

Impact of Mgnrega Functioning on Rural Development of Mandi District of Himachal Pradesh: An Empirical Investigation

Dr. Sanjeet Singh

Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Govt. College Mandi H.P

Abstract: *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. In a bid to woo tribals, the government raised the workdays from 100 days to 150 days for tribals. NREGA in the existing frame has a great potential of transforming rural India, if it is sincerely and effectively implemented. In this paper, an attempt is made to measure the performance of MNREGA on employment, income, education, work culture, women empowerment, rural infrastructure, consumption pattern, standard of living, agriculture income among the MNREGA beneficiaries in the economy Mandi district of Himachal Pradesh. Further study also measures the impact of MNREGA on horticulture, irrigation & health and road connectivity aspects in study area. The study shows that the high improvement performance of positive factors and the weak position of negative factors on different aspects resulted in strong positive impact of MNREGA. This shows MNREGA'S importance among the poor and its significant contribution in rural society.*

I. Introduction

Government of India has undertaken a number of programmes to reduce the 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).

NREGA has been a debatable and controversial issue in public, scholars and policy makers since its onset or inception. This programme is meant to correct the incorreced 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 1980s or fifty five year plan in India. Rural development may be defined as structural changes in the socio-economic situation to achieve improved living standard of 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).

NREGA Act clearly states that preference should be given to development works that have long standing resource- building objective. To this end, it specifies a number of 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, 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. NREGA 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 a lot of hope in building rural society on a strong foundation for employment generation, empowerment of women and creation of much- needed infrastructure. By introducing NREGS, India has acquired the distinction of having the world's largest employment guarantee scheme and public works programme in place (Dutta, 2009, p. 33).

The Mahatama 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 Mahatama Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MNREGA) was introduced in District Chamba and Sirmaur on 2nd February, 2006. In second phase MNREGA 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 district 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 amounting to Rs. 31,533.94 lakh have been utilized and 132.68 lakh mandays have been generated by providing employment to 3,82,250 households (Government of Himachal Pradesh, 2015, p. 144).

This study proposed to measure rural development among MNREGA'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.

II. Literature Review

A general review of literature of the period shows that the researchers were very much interested in rural development programmes including MNREGA over the years. Yadav and Mishra (1980) examined the impact of the tribal development programmes on

Employment, Income and Assets formation in Bastar district of Madhya Pradesh during 1974-75 to 1978-79 based on the data collected from 25 beneficiary and 25 non-beneficiary families. They concluded that the employment opportunities of beneficiary as well as non-beneficiary families had increased in all the occupations during the period of study. CAG (2007) has been a spate of comments mostly critical following an audit of the National Rural Employment Guarantee Programme by the Comptroller and Auditor

General of India. This audit has revealed several weaknesses of this anti-poverty programme as well as huge leakages. For example, a bare 3.2 per cent of registered households in 200 of India's poorest districts managed to get the guaranteed 100 days of employment in the year. Rajanna and Ramesh (2009) conducted a study of "NREGP-

Facet of inclusive Growth-A Study of Karimanagr District in Andhra Pradesh" based on field data. They emphasized on ensuring that the economic opportunities created by growth are available to all particularly the poor. Finally, the study revealed that NREGP has become a beacon of light in the rural areas, and contributed substantially for the increased living and economic conditions by reducing the income imbalance in the rural area. Roy (2009) conducted a study on "Impact on the Villagers in Tripura" based on primary data with objectives that NREGS will give a new lease of life to the rural poor and energize the state economy in particular. He concluded that creation of durable community assets like rural road, water bodies, tanks, market sheds for the unemployed youths have brought a shift in the livelihood of rural people. In sum, it has been concluded that MNREGS has not been implemented with same spirit, vigor as was conceived when formulated, but there is a lot of scope for making MNREGS more successful.

Objectives

The present study has been undertaken to achieve the following objective:-

- (i) to study the evaluation and monitoring of MNREGA functioning and its impact on rural development.

III. Data Source and Methodology

In the present study, Mandi district has been selected purposively for conducting the present empirical verification on the impact of NREGA, mainly due to the reason that NREGA was started in Mandi district in Phase-II i.e. 1st April 2007 as well as this district represent diverse agro-climatic conditions and the physical and financial performance of NREGA are 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 MNREGA functioning and its impact on rural development has been analyzed through simply Percentage and Average method.

