

CHAPTER – 1

INTRODUCTION

The Indian Economy has been growing fast at a high rate in the recent past, still the problems encountered by the rural people remained unabated. For instance, there has been over 30000 farmer suicides in India since the mid – 1990s, mostly as a result of pressure from poor access to finance, increasing population, decreasing farm sizes, scarce irrigation and lack of alternative employment. To alleviate the problem of acute rural unemployment, the Government of India announced the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (now the MGNREGA) in 2005, and implemented in three phases in all the 619 rural districts in India. This Act purportedly guarantees 100 days of employment at minimum wage to every rural household.

Origin of the Research Problem: Enactment of MGNREGA and implementation of the job guarantee scheme is a bold experiment in providing a minimum livelihood security to rural households through public works-based employment scheme, the primary objective of which is to ensure the transfer of a minimum income to rural households through self-seeking wage employment, and is a departure from the erstwhile employment and public works programme, which were designed to create community infrastructure first, and then simultaneously generate income and employment to local residents. The demand-based entitlement to 100 days of employment at minimum wages and a corresponding legal obligations on the agencies of the state to provide it within a stipulated period of time is a major departure from traditional approaches adopted hitherto. The compensatory provisions like unemployment allowance, compensation for the delay in wage payment and a punitive provision for the government to provide employment within 15 days of the demand complete the cycle of entitlement. More importantly, the Act exalts the position of the citizens from the receivers of state's

dole to a legally entitled shareholder in the development pie, irrespective of the size of the pie.

Critics of the programme are, however, skeptical about its success. Nonetheless, questions are raised about the viability and operational aspects as well as many other aspects of the scheme. What will be the micro and macro – level economic impacts of such a massive programme of rural income and employment generation and asset creation? Will it be able to mitigate household level rural poverty which continues to be at unacceptable level? What will be its impact on rural and agrarian economy, labour market conditions and rural – urban economic linkages? Will the wage income transferred under MGNREGS help India in sustaining domestic–demand–driven high growth rate in GDP in the Post – liberalization period? Will this guaranteed employment programme be able to address income, sectoral and regional inequalities that have increased in the reform phase? Will it be sufficient to address the issue of distribution that has become more uneven in this phase? These are some of the questions raised often about the viability and operational aspects.

Then, there are questions about the objectives as well. What is the nature of this programme, which is loaded with multiple objectives? Is it a programme of social security, or of employment generation and assets creation with larger macroeconomic effects? If it is a programme social security, then why is it linked to employment generation and asset creation, and how these two objectives could be reconciled in the programme?

These questions are being frequently asked since the commencement of this programme. Numerous plausible explanations and vague answers have also been provided, although firm trends and clear picture about its impacts are yet to be gauged into and established. There are divisions of opinion about the way the programme should have been designed and structured. There are divergent views on the thrust of the objectives as well. To some, it is primarily an income transfer programme, but to others, it is both an income transfer and asset–creation programme. The former evaluates its working from the view points of workers and

the latter from the view points of investment and community assets. There are divergent views on its working and success as well. There are some who have already written the elegy of the programme while there are others who are determined to make it a catalytic agent of rural transformation. The working of the programme so far has, however, not disappointed either group: if there are some success stories to celebrate, there are plenty of implementation bottlenecks to doom its failure.

This project work is an earnest, but humble attempt to answer some of these questions based on empirical evidences offered by published sources as well as primary data collected by sample survey.

Regarding the effectiveness in the implementation of the scheme, reports from various parts of the country are not very lucrative, particularly from the state of Kerala. An audit report on the MGNREGS has slammed the State Government for non-performance and poor maintenance of records in implementing the scheme from 2007 to 2012. (The Hindu, April 2013)

The performance audit report prepared by the CAG and tabled in Parliament in April 2013 also revealed 'delays ranging from four to six years in framing rules'. The report also brings out that there are significant variations between the estimated demand and actual generation of employment. Delay in wage payment from 23 to 138 days was reported in all grama panchayats. Several lacunae of these sorts appear in reports from various parts of the state.

In this context, it is considered appropriate to conduct a study to bring to light the real facts and experience that incumbents in the field of MGNREGS in Kerala do face and the make suggestions and recommendations. Hence the problem is stated as 'A study on Evaluation of the Effectiveness in the Implementation of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme as a Measure of Poverty Alleviation in Kerala State'

Significance of the study

Even though reports of some studies at the national level as well as outside the state, no in depth and comprehensive study has been carried out in Kerala, except that reports of some stray and isolated studies are coming out. Hence, it is felt imperative to bridge this yawning gap, by conducting a systematic and in depth study of a comprehensive nature.

Review of Research and Developments in the subject

The scheme has a history of only less than a decade. It started from February 2, 2006 in 200 districts, and was extended to cover another 130 districts in 2007-08 and eventually covered all the 619 rural districts in April 1, 2008.

The Indian finance literature, therefore, presents only a very few cases of evaluation of performance of the MGNREGS. Studies highlighting the performance, in a comprehensive manner, of the MGNREGS in the Kerala context seldom exist. However, reports on a few studies held at national level and outside the state of Kerala are available.

Parthibhan & Priyadharshini (MGNREGP & Rural Development & Poverty Alleviation) – conducted a case study of three village panchayats of Sivaganga district of Tamilnadu, concludes that, in spite of benefits accrued as a result of NREG programme, drawbacks are also witnessed. In their opinion, the development of villages and human resources is recorded and vulnerable sections are empowered, but certainly sustainability is debatable. They further, observe that investing a huge amount of money and increased spending every year do not mean that the programme runs effectively.

