In the present study to see the evaluation and monitoring of MGNREGA functioning and its impact on rural development have been analyzed through simply Percentage and Average method.

Further, due to difference in the efficiency of male, female, children and old person standard man-days have been worked out in the present study by attaching the 'proper co-efficient of efficiency, that is, one woman day (WD) has been treated equal to 0.75 man-days (MD), one child day (CD) has been treated equal to one old person day (OD) and both are considered equal to 0.50 MD, i.e., 1 WD=0.75 MD, 1 CD= 1 OD=0.50 MD (Ghosh, 1977, p.90).

III. Results And Discussion

Evaluation and Monitoring of MGNREGA Functioning

In the present empirical study, the evaluation and monitoring of MGNREGA functioning have been discussed. The study has been divided into various sections.

Job Card

Issues and percentage distribution of responses on job cards among the sample households in percentage have been present in Table 1. Among all the holdings together, 94.00 per cent responded that they were issued with their job card. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 6.00 per cent responded that they were issued job cards jointly with some other household. About 49.95 per cent female adults have been listed in the job cards. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 50.05 per cent male adults have been listed in the job cards. 100.00 per cent responded that they do not pay for their job cards. Among all the holdings together, 100.00 per cent responded that they paid for their photograph. Among all the holdings together the average value paid for the photograph came out Rs. 28.98. 100.00 per cent responded that they have in possession of their job card at the moment. Among all the holdings together the average man-days worked by the respondents during the last 12 months in the reference year came out 40. Among all the holdings together the average man-days worked by all household members during the last 12 months in the reference year came out 100. Among all the holdings together that they have been chosen to work on average person-days out of 365 days in a year came out 172.33 person-days.

Table 1. Category-wise distribution of responses of respondents on job cards related to different issues (Percentage)

A. Job CARD				
Issue	Category wise land holdings percentage distribution of responses among the respondents given on different issues			
	Marginal Holdings	Small Holdings	Medium Holdings	All Holdings
Does your household have a job card?				
1. Yes(own job card)	(94.44)	(93.75)	(92.50)	(94.00)
2. Yes(but joint with some)	(5.56)	(6.25)	(7.5)	(6.00)
Total	(100.00)	(100.00)	(100.00)	(100.00)
How many adults are listed in the job cards?				
1. Female	(50.44)	(50.38)	(47.59)	(49.95)
2. Male	(49.56)	(49.62)	(52.41)	(50.05)
Total	(100.00)	(100.00)	(100.00)	(100.00)
Did you have to pay for your job card or the photograph on the job card?				
<i>Job card</i>				
1. No				
Total	(100.00)	(100.00)	(100.00)	(100.00)
<i>Photograph</i>				
1. Yes				
Total	(100.00)	(100.00)	(100.00)	(100.00)
If yes how much paid (Average)	(100.00) 28.30	(100.00) 30.00	(100.00) 30.00	(100.00) 28.98
Are you in possession of your job card at the moment, or is it with someone else?				
1. In Possession	(100.00)	(100.00)	(100.00)	(100.00)
Total	(100.00)	(100.00)	(100.00)	(100.00)
After careful discussion with the respondent, and examination of job card, write below your best estimate of the number of days NAREGA work done during the last 12 months by (1) the respondent (2) the household member together.				
1. No of days worked.	39	40	40	40
2. No. of days worked by all households member together:(Average)	100	100	100	100
Suppose you were free to work under MGNREGA for as many days as you like, up to 365 days. In a year, how many days do you think, you would choose to work?Days (Average)				
	187.06	154.75	141.25	172.33

MGNREGA Wages

The responses regarding the payment of wages have been presented in Table 2. Among all the holdings together, 15.00 per cent responded that the wages were paid to them so far at the worksite. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 85.00 per cent responded that the wages had not been paid to them at the worksite.