Further, due to difference in the efficiency of male, female, children and old person standard mandays have been worked out in the present study by attaching the 'proper co-efficient of efficiency' i.e., one woman day (WD) has been treated equal to 0.75 mandays (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).

Results and Discussion Evaluation and Monitoring of MGNREGA Functioning

In the present empirical study the evaluation and monitoring of NREGA functioning has 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.

Table 1
Category- Wise Distribution of Responses of Respondents on Job Cards Related
Different Issues

(Percentage)

A. JOB CARD					
S.No.	Issue	Category wise land holdings percentage distribution of responses among the respondents given on different issues			
		Marginal Holdings	Small Holdings	Medium Holdings	All Holdings
1.	Does your household have a job card? 1.Yes(own job card) 2.Yes(but joint with some) 3.Yes(Several Job cards) 4.No 5.Unclear Total	(94.44) (5.56) (0.00) (0.00) (0.00) (100.00)	(93.75) (6.25) (0.00) (0.00) (0.00) (100.00)	92.50 (7.5) (0.00) (0.00) (0.00) (100.00)	(94.00) (6.00) (0.00) (0.00) (0.00) (100.00)
2.	How many adults are listed in the job cards? Female Male Total	(50.44) (49.56) (100.00)	(50.38) (49.62) (100.00)	(47.59) (52.41) (100.00)	(49.95) (50.05) (100.00)
3.	Did you have to pay for your job card or for the photograph on the job card? <i>Job card</i> 1.Yes 2.No Total <i>Photograph</i> 1.Yes 2.No Total If yes how much paid(Average)	(0.00) (100.00) (100.00) (100.00) (0.00) (100.00) 28.30	(0.00) (100.00) (100.00) (100.00) (0.00) (100.00) 30.00	(0.00) (100.00) (100.00) (100.00) (0.00) (100.00) 30.00	(0.00) (100.00) (100.00) (100.00) (0.00) (100.00) 28.98
4.	Are you in possession of your job card at the moment, or is it with someone else? 1.In Possession 2.Some else 3.Not sure Total	(100.00) (0.00) (0.00) (100.00)	(100.00) (0.00) (0.00) (100.00)	(100.00) (0.00) (0.00) (100.00)	(100.00) (0.00) (0.00) (100.00)
5.	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 by the respondent. 2. No. of days worked by all households member together:(Average)	39 100	40 100	40 100	40 100
6.	If you were free to work under NREGA for as many days as you like, up to 365 days In a year, how many days do you think you would chose to work? Days (Average)	187.06	154.75	141.25	172.33

Among all the holdings together 94.00 per cent responded that they have been issued with the own job card. And out of rest, among all the holdings together 6.00 per cent responded that they have been 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 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 mandays worked by the respondents during the last 12 months in the reference year came out 40. Among all the holdings together the average mandays worked by all household members together 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 an average mandays out of 365 days in a year came out 172.33 mandays.

NREGA WAGES

Table 2
Category Wise Distribution of Responses of Respondents on NREGA Wages Related Different Issues
(Percentage)

C. NREGA WAGES					
S.No.	Issue	Category wise land holdings percentage distribution of responses among the respondents given on different issues			
		Marginal Holdings	Small Holdings	Medium Holdings	All Holdings
11	Have any wages been paid so far at the worksite? 1.Yes 2.No 9.Unclear Total	16.67 83.33 100.0	12.50 87.50 100.0	12.50 87.50 100.0	15.00 85.00 100.0
12	Did this payment happen within 15 days of the work being done? 1.Yes 2.No, but payment was made within a month 3.No, and payment was not even made within a month 9.Unclear Total	22.22 43.34 0.00 100.00	34.44 42.50 0.00 100.00	25.00 45.00 30.00 100.00	22.00 36.67 41.33 100.00
13	Where was the payment made? 1.Worksite 2.Panchayat Bhavan 3.Other public space(Bank) 4. Someone's private Total	16.67 73.33 0.00 100.00	10.00 77.50 0.00 100.00	5.00 20.00 75.00 100.00	14.00 11.33 74.67 100.00
14	Did you sign the official Muster Roll after taking your wages? 1.Yes 2.No 9.Unclear Total	100.00 0.00 0.00 100.00	100.00 0.00 0.00 100.00	100.00 0.00 0.00 100.00	100.00 0.00 0.00 100.00
15	Who made the wages? 1.Sarpanch or Sachib 2.Post Office 3.Bank 4.Other Governmental 5.Contractor 6.Other(Specify) Total	100.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 100.00	100.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 100.00	100.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 100.00	100.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 100.00
16	After your wages were collected, who kept them? 1.Respondent himself/herself 2.Respondent's Spouse 3.Other household member 4.Held collectively by the tne Family/Household 5.Other (Specify) 9.Unclear Total	57.78 22.22 20.00 0.00 0.00 100.00	0.00 0.00 18.75 0.00 0.00 100.00	62.50 18.75 15.00 0.00 0.00 100.00	67.50 17.50 19.00 0.00 0.00 100.00