Surjith Singh, V. Joshi et. al, (Working of Employment Guarantee Scheme in Rajasthan: Some Grass – root Experiences, SAGE publications, New Delhi, 2012) found that people of Rajasthan have perceived the MGNREGA as a very important programme for rural India and more so for Rajasthan that often faces the problem

of drought, food insecurity, low irrigation and hence, of agriculture and low income and employment opportunities causing large scale migration. People have benefited directly through increased income and security of income and indirectly through enhanced rural infrastructure. Women have got avenues to earn independently and this has improved their decision making power at the household level.

Nonetheless, there are problems of implementation. They are related to measurement, wage payment, planning of projects, involvement of people, mobilization of community and training and capacity buildings of officials and representatives. The scale of implementation is bound to stress the capacity and efficiency of the local bureaucracy. The state is still not fully equipped with trained and adequate manpower to handle the MGNREGA.

Galab and Revathi (MGNREGs in Anthrapradesh: Examining the Role of State – enabled Institutions, SAGE Publications, New Delhi – 2012) found that SHGs and Social Audit have enabled the households in general to obtain additional employment. Moreover, they have increased the probability of getting 100 days of employment by the households. The SHGs were found to be more effective in enabling the households in getting more employment in highly drought prone situations. This indicates that MGNREGS has provided social protection in the vulnerable situation. Social audit is found to be more effective in enabling the households in obtaining more employment in the villages which have highly unstable irrigated area and larger proportion of female population. Further it is found to be more effective in the villages with lower per capita income and lower proportion of SC/ST population in raising the employment per household. But this institution has not enabled SC and ST households in obtaining additional employment in the villages which have larger proportion of SC & ST population. It is also found that WSAs (Wage Seekers Association) have not contributed in obtaining additional employment in general and also to the SC/ST households.

Ghuman and Dua (Employment Guarantee Scheme in Panjab. A case study of Hoshiarpur District, SAGE Publication, Delhi) examines working of the guaranteed employment scheme in the state of Panjab that has been the bedrock of green

revolution and is one of the most prosperous states of India. They observe that the ideal target of the MGNREGS is the state with high incidence of rural BPL population, low productivity of agriculture and lack of non – agricultural activities, low level of irrigation and high incidence of outmigration of rural population in search of wage employment. The Panjab with very low rural BPL population, highly intensive agriculture, vertical integration of agriculture and non-agriculture sectors, very high proportion of irrigated areas and net importer of agricultural labourers, is not a suitable candidate for the scheme (at least in its present form) that provide wage employment to rural population at the prescribed minimum wages in the rural areas.

There is a fundamental constraint in providing employment under the types of work permitted under the MGNREGS in the state (in many states). There is saturation of irrigated area and little scope to undertake work of water conservation and harvesting. Most of the villages are connected with all-weather pucca roads. Even the scope for land development is limited.

Nonetheless, there is a demand for guaranteed wage employment in the state and the demand is increasing, although unlike some other states, the demand varies sharply across the districts. Moreover, the demand for such employment is largely concentrated in the SC and BPL population. The record of job creation, however, under the MGNREGS is rather poor in the state.

“Nevertheless, the rural employment guarantee scheme has a potential to provide livelihood security to the poorest of the poor in rural areas, provided it is made commensurate with the local needs and ground realities of the state and above all the scheme is properly implemented.”

Haque .T (MGNREGS and its Effects on Agriculture. Exploring Linkages – Sage Publication 2013) attempts to analyze the nature and extent of the effects of MGNREGS on agriculture, including, irrigation, water management, cropping, pattern, crop productivity and cost of production due to MGNREGS – propelled rise in agricultural wages and labour shortage, if any.

In quite a few places covered by the field study, it was observed that farmers have improved their irrigated area and changed the cropping pattern for realizing higher productivity and incomes in areas treated through MGNREGS works. But in most cases, productivity – enhancing efforts are missing. The study also brings out that the wage rates of the agricultural labourers have substantially increased in recent years, under the impact of the MGNREGS. Also, there is scarcity of labour in the peak seasons in some places. These two factors are reportedly affecting agricultural productivity adversely in some developed pockets of the country. It has also been noticed that there is hardly any planned efforts to ensure productive utilization of whatever assets have been created. This is partly because of lack of adequate co-ordinations and convergence with other programmes and works. Apart from that the absence of adequate socio-economic infrastructure such as roads, electricity, education, training etc, the potentials of assets created under MGNREGS remain either unused or underutilized.

Reddy Narasimha D. (MGNREGS and Indian Agriculture. Opportunities and challenges) who examines the impact of MGNREGS on Indian agricultural sector states that the impact is clear in labour market. Agricultural wages have increased across the country and the rate of increase in the female agricultural wages has been much higher than male wages and female differentials in agricultural wages have declined substantially. The tightening labour market has offered better bargaining power to agricultural labour, better treatment at the place of work and ability to negotiate the duration of the working day. One of the salutary effects of MGNREGS on poor rural households is the drastic reduction in distress migration.

Pankaj Ashok K. & Tankha Rukmini (Empowerment Effects of the MGNREGS on Women Workers – Economic & Political Weekly, July 24, 2010) comments that empowerment of rural women has emerged as an unintended consequence of MGNREGS. Women have benefitted more as workers than as a community. Women as individuals have gained because of their ability to earn independently. Independent and monetized earning have increased consumption choices and reduced economic dependence. This has helped women in registering their tangible

contribution to the house – hold's income. The overall effects of the above have translated as increased say of women in house-hold affairs.

Objectives of the study

The overall objective of the study is to gauge the performance of the state government in the matter of implementing this programme in the state of Kerala over the past years. The study aims to bring out the effectiveness as well as lacunae and snag, if any, in its implementation and throw some light on the various aspects of the wide spectrum in MGNREGS, and aims to put forth suggestions and recommendations for its effective implementation.