Among all the holdings together, 22.00 per cent responded that the payment of wages received by them within 15 days of work being done. And among all the holdings together, 36.67 per cent responded that the payment of wages received by them, not within 15 days of work being done but the payment was made to them within a month. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 41.33 per cent responded that the payment was not even made to them within a month.

Table 2. Category-wise distribution of responses of respondents on MGNREGA wages related to different issues (Percentage)

C. MGNREGA wages				
Issue	Category wise land holdings percentage distribution of responses among the respondents given on different issues			
	Marginal Holdings	Small Holdings	Medium Holdings	All Holdings
Have any wages been paid so far at the worksite?				

1.Yes	16.67	12.50	12.50	15.00
2.No	83.33	87.50	87.50	85.00
Total	100.0	100.00	100.00	100.00
Did this payment happen within 15 days of the work being done?				
1.Yes	22.22	20.00	25.00	22.00
2.No, but payment was made within a month	34.44	37.50	45.00	36.67
3.No and payment was not even made within a month	43.34	42.50	30.00	41.33
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Where was the payment made?				
1.Worksite	16.67	12.50	5.00	14.00
2.Panchayat Bhavan	10.00	10.00	20.00	11.33
3.Other public space(Bank)	73.33	77.50	75.00	74.67
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Did you sign the official Muster Roll after taking your wages?				
1.Yes	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Who made the wages?				
1.Sarpanch or Sachib	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
After your wages were collected, who kept them?				
1.Respondent himself/herself	57.78	62.50	67.50	60.33
2.Respondent's Spouse	22.22	18.75	17.50	20.67
3.Held collectively by the Family/Household	20.00	18.75	15.00	19.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Among all the holdings together, 14.00 per cent responded that the payment had been made to them at Worksite. Among all the holdings together, 11.33 per cent responded that the payment was made to them at PanchayatBhavan. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 74.67 per cent responded that the payment was made to them at Other Public Place (Bank). Among all the holdings together, 100.00 per cent responded that they had signed the wage receipts after taking their wage amount. Among all the holdings together, 100.00 per cent responded that Sarpanch or Sachib had made the wages. Among all the holdings together, 60.33 per cent responded that their wages had been collected and kept by themselves. Among all the holdings together, 20.67 per cent responded that their wages had been collected and kept by their Spouse. Remaining total among all the holdings together, 19.00 per cent responded that their wages had been collected, kept and Held collectively by their Family/Household.

At the Work Site

Among all the holdings together the average man-days that the respondents worked at this (one) work site so far came out 13.49.Among all the holdings together, 69.33 per cent responded that at the worksite, the mate/supervisor generally mark their attendance in the official Muster Roll. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 30.67 per cent responded that at this worksite, the mate/supervisor generally mark their attendance in the Informal Notebook.

Among all the holdings together, 32.33 per cent responded that they had faced verbal harassment at the worksite. Among all the holdings together, 10.33 per cent responded that they had faced caste discrimination harassment at the worksite. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 57.34 per cent responded that they did not face any harassment at the worksite. Among all the holdings together, 44.49 per cent responded that they have a sort of Pond (talab) created or repaired at the worksite. Among all the holdings together, 44.97 per cent responded that they have a sort of Check dam created or repaired at the worksite. Among all the holdings together, 43.88 per cent responded that they have created or repaired well at the worksite. Among all the holdings together, 39.02 per cent responded that they have created or repaired a sort of Water harvesting structure at the worksite. Among all the holdings together, 46.39 per cent responded that they had undertaken Land improvement/leveling work at the worksite. Among all the holdings together, 44.79 per cent responded that they have worked onKaccha road at the worksite. Among all the holdings together, 44.37 per cent responded that they have worked on Pucca road at the worksite. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 37.63 per cent responded that they have worked on Forestry related activities at the worksite.

Among all the holdings together, 90.67 per cent responded that they felt that this work was very useful. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 9.33 per cent responded that they felt that this work was quite useful.