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 have been paid to them so far at the work site. And out of rest, among all the holdings together 85.00 per cent responded that the wages have not been paid to them at the work site. 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.

Among all the holdings together 14.00 per cent responded that the payment has been made to them at Worksite. Among all the holdings together 11.33 per cent responded that the payment has been made to them at Panchayat Bhavan. And out of rest, among all the holdings together 74.67 per cent responded that the payment

has been made to them at Other Public Place (Bank). Among all the holdings together 100.00 per cent responded that they have signed the wage receipts after taking their wage amount. Among all the holdings together 100.00 per cent responded that Sarpanch or Sachib has made the wages. Among all the holdings together 60.33 per cent responded that their wages have been collected and kept by themselves. Among all the holdings together 20.67 per cent responded that their wages have been collected and kept by their Spouse. Remaining total among all the holdings together 19.00 per cent responded that their wages have been collected, kept and Held collectively by their Family/Household.

At the Work Site

Table 3
Category Wise Distribution of Responses of Respondents on the Work Site Related Different Issues
(Percentage)

<i>D. AT WORK SITE</i>					
S.No.	Issue	Category wise land holdings percentage distribution of responses among the respondents given on different issues			
		Marginal Holdings	Small Holdings	Medium Holdings	All Holdings
17.	How many days have you worked at this worksite so far? Average	13.14	14.00	14.00	13.49
18.	At this worksite, does the mate/supervisor generally mark your attendance in the official Muster Roll, or in an informal notebook/register (Kacchakhata)?	66.67	71.25	77.50	69.33
	1.Muster Roll	33.33	28.75	22.50	30.67
	2.Informal Notebook	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	3.Other specify	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	4.Not Applicable(mate doesn't record attendance)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	9.Unclear	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
19.	Have you ever faced any harassment at this worksite?				
	1.Physical violence	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2.Verbal abuse	41.67 0.00	22.50	10.00	32.33 0.00
	3.Sexual harassment	12.78 0.00	0.00 6.25	0.00 7.50	10.33 0.00
	4.Caste discrimination	45.55	0.00	0.00	57.34
	5.Other(specify)	100.00	71.25	82.50	100.00
20.	6.No		100.00	100.00	
	Total				
	What sort of asset is being created or repaired at this worksite? 1.Pond(talab)	58.23 60.14	29.89 26.80	11.88 13.06	44.49 44.97
	2.Checkdam	58.33 45.23	25.00 34.39	16.67	43.88 39.02
	3.Well	62.94 60.00	27.70 25.96	20.38 9.36	46.39 44.79
	4.Other water harvesting	59.88	23.26	14.04 16.86	44.37
	5.Land improvent(e.g.Leveling)	39.46	44.22	16.32	37.63
	6.Kaccha road	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	7.Pacca road				
8.Other(specify) (Forest)					
21.	9.Unclear				
	Total				
	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 0.00	12.50	25.00	9.33 0.00
	3.Not Particularly useful	0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00
4.Useless	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
9.Unable to tell	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	

Among all the holdings together the average mandays 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 have faced verbal harassment at the worksite. No body responded facing any sexual harassment. Among all the holdings together 10.33 per cent responded that they have 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 faced 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 Checkdam 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 have undertaken Land improvement / leveling work at the worksite. Among all the holdings together 44.79 per cent responded that they have worked on Kaccha 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.