To put in more specific terms, the objectives of the study are:

1. to ascertain whether the MGNREGS is successful in enhancing livelihood security of households in rural areas.
2. to ascertain whether the scheme is successful in creating durable assets and strengthening the livelihood resource–base of the rural poor.
3. to examine whether the works by the schemes address the causes of chronic poverty, like drought, deforestation and soil erosion.
4. to examine whether the process of employment generation is on a sustainable basis.
5. to check whether the scheme is able to improve the purchasing power of the rural people below poverty line.
6. to ascertain whether the introduction of scheme has led to the shifting of the economic basis of the rural poor.
7. to examine whether in the execution of the scheme, priority as envisaged in the Act is given to the rural women (33% is set apart for women).
8. to examine whether the implementing authority is properly adhering to the various provisions of the Act for its proper execution

- a. whether shelf of projects are prepared.
- b. Proper redressal mechanism introduced etc.

Various studies at national level reveal that regional differences in poverty reduction are quite substantial between different states. The wide disparity in the number and percentage of populations below the poverty line by states are brought to light in those studies. In the light of the above, in this study, inter alia, it is also examined whether regional differences and disparities exist in the matter of various aspects of implementation of MGNREGS and its effectiveness in the state of Kerala.

Hypothesis

Pertaining to the differences observed between regions in respect of each variable analysed with the help of the Tables in Analyses section, a Hypothesis is formulated, it is tested and the result is presented in the respective Table itself. The general Hypothesis laid down is 'Ho: There is no significant difference between regions as regards the different variables examined under this study'. It has also been examined whether the opinions, the respondents expressed as regards the various aspects of the implementation of the scheme, are homogeneous between regions. The general Hypothesis laid down in this connection is 'Ho: Opinions of respondents as regards various implementation aspects are homogeneous between regions'. These hypotheses also have been tested and the results presented in the respective Tables.

Methodology

Both primary and secondary data are used for the purpose of the study. Primary data are collected by means of sample survey. For this purpose, multi-stage sampling technique is applied. The entire state of Kerala is divided into three regions – North, Central and South; comprising 5 districts each in North and Central regions and 4 districts in South region. One district each from these regions is selected and from each district so selected, two panchayats are selected at random. Thereafter, from each panchayat, a sample of 50 respondents is selected. (Kozhikode, Kottayam and Quilon are the districts selected in the first stage. As the

second stage, the panchayats are selected. Maruthonkara and Kavilumpara are the panchayats from Kozhikode; Vellavoor and Panachickad from Kottayam; and Perinad and Thrikkadavoor from Quilon district)

Collection of data and Tools of Analysis

From these respondents, data are collected using structured interview schedules. 50 samples from each panchayat, and thus, a total of 300 samples are collected for the purpose of study. Various tools are used for both presentation and analysis of the data. For presentation, tools like tables are used. For analysis, various statistical tools have been used. The important tools used are—ratios, percentages, Likerts Scaling Technique, chi-squares, and computer software like MS-Excel. An online programme—the interactive statistical pages project, (statpages.org) is used for testing Hypotheses. Analysis is made region-wise as well as in aggregate for the state as a whole. The significance of the differences observed has been statistically tested for their validity, using chi-square test of independence and test for homogeneity.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 of this project presents the introductory part, objectives, importance, methodology, tools of analysis, limitations of the study. Chapter II deals with the theoretical aspects which describes in brief, the concept of poverty, the global and Indian scenario. India's experiments with various poverty eradication and employment programmes and then the changing thrust of its anti-poverty programmes. It also explains MGNREGS as a new approach to employment programme and describes its main objectives and features to understand its distinct character and nature. Chapter III, analyses and examines the working of MGNREGS and evaluates its performance with respect to its major objectives, with the help of primary data collected with the help of Interview Schedule through sample survey and examines the poverty alleviation role of employment guarantee scheme. Chapter IV presents the summary of findings and conclusion.

Limitations of the Study

A study of this nature, of course, faces limitations and entails constraints and snags. Physical constraints, to a great extent, have compelled the researcher to reduce the size of the research canvas. So too has been the question of time constraints. The impending deadline has compelled the researcher to rush through many stages of the research. The hesitation of the respondents to divulge factual information regarding some of their personal state of affairs has affected the reliability of the data in some respects. In spite of all these constraints, the researcher feels that modest but sincere and serious attempt has been made in this study to make it meaningful one.

CHAPTER – 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK-AN OVERVIEW

Poverty – The Concept and Perspectives

The concept of poverty is better felt than can be described. People's perception of poverty varies from place to place and even among people in the same locality. It is agreeable, however, that 'a person is said to be poor if, in monetary terms, income or expenditure falls below a level accepted as the minimum to assure a minimum decent standard of living (UNDP – 1999:15) Poverty may result from a lack of human, physical and financial capital needed to sustain livelihoods and from inequities in access to control and benefit from reasons, be they political, social or economic. Thus, the poor can be characterized as living in material deprivation, physical weakness, isolation, vulnerable and power lessness.

In the development literature, various terms have been used to describe poverty as it affects people. Three perspectives on poverty are income, basic needs and capability.