Table 3. Category Wise Distribution of Responses of Respondents on the Work Site Related Different Issues

(Percentage)				
<i>D. At work site</i>				
Issue	Category wise land holdings percentage distribution of responses among the respondents given on different issues			
	Marginal Holdings	Small Holdings	Medium Holdings	All Holdings
How many days have you worked at this worksite so far? Average				
	13.14	14.00	14.00	13.49
At this worksite, does the mate/supervisor generally mark your attendance in the official Muster Roll, or an informal notebook/register (Kachakhata)?				
1. Muster Roll	66.67	71.25	77.50	69.33
2. Informal Notebook	33.33	28.75	22.50	30.67
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Have you ever faced any harassment at this worksite?				
1. Verbal abuse	41.67	22.50	10.00	32.33
2. Caste discrimination	12.78	6.25	7.50	10.33
3. No	45.55	71.25	82.50	57.34
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
What sort of asset is being created or repaired at this worksite?				
1. Pond (talab)	58.23	29.89	11.88	44.49
2. Checkdam	60.14	26.80	13.06	44.97
3. Well	58.33	25.00	16.67	43.88
4. Other water harvesting	45.23	34.39	20.38	39.02
5. Land improvement (e.g. Leveling)	62.94	27.70	9.36	46.39
6. Kaccha road	60.00	25.96	14.04	44.79
7. Pucca road	59.88	23.26	16.86	44.37
8. Other (specify) (Forest)	39.46	44.22	16.32	37.63
Do you feel that this work is useful or useless?				
1. Very useful	95.56	87.50	75.00	90.67
2. Quite useful	4.44	12.50	25.00	9.33
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Monitoring

Among all the holdings together, 100.00 per cent responded that there had been some authorities that monitored the functioning of the MGNREGA administration. About 5.67 per cent responded that they had been lodged complaint relating to the worksite or other complaint to the Gram Panchayat, Programme Officer or other officials. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 94.34 per cent responded that they had not been lodged complaint relating to this worksite or other complaint to the Gram Panchayat, Programme Officer or other officials. 76.67 per cent responded that the action had been taken on their complaints. Among all the holdings together, 10.00 per cent responded that the action had not been taken on their complaints. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 13.13 per cent responded that action has been taken sometimes and sometimes not taken on their complaints. From the foregoing analysis under MGNREGA the following key points- issuance of job card to the MGNREGA workers; use of a number of channels for receiving the job application in panchayat office; delay of one month or more period in receiving job and wage payments; payments of wages by sarpanches; payment of wages to the worker or his/her spouse only; regular recording at and monitoring of the worksite (work); use of muster roll or notebook for recording; complaints on the work and action undertaken by the MGNREGA authorities in practice; creation of assets like check dams, pond, water harvesting, kaccha and pucca roads; forest-related activities, etc.; verbal abuse among MGNREGA worker, have been observed.

It may be concluded that under MGNREGA- jobs are not created to MGNREGA worker at the time of their requirement, there have always been a delay in the job assigned to them and payment of their wages. The payment of their wages in their bank/ PO accounts is not in practice under MGNREGA in the reference year.

Table 4. Category-wise distribution of responses of respondents on the monitoring related different issues (Percentage)

E. MONITORING				
<i>Issue</i>	Category wise land holdings percentage distribution of responses among the respondents given on different issues			
	Marginal Holdings	Small Holdings	Medium Holdings	All Holdings
Is there any authority that monitors the functioning of the MGNREGA administration?				
1.Yes	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Did you lodge any complaint relating to this worksite or any other complaint to the Gram Panchayat, Programme Officer or other officials.				
1.Yes	6.67	3.75	5.00	5.67
2.No	93.33	96.25	95.00	94.34
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
If yes, has any action been taken on your complaints?				
1.Yes	83.33	62.50	75.00	76.67
2.No	5.56	25.00	0.00	10.00
3.Sometimes Yes, sometimes not	11.11	12.50	25.00	13.33
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