Monitoring

Table 4
Category Wise Distribution of Responses of Respondents on the Monitoring Related Different Issues

(Percentage)

E. MONITORING					
S.No.	Issue	Category wise land holdings percentage distribution of responses among the respondents given on different issues			
		Marginal Holdings	Small Holdings	Medium Holdings	All Holdings
22.	Is there any authority that monitors the functioning of the NREGA administration? 1.Yes 2.No Total	100.00 0.00 100.00	100.00 0.00 100.00	100.00 0.00 100.00	100.00 0.00 100.00
23.	Did you lodge any complaint relating to this worksite or any other complaint to the Gram Panchayat, Programme Officer or other officials. 1.Yes 2.No 3.Unclear Total	6.67 93.33 0.00 100.00	3.75 96.25 0.00 100.00	5.00 95.00 0.00 100.00	5.67 94.34 0.00 100.00
24.	If yes, has any action been taken on your complaints? 1.Yes 2.No 3.Sometimes Yes, sometimes not 4.Unclear Total	83.33 5.56 11.11 0.00 100.00	62.50 25.00 12.50 0.00 100.00	75.00 0.00 25.00 0.00 100.00	76.67 10.00 13.33 0.00 100.00

Among all the holdings together 100.00 per cent responded that there had been some authorities that monitored the functioning of the NREGA administration.

About 5.67 per cent responded that they have 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 have 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 has been taken on their complaints. Among all the holdings together 10.00 per cent responded that the action has 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 MNREGA the following key points- issuance of job card to the MNREGA workers; use of a number of channels for receiving the job application in panchayat office; delay of one month or more time period in receiving job and wage payments; payments of wages by surpanches; payment of wages to the worker or his/her spouse only; regular recording at and monitoring of the worksite (work); use of must roll or notebook for recording; complaints on the work and action undertaken by the MNREGA authorities in practice; creation of assets like checkdam, pond, water harvesting, kaccha and pucca roads; forest related activities etc. ; verbal abuse among MNREGA worker, have been observed.

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

General Matters

Table 5A
Category Wise Distribution of Responses of Respondents on the General Matters
Related Different Issues (Positive)

(Percentage)

S.No.	Whether positive factors due to MNREGA	Category wise land holdings percentage distribution of responses among the respondents given on different issues			
		Marginal Holdings	Small Holdings	Medium Holdings	All Holdings
25.	Employment				
	Yes	94.44	95.00	97.50	95.00
	No	5.56	5.00	2.50	5.00
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
26.	Income				
	Yes	94.44	95.00	97.50	95.00
	No	5.56	5.00	2.50	5.50
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
27.	Standard of living				
	Yes	61.11	65.00	75.00	64.00
	No	38.89	35.00	25.00	36.00
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
28.	Education				
	Yes No	90.00 10.00	85.00 15.00	82.50 17.50	87.67 12.33
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
29.	Horticulture				
	Yes	5.56	6.25	7.50	6.00
	No	94.44	93.75	92.50	94.00
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
30.	Work Culture				
	Yes	96.11	88.75	87.50	93.00
	No	3.89	11.25	12.50	7.00
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
31.	Agriculture Income Yes	44.44	43.75	37.50	43.33
	No Total	55.56 100.00	56.25 100.00	62.50 100.00	56.67 100.00
32.	Women Empowerment				
	Yes	97.78	91.25	87.50	94.67
	No	2.22	8.75	12.50	5.33
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
33.	Forestry				
	Yes	67.78	52.50	50.00	61.33
	No	32.22	47.50	50.00	38.67
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
34.	Rural Infrastructure				
	Yes	100.00 0.00	100.00 0.00	100.00 0.00	100.00 0.00
	No	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	Total				
35.	Irrigation and Health				
	Yes	27.78	18.75	15.00	23.67
	No	72.22	81.25	85.00	76.33
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
36.	Road Connectivity				
	Yes	27.78	25.00	22.50	26.33
	No	72.22	75.00	77.50	73.67
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
37.	Consumption Pattern				
	Yes	97.22	80.00	77.50	90.00
	No	2.78	20.00	22.50	10.00
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table 5B
Category Wise Distribution of Responses of Respondents on the General Matters
Related Different Issues (Negative)

(Percentage)