- ★ ***Income perspective:*** A person is poor if, and only if, available income is below the defined poverty line. Many countries have adopted income poverty lines to monitor progress in reducing poverty incidence.
- ★ ***Basic Needs Perspective:*** Poverty is deprivation of material requirements for minimally acceptable fulfillment of human needs, including food. This concept of deprivation goes well beyond the lack of private income: it includes the need for basic health and education and essential services that have to be provided by the community to prevent people from falling into poverty. It also recognizes the need for employment and participation; and
- ★ ***Capability Perspective:*** Poverty represents the absence of some basic capabilities to function—a person lacking the opportunity to achieve some minimally acceptable levels of these functioning. The functioning relevant to

this analysis can vary from such physical ones as being well nourished, being adequately clothed and sheltered and avoiding preventable morbidity, to more complex social achievements such as partaking in life of the community. [UNDP 1999:16]

In the contemporary era, the poor have been identified to include (1) people living with HIV/AIDS and AIDS Orphans (ii) Street children and beggars, (iii) the landless, (iv) pastoralists in drought prone districts o environmentally fragile agricultural lands, (v) the physically challenged or handicapped, (vi) female headed households, (vii) households headed by people without formal education, and (viii) unskilled and semi – skilled casual labourers. [Kariuku & Kingoo – 1998]

Dynamics of Poverty – Global Scenario

Poverty has dominated development thinking since the early 1970s. The incidence of poverty in the less developed countries defined in absolute terms has a powerful appeal for dramatizing the need for policy action in both domestic and international spheres. About one- third of the world's over six billion people are afflicted by poverty, out of which 300 million live in the Sub-Saharan Africa. India accounts for around 220 to 230 million, according to NSSO. Of all the world wide scourges, which retard human development, poverty is the most wide spread. It denies individuals their most basic rights and denies humanity the benefit of their talents [UNDP – 2003].

According to World Bank estimates (2000) 1.2 billion people lived in absolute poverty towards the close of this millennium (1998) depending on an income of less than US \$1 per day. An additional 1.6 billion live on less than \$2 per day. The number of people in the former category has remained constant in the last decade too, while there are now an additional 250 million living on less than \$2 per day. Around two– thirds of the world's poor live in the rural areas of the developing world and in sub-Saharan Africa, they constitute as much as 50 to 90% of the population (World Bank 2000).

The above stated facts bring out a broad outline of the global picture, in which the share of India is not insignificant. It is fully realizing the gravity of the problem and duly taking cognizance of the need for alleviating this chronic issue that world leaders adopted the UN's declaration as the Millennium Development Goal.

Millennium Development Goal

In pursuance to the millennium summit in September 2000, the world leaders adopted the United Nation's Millennium Declaration, committing their nations to a new global partnership to reduce extreme poverty and setting out a series of targets with a deadline of 2015 known as Millennium Development Goal (MDG) 'to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger', which lays down the following targets:

1. Halve the proportion of people whose income is less than one dollar a day between 1990 and 2015.
2. Achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all, including women and young people.
3. Halve the proportion of people who suffer from hunger, between 1990 and 2015.

The MDG have set a uniform reference poverty line at consumption levels of \$1 based on 1993 purchasing power parity per day for different countries.

Indian Scenario

Several attempts have been made in India to estimate the incidence of poverty and trends thereof. The estimates are, however, not comparable because of differences in the methodologies used to define the poverty lines, size of samples taken and other parameters employed in the studies. However, by and large, it can be said that proportion of India's population living below the poverty line has fluctuated widely over time and across states in the past.

Poverty and unemployment have been the bane of India since long. Their reduction has been one of the major goals of India's development planning since the beginning of planning era in 1951-52 and the planning process has been sensitive to the needs of the poor.

Despite over six decades of planned development in India, a large section of the population continues to live in abject poverty. In spite of India's record of rapid economic growth and poverty reduction over recent decades, rising inequality in the country has been a subject of concern among policy makers, academics and activists alike.

It is paradoxical that the benefits of economic growth have not percolated to the poorer sections of the society in spite of the high growth rate attained by the Indian economy in the recent years. Although, it is true that there has been some reduction in the proportion of the poor over time, their aggregate number has risen. There are also sharp regional disparities.

The fundamental objectives of planning such as reductions in poverty, unemployment and regional disparity, instead of being mitigated, have been accentuated over the periods. The poorer sections have been deprived of growth which demonstrates that equity aspect have been undermined at the cost of economic growth. It has been found that poverty alleviation programmes in India are confined to a set of targeted intervention and couldn't substantially affect poverty. Growth has not penetrated so as to ameliorate the socio-economic conditions of the poor agricultural labourers, wage earners, and other depressed sections of the society. The incidence of poverty is more concentrated among these groups.

The Eleventh five year plan aptly emphasized on inclusive growth oriented policies combined with policies ensuring broad based per capita income growth benefitting all sections of the society. An off-shoot and direct outcome of this long range policy development is the enactment of NREGA in 2005.

However, in spite of all these planned developmental activities, over the years, in India, 220-230 million of people, i.e. around 22% of the total population are poor,

according to the, National sample survey. That makes India, the world's largest proportion of the poor, even if, the percentage of people living below the poverty line reduced from 36% in 1994 to 22 percent in 2009-10. (Viswanathan V. N., Poverty Alleviations and Rural Development, Abhijeet Publication, New Delhi, 2012, PP.2)

There are other dismal statistics about poverty in this fourth largest economy in the world: 126th Rank out of 177 in the World Human Development Index and the rate of child malnutrition double that of Sub-Saharan Africa, is one such situation. Apart from this a recent World Bank paper (World Bank – 2008) estimates that 45.6 crore people (around 42% of the total population) are living below poverty line in India, if the new international poverty line of \$1.25 per day is taken as the standard. It states, if \$2 per day level is considered, then about 75.6% population of India would fall below the poverty line. (Jha Chandra S., Poverty, Unemployment & NRLM, Abhijeet Publications, New Delhi, 2013)

The projected population and rural BPL population in India for the period 2008 – 2015 are given in the following table.