General Matters

General questions: Positive aspects

Beneficiaries were asked to know the positive aspect or impact of MGNREGA. Following includes the positive factors that were undertaken to record their percentage distribution in ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ and have been presented in Table 5. The table makes clear that on Employment, among all the holdings together, 95.00 per cent responded that there had been positive factors improved due to MNREGS. And the remaining 5.00 per cent, among all the holdings, together responded that there had been no positive impact on employment due to MNREGS. Among all the holdings together, 95.00 per cent responded that there had been positive factors improved Income due to MNREGS. And the remaining 5.00 per cent, among all the holdings, together responded that there had been no positive impact on income due to MNREGS. 64.00 per cent responded that there had been a positive impact on Standard of Living due to MNREGS. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 36.00 per cent responded that there had been no positive impact on Standard of Living due to MNREGS. About 87.67 per cent responded that there had been a positive impact on Education due to MNREGS. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 12.33 per cent responded that there had been no positive factors improved due to MNREGS, on Education. Among all the holdings together, 6.00 per cent responded that there had been positive factors improved Horticulture activities due to MNREGS. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 94.00 per cent responded that there had been no positive factors improved due to MNREGS. 93.00 per cent responded that there had been a positive impact on the improvement of Work culture due to MNREGS. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 7.00 per cent responded that there had been no positive impact on Work culture due to MNREGS. Among all the holdings together, 43.33 per cent responded that there had been a positive impact on Agriculture Income due to MNREGS. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 56.67 per cent responded that there had been no positive impact on Agriculture Income due to MNREGS. On Women Empowerment matters, among all the holdings together, 94.67 per cent responded that there had been positive factors improved due to MNREGS. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 5.33 per cent responded that there had been no positive factors improved due to MNREGS, on Women Empowerment.

Whereas, On Forestry activities, among all the holdings together, 61.33 per cent responded that there had been positive factors improved due to MNREGS. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 38.67 per cent responded that there had been no positive factors improved due to MNREGS, on Forestry. On Rural Infrastructure among all the holdings together 100.00 per cent responded that there had been a positive impact due to MNREGS. Among all the holdings together, 23.67 per cent responded that there had been a positive impact on Irrigation and Health due to MNREGS. And the remaining 76.30 per cent, among all the holdings, together responded that there had been no positive impact on Irrigation and Health due to MNREGS. Among all the holdings together, 26.33 per cent responded that there had been positive factors improved due to MNREGS, on Road Connectivity. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 73.67 per cent responded that there had been no positive factors improved due to MNREGS, on Road Connectivity. On Consumption Pattern, among all the holdings together, 90.00 per cent responded that there had been positive factors improved due to MNREGS.

And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 10.00 per cent responded that there had been no positive factors improved due to MNREGS, on Consumption Pattern.

Table 5. Category-wise distribution of responses of respondents on the general matters related to different issues (Positive)

Whether positive factors due to MGNREGA	Category wise land holdings percentage distribution of responses among the respondents given on different issues			
	Marginal Holdings	Small Holdings	Medium Holdings	All Holdings
(Percentage)				
Employment				
1. Yes	94.44	95.00	97.50	95.00
2. No	5.56	5.00	2.50	5.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Income				
1. Yes	94.44	95.00	97.50	95.00
2. No	5.56	5.00	2.50	5.50
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Standard of living				
1. Yes	61.11	65.00	75.00	64.00
2. No	38.89	35.00	25.00	36.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Education				
1. Yes	90.00	85.00	82.50	87.67
2. No	10.00	15.00	17.50	12.33
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Horticulture				
1. Yes	5.56	6.25	7.50	6.00
2. No	94.44	93.75	92.50	94.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Work Culture				
1. Yes	96.11	88.75	87.50	93.00
2. No	3.89	11.25	12.50	7.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Agriculture Income				
1. Yes	44.44	43.75	37.50	43.33
2. No	55.56	56.25	62.50	56.67
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Women Empowerment				
1. Yes	97.78	91.25	87.50	94.67
2. No	2.22	8.75	12.50	5.33
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Forestry				
1. Yes	67.78	52.50	50.00	61.33
2. No	32.22	47.50	50.00	38.67
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Rural Infrastructure				
1. Yes	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Irrigation and Health				
1. Yes	27.78	18.75	15.00	23.67
2. No	72.22	81.25	85.00	76.33
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Road Connectivity				
1. Yes	27.78	25.00	22.50	26.33
2. No	72.22	75.00	77.50	73.67
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Consumption Pattern				
1. Yes	97.22	80.00	77.50	90.00
2. No	2.78	20.00	22.50	10.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