S.No.	Whether there is Negative impact due to MNREGA	Category wise land holdings percentage distribution of responses among the respondents given on different issues			
		Marginal Holdings	Small Holdings	Medium Holdings	All Holdings
38.	Favouritism				
	Yes	15.56	8.75	25.00	15.00
	No	84.44	91.25	75.00	85.00
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
39.	Corruption				
	Yes No	33.33	16.25	15.00	26.33
	Total	66.67	83.75	85.00	73.67
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
40.	Misutilisation of Resources				
	Yes	14.44	15.00	20.00	15.33
	No	85.56	85.00	80.00	84.67
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
41.	Fake employment				
	Yes	2.78	3.75	12.50	4.33
	No	97.22	96.25	87.50	95.67
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
42.	Nepotism				
	Yes	5.56	5.00	5.00	5.33
	No	94.44	95.00	95.00	94.67
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
43.	Wrong selection of beneficiaries				
	Yes	13.89	13.75	10.00	13.33
	No	86.11	86.25	90.00	86.67
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
44.	Misuse of Govt. Machinery				
	Yes	14.44	15.00	20.00	15.33
	No	85.56	85.00	80.00	84.67
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
45.	Idleness				
	Yes	51.11	18.75	60.00	43.67
	No	48.89	81.25	40.00	56.33
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
46.	Delay in wage payment				
	Yes	77.78	80.00	75.00	78.00
	No	22.22	20.00	25.00	22.00
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
47.	Paid less than what you have made to sign for				
	Yes	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	No	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
48.	Problem in assessing PO/Bank account				
	Yes	22.22	11.25	10.00	17.67
	No	77.78	88.75	90.00	82.33
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
49.	Poor planning				
	Yes	6.11	5.00	0.00	5.00
	No	93.89	95.00	100.00	95.00
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
50.	Ignoring women				
	Yes	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	No	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

A. General Questions (Positive Aspects):

Beneficiaries were asked to know the positive aspect or impact of NREGA. Following includes the positive factors that were undertaken to record their percentage distribution in ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ and have been presented in table 5(A).

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 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 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 positive impact on 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 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 positive impact due to MNREGS. Among all the holdings together 23.67 per cent responded that there had been 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.

B. General Questions (Negative Aspects):

Further, beneficiaries were asked to know the negative aspect or impact of NREGA. Following includes the negative factors that were undertaken to record their percentage distribution in 'Yes' or 'No' and have been presented in table 5(B). 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 Favoritism. 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 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 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 no body 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 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 no body ignoring women and a negative impact due to MNREGS of ignoring Women.

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.

IV. Concluding Remarks

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 MNREGA workers. Otherwise, the programme itself reflects its significance in the country.

References

- [1]. Kumar, Pawan (2006), Rural Infrastructure, **Yojana**, Vol. 50, New Delhi, p. 83.
- [2]. Dutta, Subhabrata (2009), NREGA In West Bengal: Success and Challenges, **Kurukshetra**, Vol.58, No. 2, New Delhi, p. 33.
- [3]. For detailed see CAG Audit in (2007), Performance Audit of Scheme, **Economic & Political Weekly**, Vol. 40, No. 42, Mumbai, pp. 4531-37.
- [4]. Ghosh, B. N. (1977), "Disguised Unemployment in Underdeveloped Countries with Special Reference to India", Heritage Publishers, New Delhi, p.90.
- [5]. Government of Himachal Pradesh, (2015), "Economic Survey of Himachal Pradesh", Economics and Statistics Department of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla, p. 144.
- [6]. Rajanna, Mamidipally and Ramesh, Gundeti (2009), NREGP Facet of Inclusive Growth- A Study of Karimnagar District in Andhra Pradesh, **Kurukshetra**, Vol. 57, No. 4, New Delhi, Feb., p.33.
- [7]. Roy, Sanjay (2009), Impact on Villagers in Tripura- Field Study, **Kurukshetra**, Vol. 58, No.2, New Delhi, pp. 27-28.
- [8]. Sontakki Bharat S. and Ahire, Laxman M. (2011), "From the Ground Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme: Boon or bane to Indian Agriculture"? **Kurukshetra**, Vol. 59, No.6, New Delhi, p. 40.
- [9]. Yadav, H. and Mishra, C.S. (1980), Impact of the Tribal Development Programmes on Employment, Income and Assets Formation in Baster District of M.P., **Indian Journal of Agriculture Economics**, Vol. 35, No. 4, Bombay, pp. 67-68.