Table 2.1

Projected Rural BPL Population by 2015

Year	Total Population (n)	Rural Population (Cr)	Rural BPL	Rural HH
2008-09	114.75	80.45	20.92	4.23
2009-10	116.25	81.13	20.50	4.12
2010-11	117.76	81.81	20.09	4.02
2011-12	119.27	82.49	19.69	3.94
2012-13	120.78	83.17	19.29	3.86
2013-14	122.29	83.85	18.91	3.78
2014-15	125.31	84.53	18.53	3.71

Assumption: 1. Annual population growth rate : 1.3%

2. Annual decline in ratio of rural poverty – 2% : [2008 – 15]

Source: Jha Chandra S, Poverty etc. 2013

It is evident from the figures that in 2015, there will be about 18.53 crore BPL population in rural areas constituting 22% of the total rural population.

The painful paradox of such poverty in the midst of consistently high rates of economic growth over past few years and the sustained development effort pursued through economic planning since 1950 is the measure of the pathos in the Indian story.

Causes of Poverty in India:

- High level of dependent and primitive methods of agriculture.
- High population growth rate.
- High illiteracy (about 35% of the adult population)
- Regional inequalities.
- Protectionist policies pursued till 1991 that prevented high foreign investment. (ibid)

Poverty: Magnitude and Trends after Independence

As has been stated earlier, the proportion of India's population living below the poverty line has fluctuated widely over time and across states in the past, but the overall trend, however, has been downward. The incidence of poverty and trends therein can be examined under the following three phases (Muthalagu 2007:4, Poverty Eradication in India under Anti Poverty Programmes: Kurukhetra – 2007, 56(2))

Phase I: 1950 to the Mid-1970s.

Incidence of poverty shows no discernible trend in this phase. In 1951, 47% of India's rural population was below the poverty line. The proportion went up to

64% in 1954-55, came down to 45% in 1966-61 but in 1977-78, it went up again to 51 percent.

Phase II: Mid-1970s to 1990.

Poverty declined significantly between mid-1970s and the end of the 1980s. The decline was more pronounced between 1971-78 and 1986-87, with rural poverty declining from 51 percent to 39%. It went down further to 34% by 1989-90. Urban poverty went down from 41% in 1971-78 to 34% in 1986-87 and further to 33% in 1989-90.

Phase III: Post 1991 Era

This post-economic reform period evidenced both progress and setbacks. Rural poverty increased from 34% in 1989-90 to 43% in 1992 and then fell to 37% in 1993-94. Urban poverty went up from 34.4% in 1989-90 to 33.7% in 1992 and declined to 31% in 1993-94. Some estimates of poverty ratio and the extent of decline in the poverty ratio are presented in the following table.

Table 2.2

Estimates of Poverty and Trends in Poverty

Year	NSSO round	Poverty ratio (%)	Reduction in Poverty (%) (over the previous 5 yrs)
1977-1978	32	51.30	-
1983-1984	38	45.65	11.01
1987-1988	43	39.09	14.37
1993-1994	50	37.27	4.66
1999-2000	55	26.09	30.00
2004-2005	61	22.5	15.10

Source: Muthalagu – 2007

As shown in the table, the poverty ratio in India was 51.3% in 1977-78 and it declined to 22.5% in 2004-05 with a 56.82% reduction over a period of nearly 30 years.

The regional differences in poverty reduction are quite substantial. The decline in state's incidence of poverty ranged between 12-50 percentage points in rural areas during 1973-2000 and 20-40 percentage points in urban areas. The wide disparity in the number and percentage of populations below the poverty line by states can be observed from Table below: 2. 3

Table2.3

**Number and Percentage of Population below the Poverty Line by States,
2004-05**

Sl. No.	States/UTs	Rural		Urban		Combine	
		Percentage of persons	No. of persons (Lakhs)	Percentage of persons	No. of persons (Lakhs)	Percentage of persons	No. of persons (Lakhs)
1	Andhra Pradesh	11.2	64.70	28.0	61.40	15.8	126.10
2	Arunachal Pradesh	22.3	1.94	3.3	0.09	17.6	2.03
3	Assam	22.3	54.50	3.3	1.28	19.7	55.77
4	Bihar	42.1	336.72	34.6	32.42	41.4	396.15
5	Chhattisgarh	40.8	71.50	41.2	19.47	40.9	90.96
6	Delhi	6.9	0.63	15.2	22.30	14.7	22.93
7	Goa	5.4	0.36	21.3	1.64	13.0	2.01
8	Gujarat	19.1	63.49	13.0	27.19	16.8	9.69
9	Haryana	13.6	21.49	15.1	10.60	14.0	32.10
10	Himachal Pradesh	10.7	6.14	3.4	0.22	10.0	6.36
11	Jammu & Kashmir	4.6	3.66	7.9	2.19	5.4	5.85

12	Jharkhand	46.3	103.19	20.2	13.20	40.3	116.39
13	Karnataka	20.8	75.05	32.6	63.83	25.0	138.89
14	Kerala	13.2	32.43	20.2	17.17	15.0	49.60
15	Madhya Pradesh	36.9	175.65	42.1	74.03	38.3	249.68
16	Maharashtra	29.6	171.13	32.2	146.25	30.7	317.38
17	Manipur	22.3	3.76	3.3	0.20	17.3	3.95
18	Meghalaya	22.3	4.36	3.3	0.16	18.5	4.52
19	Mizoram	22.3	1.02	3.3	0.16	12.6	1.15
20	Nagaland	22.3	3.87	3.3	0.12	19.0	3.99
21	Orissa	46.8	151.75	44.3	26.74	46.4	178.49
22	Punjab	9.1	15.12	7.1	6.50	8.4	21.63
23	Rajasthan	18.7	87.38	32.9	47.51	22.1	134.39
24	Sikkim	22.3	1.12	3.3	0.02	20.1	1.34
25	Tamil Nadu	22.8	76.50	22.2	69.13	22.5	145.62
26	Tripura	22.3	6.18	3.3	0.20	18.9	6.36
27	Uttar Pradesh	33.4	473.00	30.6	117.03	32.8	596.
28	Uttarakhand	40.8	27.11	36.5	8.85	39.6	35.
29	West Bengal	28.6	173.22	14.8	35.14	24.7	206.
30	A & n Islands	22.9	0.60	22.2	0.32	22.6	0.92
31	chandigarh	7.1	0.08	7.1	0.67	7.1	0.74
32	Dadra & N. Haveli	39.8	0.68	19.1	0.15	33.2	0.84
33	Daman & Diu	5.4	0.07	21.2	0.14	10.5	0.21
34	Lakshadweep	1.3	0.06	20.2	0.06	16.0	0.11
35	Pondicherry	22.9	0.78	22.2	1.59	22.4	2.37
	All - India	28.3	2,209.2 4	25.7	807.96	27.5	3,017.2 0