General questions: Negative aspects

Further, beneficiaries were asked to know the negative aspect or impact of MGNREGA. Following includes the negative factors that were undertaken to record their percentage distribution in 'Yes' or 'No' and have been presented in Table 6. It is clear from the table that among all the holdings together, 15.00 per cent responded that there had been a negative impact due to MNREGS of conducting favouritism. And out of rest,

among all the holdings together, 85.00 per cent responded that there had been no Favoritism and a negative impact due to MNREGS by Favoritism. Among all the holdings together, 26.33 per cent responded that there had been a negative impact of flourishing corruption due to MNREGS. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 73.67 per cent responded that there had been no Corruption and observed a negative impact due to MNREGS on the matter. About 15.33 per cent responded that there had been a negative impact due to the MNREGS of Misutilization of Resources. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 84.67 per cent responded that there had been no Misutilization of Resources and a negative impact due to MNREGS of Misutilization of Resources. Among all the holdings together, 4.33 per cent responded that there had been a negative impact due to the MNREGS of Fake employment. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 95.67 per cent responded that there had been no Fake employment and a negative impact due to MNREGS of Fake employment. Among all the holdings together, 5.33 per cent responded that there had been a negative impact due to MNREGS of Nepotism. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 94.67 per cent responded that there had been no Nepotism and a negative impact due to MNREGS of Nepotism.

Whereas, 13.33 per cent responded that there had been a negative impact due to MNREGS of wrong selection of the beneficiaries. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 86.67 per cent responded that there had been no wrong selection of the beneficiaries and a negative impact due to MNREGS of Wrong selection of the beneficiaries. Among all the holdings together, 15.33 per cent responded that there had been a negative impact due to MNREGS of Misuse of Govt. Machinery. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 84.67 per cent responded that there had been no Misuse of Govt. Machinery and a negative impact due to MNREGS of Misuse of Govt. Machinery. Among all the holdings together, 43.67 per cent responded that there had been a negative impact due to MNREGS of Idleness. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 56.33 per cent responded that there had been no Idleness and a negative impact due to MNREGS of Idleness. 78.00 per cent responded that there had been a negative impact due to MNREGS of making delay in wage payment. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 22.00 per cent responded that there had been no delay in wage payment and a negative impact due to MNREGS of Delay in wage payment. 100.00 per cent responded that there had been nobody Paid less wage payment to what they sign for and a negative impact due to MNREGS of Paid less wage payment to what they sign for. About 17.67 per cent responded that there had been a negative impact due to the MNREGS of Problem in assessing PO/Bank account. And out of rest, among all the holdings together 82.33 per cent responded that there had been no Problem in assessing PO/Bank account and a negative impact due to MNREGS of Problem in assessing PO/Bank account. Among all the holdings together, 5.00 per cent responded that there had been a negative impact due to MNREGS of Poor Planning. And out of rest, among all the holdings together, 95.00 per cent responded that there had been no Poor Planning and a negative impact due to MNREGS of Poor Planning. 100.00 per cent responded that there had been nobody ignoring women and a negative impact due to MNREGS of ignoring Women.