Source: Kurukshetra (2007: 45)

Poverty in India : Its Magnitude and Trends in the Recent Past

The Planning Commission is the nodal agency in the Govt. of India for estimation of poverty at national and state levels. The poverty line used is per capita consumption expenditure level which meets the per capita daily calorie requirement of 2400 kcal in rural areas and 2100 kcal in urban areas along with a minimum of non-food expenditure. The monetary equivalent of these norms i.e., poverty line for the year 1973-74 was estimated as consumer expenditure of Rs. 49.09 and Rs. 56.64 per capita per month in rural and urban areas respectively. The national level rural and urban poverty lines were updated for subsequent years using state-specific Consumer Price Index of Agricultural Labourers (CPIAL) for rural poverty line and Consumer Price Index of Industrial Workers (CPIIW) for urban poverty line.

The estimates of poverty are made using the large sample survey data on household consumer expenditure conducted by the National Sample Survey Organization (NSSO) of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. The State-specific poverty ratio are worked out from state-specific poverty lines and distribution of persons by expenditure groups obtained from the NSS data on consumer expenditure. The poverty ratio at all-India level is obtained as the weighted average of the state wise poverty ratios.

The national poverty line at 2004-05 prices is Rs. 356.30 per capita per month (Rs. 21378 or around Rs. 22000/- per household per annum) in rural areas and Rs. 538.60 per capita per month (on Rs. 32316 per HH, p.a) in the urban areas. These figures constitute the current statistics on poverty line. Table 2 presents poverty reduction from 1973-74 to 2004-05 (till the eve of the enactment of MGNREGA).

Table 2.4**Estimates of Poverty from 1973 to 2004 - 05**

Years	Percentage people below poverty line			No. of persons below poverty line (crores)		
	Rural	Urban	Combined	Rural	Urban	Combined
1973	56.44	49.01	54.88	26.13	6.00	32.13
1983	45.65	40.79	44.48	25.20	7.09	32.29
1993	37.27	32.36	35.97	24.40	7.63	32.04
2004	28.30	25.70	27.50	22.09	8.08	30.17

Source: Planning Commission (Poverty, Unemployment NRLM, Jha.S Chandra. Abhijeet Publication Delhi - 2012)

Table 2.4 shows that poverty in rural areas in percentage forms, has declined to half from 56.4% in 1973 - 74 to 28.3% in 2004 - 05, however, in absolute terms the reduction is not very significant. The population living below the poverty line in the rural areas is still unacceptably high at over 22 crore, and the urban combined figure is over 30 crore.

Table 2.5 provides information on geographical profile and concentration of rural poor. The rural poor in India are highly concentrated in select states of the Country, viz., U. P., Uttarakhand, Bihar, Jharkhand, M. P., Chattisgarh, West Bengal, Maharashtra and Orissa. The poor from these 9 states together account for nearly 76.2% of the total rural poor in India is 2004 - 05.

Table - 2.5**Geographical Concentration of Rural Poor in select states (lakhs)**

Sl. No.	Name of States	1973-74	1983-84	1993-94	2004-05
1	UP & Uttarakhand	449.99 (17.2)	448.03 (17.7)	496.17 (20.3)	500.11 (22.6)
2	Bihar & Jharkhand	336.52 (12.9)	417.70 (16.5)	450.86 (18.4)	439.91 (19.9)
3	MP & Chattisgarh	231.21 (8.8)	215.48 (8.6)	216.19 (8.8)	247.25 (11.2)
4	West Bengal	257.96 (9.9)	268.60 (10.6)	209.90 (8.6)	173.22 (7.8)
5	Maharashtra	210.84 (8.1)	196.75 (7.6)	193.33 (7.9)	171.13 (7.7)
6	Orissa	142.24 (5.4)	164.65 (6.5)	140.9 (5.7)	151.75 (6.7)
	Subtotal	1628.76 (62.3)	1708.21 (67.7)	1707.35 (69.9)	1683.25 (76.19)
	All - India	2612.9	2519.57	2440.31	2209.24

Source: Planning Commission (Poverty, Unemployment NRLM, Jha.S Chandra. Abhijeet Publication Delhi - 2012)

The estimates of poverty are based on caloric intake requirement. Since income to achieve the required level of caloric intake is limited, their capacity to work is low and they are caught in a vicious circle of poverty. Lack of purchasing power due to low level of income leads the BPL population into a food insecurity trap. In order to raise their level of income, there is comparative need to tackle problem of unemployment and under employment among the BPL population.

Poverty and Unemployment Alleviation Programmes

Since reduction of poverty and unemployment has been one of the major goals of India's development planning right from the beginning of the planning era in 1951-52 and the planning process has been sensitive to the needs of the poor, Govt. of India was very keen to launch various programmes from time to time aimed at alleviation of poverty and unemployment and creating adequate livelihood opportunities for the poor through provision of employment and public services. The recent body of literature high lights the multi-dimensionality of poverty and also the heterogeneity of the poor. It also highlights the need to go beyond income poverty by using indices of human development and over all welfare. Since the determinants of poverty and unemployment are interrelated, a comprehensive approach is needed to address these two problems.

Poverty alleviation schemes and programmes have been in place for a long time now. The programmes and schemes have been modified consolidated, expanded and improved over time. The targeted programmes fall into four broad categories: (a) Public Distribution System, (b) Self-employment programmes, (c) Social Welfare oriented programmes and (d) Wage- employment programmes.

The major poverty and unemployment eradication programmes launched in India from time to time and their salient features are briefly explained below:

1. Public Distribution System (PDS)

The PDS is perhaps the oldest of all the programmes that were designed to ensure food security in India, particularly, of the poor. It is perhaps the World's largest food distribution network having within its fold over 435000 fair price shops distributing commodities worth more than 15000 crore annually. The basic objective of the PDS is to ensure that essential commodities are made available to the people at reasonable price, so as to provide them a safety net against inflation.

The PDS has been an integral part of India's food policy since the World War II period, when statutory rationing was introduced in big cities such as Mumbai and Kolkata. After independence also the Govt. of India has continued to follow the system, although the nature and extent of govt. intervention has varied over time, depending on fluctuation in food grains production and price rise.

2. Self - employment Programmes:

(a) The Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP)

The IRDP is the most important programme that falls in the category of Self employment programmes. It is the single largest anti-poverty programme currently underway in all the community development blocks in the country. It was launched in 1978-79 in 2300 selected blocks in the country and was extended to all the blocks in the country with effect from 2nd October 1980. It aims at providing income generating assets and self-employment opportunities to the rural poor to enable them to rise above the poverty line once and for ever. The IRDP in effect seeks to redistribute assets and employment opportunities in favour of the rural poor and thereby reduce income inequality. It is a centrally sponsored scheme and is funded on 50:50 basis by the centre and the states. The IRDP beneficiaries are assisted through viable bankable projects which are financed partly by subsidy and partly by bank loans.

(b) Training of Rural Youth for Self - employment (TRYSEM)

A special scheme called TRYSEM was initiated in 1979 with the principal objective of removing unemployment among the rural youth. The TRYSEM is an integral part of the IRDP and is concerned with equipping rural youth in the age group of 18-35 years with the necessary skills that would enable them to be self-employed. Any rural youth below the poverty line is eligible for selection but preference in selection is given to SC/ST and woman candidates. The TRYSEM training is sharply focused on trades whose products have high potential demand and can lead to sustainable projects.

(c) *Development of Women and Children in Rural Areas (DWCRA)*

The DWCRA programme was launched in 1982 as part of the IRDP. Its aim was to empower rural women living below the poverty line by organizing them to create sustainable income generating activities through self-employment. It was the first programme of its kind that specifically focused in improving the quality of life of rural women. A unique feature of the DWCRA was that along with the improvement in income, it also focused on access to health education, safe drinking water, sanitation, nutrition and so on. Thus, it not only aimed at promoting economic development, but also facilitated social development.

(d) *Swarnjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY)*

The SGSY was operationalized in April 1999 after restructuring and combining the IRDP with allied programmes into a single self-employment programme. The basic objectives of SGSY are to bring the assisted poor families above the poverty line by providing them income -generating assets through bank credit and govt. subsidy. The approach of the SGSY is based on women's self-help groups (SHGs) that have to act as a financial intermediary and a vehicle for women's empowerment. The programme aims at establishing a large number of micro enterprises in rural areas based on the ability of the poor and the potential of each area. Assistance under the SGSY is given in the form of subsidy by Govt. and Credit by the banks. Community involvement is emphasized in the programmes, in contrast to IRDP. The scheme is being implemented on a cost-sharing basis of 75:25 between the Centre and the States. The number of SHGs has been increasing rapidly; as on December 2007, about 27.37 lakh groups had been formed since April 1999 and 93.21 lakh Swarozgaris had been assisted with a total outlay of 19340.32 crore.

3. Social Welfare – Oriented Programmes. (SWOP)

SWOPs are another set of programmes launched by the GOI for improving the lot of the rural poor. The major programmes belonging in this category include the National Social Assistance Programme (NSAP) the Aam Admi Bima Yojana (AABY) and Rashtriya Swasthya Bima Yojana (RSBY). The NSAP subsumes (a)

The National Old Age Pension Scheme (NOAPS), (b) The National Family Benefit Scheme (NFBS) and (c) The National Maternity Benefit Scheme (NMBS).

(i) National Social Assistance Programme (NSAP)

The NSAP was sponsored by the Ministry of Rural Development, GOI, with the main goal of providing social assistance to the rural poor in India. It came into effect from August 1995. The programme extends 100% Central assistance to the States and Union Territories to provide the benefits in accordance with the norms, guidelines and conditions laid down by the Central Govt. NSAP has three components, namely NOAPS, the NFBS, and the NMBS.

The NOAPS was introduced in 1995 to address the deprivation and insecurities faced by the elderly people. It provided for a pension of Rs. 150 to people above the age 65 years who have no source of income or financial support and destitute. Though the scheme had proved beneficial, over a period of time, certain gaps were noticed which needed rectification. To rectify the drawbacks of the scheme a new scheme called Indira Gandhi National Old Age Pension Scheme (IGNOAPS) was launched in November 2007. The pensioners in the new scheme would receive at least Rs. 400/ p. m. as against the earlier provisions of Rs. 150/ to be shared by the Centre and the State Governments in the 50:50 ratio and the coverage is extended to all the elderly people below the poverty line.

NFBS grants a one-time financial assistance of Rs. 10,000/- to families living below the poverty line when their main earning member dies. NMBS provides for a grant of Rs. 500 to pregnant women of families living below the poverty line.