Table 6. Category-wise distribution of responses of respondents on the general matters related to different issues (negative)

Whether there is a Negative impact due to MGNREGA	Category wise land holdings percentage distribution of responses among the respondents given on different issues			
	Marginal Holdings	Small Holdings	Medium Holdings	All Holdings
(Percentage)				
Favouritism				
1. Yes	15.56	8.75	25.00	15.00
2. No	84.44	91.25	75.00	85.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Corruption				
1. Yes	33.33	16.25	15.00	26.33
2. No	66.67	83.75	85.00	73.67
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Misutilization of Resources				
1. Yes	14.44	15.00	20.00	15.33
2. No	85.56	85.00	80.00	84.67
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Fake employment				
1. Yes	2.78	3.75	12.50	4.33
2. No	97.22	96.25	87.50	95.67
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Nepotism				
1. Yes	5.56	5.00	5.00	5.33
2. No	94.44	95.00	95.00	94.67
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Wrong selection of beneficiaries				
1.Yes	13.89	13.75	10.00	13.33
2.No	86.11	86.25	90.00	86.67
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Misuse of Govt. Machinery				
1.Yes	14.44	15.00	20.00	15.33
2.No	85.56	85.00	80.00	84.67
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Idleness				
1.Yes	51.11	18.75	60.00	43.67
2.No	48.89	81.25	40.00	56.33
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Delay in wage payment				
1.Yes	77.78	80.00	75.00	78.00
2.No	22.22	20.00	25.00	22.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Paid less than what you have made to sign for				
1.No	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
The problem in assessing PO/Bank account				
1.Yes	22.22	11.25	10.00	17.67
2.No	77.78	88.75	90.00	82.33
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Poor planning				
1.Yes	6.11	5.00	0.00	5.00
2.No	93.89	95.00	100.00	95.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Ignoring women				
1.No	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

The preceding analysis presents a higher performance of MGNREGA on employment, income, education, work culture, women empowerment, rural infrastructure and consumption pattern as the positive factor improved due to MGNREGA highly and a moderate performance on the standard of living, agriculture income and forestry work as well as a comparatively poor positive performance on horticulture, irrigation and health and road connectivity aspects. The high improvement performance of positive factors and the weak position of negative factors on favouritism, corruption, mis-utilization of resources, fake employment, nepotism, wrong selection of beneficiaries, misuse of Govt. machinery, idleness, paid less than what is signed, the problem of PO/Bank account, poor planning and ignoring women, etc. resulted in the strong positive impact of MGNREGA.

IV. Conclusions

The foregoing analysis presents a higher performance of MNREGA on employment, income, education, work culture, women empowerment, rural infrastructure and consumption pattern as the positive factor improved due to MNREGA highly and a moderate performance on standard of living, agriculture income and forestry works as well as a comparatively poor positive performance on horticulture, irrigation and health and road connectivity aspects. The high improvement performance of positive factors and the weak position of negative factors on favoritism, corruption, misutilisation of resources, fake employment, nepotism, wrong selection of beneficiaries, misuse of Govt. machinery, idleness, paid less than what is signed, problem of PO/Bank account, poor planning and ignoring women etc. resulted in strong positive impact of MNREGA. This shows MNREGA'S importance among the poor and its significant contribution in rural society. Only the delay in wage payments appeared as a strong negative factor causing harassment among MGNREGA workers. Otherwise, the programme itself reflects its significance in the study area.

References

- [1]. Kumar, Pawan (2006). Rural infrastructure. *Yojana*, 50, 83.
- [2]. Dutta, Subhabrata (2009). MGNREGA in West Bengal: success and challenges. *Kurukshetra*, 58 (2), 33.
- [3]. Ghosh, B. N. (1977). Disguised unemployment in underdeveloped countries with special reference to India. *Heritage Publishers*, 90.
- [4]. Government of Himachal Pradesh, (2015). Economic survey of Himachal Pradesh. *Economics and Statistics Department of Himachal Pradesh*, 144.
- [5]. Sontakki B. S. & Ahire, L. M. (2011). From the ground rural employment guarantee scheme: Boon or bane to Indian agriculture?. *Kurukshetra*, 59 (6), 40.