(ii) Aam Admi Bima Yojana (AABY)

Under a new scheme called AABY launched on 2 October 2007, insurance to the head of the family of rural landless households in the country will be provided against natural death as well as accidental death and partial /

permanent disability. This cover is Rs. 75000/ on death due to accident and permanent disability due to accident, Rs. 37500/ in case partial permanent disability due to accident and Rs. 30000/ in case of death of member prior to terminal date. The premium to be charged under the scheme is Rs. 200/ p. a. permember, 50 percent of which is to be contributed by the Central govt. and remaining by the state government.

(iii) Rashtriya Swasthya Bima Yojana (RSBY)

The RSBY was formally launched on 1 October 2007. All workers in the unorganized sector who come in the category of BPL and their families will be covered under the scheme. The scheme also has a provision of smart cards to be issued to the beneficiaries to enable cashless transaction for health care. The total sum insured is Rs. 30000/- per family p. a. with GOI contributing 75% of the annual estimated premium amount of Rs. 750/- subject to a maximum of Rs. 565 per family p. a.; while the state governments are expected to contribute 25% of the annual premium as well as any additional premium. The cost of smart card would also be by Central Government.

4. Wage – Employment Generating Schemes (WEGS)

Wage–employment programmes have become important instruments for alleviating poverty and smoothening consumption during critical periods including, drought and flood situation. The Rural Works Programme (RWP) was the first major government intervention aimed at providing employment to the unemployed particularly in the lean season. It was introduced in 1971. However, due to its limited scope and various administrative and organizational deficiencies, it did not make any significant dent in the problem of unemployment.

A series of special employment programmes followed the RWP, thereafter. Major programmes of the series were as follows:

i) Crash Scheme of Rural Employment (CSRE) 1971.

The CSRE was introduced in April 1971 as a crash scheme to alleviate the prevailing conditions of unemployment and under employment in rural areas by generating additional employment through additional rural works. Apart from employment generation, the other objective of the CSRE was to generate assets of durable nature in the areas of minor irrigation, land developments, roads, afforestation, school building and other durable assets.

ii) The Food-for-work (FFW) programmes

This programme provided temporary employment with food grains as wages. Its objective was to ensure employment and food security to the rural people affected by natural disasters like droughts and floods. A new programme called the National Food-for-Work Programmes (NFFWP) was launched in 150 most back ward districts in November 2004. It was a 100 percent centrally sponsored scheme.

iii) Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY)

The JRY was launched in April 1989, after merging the then ongoing two wage employment programmes, that is, National Rural Employment Programme (NREP) and Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (RLEGP). The main objective of JRY was to provide additional gainful wage-employment to unemployed and under employed persons in the rural areas in the lean agricultural seasons. The JRY was targeted at people living below poverty line. The expenditure under the programme was shared between the centre and the states in the ratio of 80:20.

The JRY contributed to the creation of durable assets in the form of school buildings, roads, and other infrastructure. It was, however, felt that a stage had come when the development of village infrastructure had to be taken up in a planned manner. Keeping this in view, the JRY was restructured in 1999 and renamed as the Jawahar Grama Samridhi Yojana (JGSY).

iv) Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS)

The EAS was launched on 2 October 1993. It guaranteed 100 days of employment per annum to rural poor, particularly during lean seasons. The use of food grains for payment in kind is minimal in the EAS and its regulation prohibits the engagement of contractors and middlemen. However, this provision was widely floated, and had been accompanied by falsification of attendance lists and other irregularities, which ultimately led to its discontinuance sooner.

v) Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY)

SGRY was launched in 2001, combining the various features of EAS, FFW and JGSY, to replace those schemes. The main aim of SGRY remains the same as of previous employment programmes, which is, providing wage employment in rural areas and creation of economic assets. Under the scheme, wages are paid in both cash and food grains.

vi) National Food-for- Work Programme (NFFWP) 2004-05

Duly taking cognizance of the need for alleviating the chronic problems of rural poverty and unemployment and reducing the inter-regional disparities in economic growth and development in India, the planning commission designed and launched in 2004-05, a new programme called NFFWP. It identified 150 most backward districts in India on the basis of incidence of poverty as indicated by the proportion of SC/ST population, agricultural production per worker and agricultural wage rate. Most districts identified are tribal dominated areas. It is a 100 percent centrally sponsored scheme.

vii) National Rural Employment Guarantee (NREG) Scheme.

Consequent up on the passing of the Rural Employment Guarantee Act on 7 September 2005, the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS) was launched on 2 February 2006 in 200 backward districts with a view to extend it to all the districts within 5 years. The schemes subsume both SGRY and FFW in the districts covered by the NREG scheme. It aims at

enhancing the livelihood security of the people in rural areas by guaranteeing 100 days of wage employment in a financial year, to a rural household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work. For the first time in India, it recognizes the right to work as a fundamental legal right.

Besides the most backward districts that were notified under the NREG Act on 2 February 2006, 130 additional districts were notified in the financial year 2006-07. The remaining 266 districts had been notified on 28 September 2007, where the scheme had come into effect from 1 April 2008. The coverage was extended to all rural districts of the country in 2008-09. Currently 619 districts have been covered under the NREGA. The Act was renamed as Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) on 2 October 2009.

MGNREGA – Encapsulated:

The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005, later renamed as Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, is an Act to provide for the enhancement of livelihood security of the households in rural areas in the country by providing at least one hundred days of guaranteed wage employment in every financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

The Act consists of 34 sections passing through 6 chapters, and 2 schedules. Chapter 1 deals with short title, extent and commencement; chapter 2 deals with Guarantee of Employment in Rural areas; chapter 3 deals with Employment Guarantee Schemes and Unemployment Allowance; chapter 4 handles with implementing and Monitoring Authorities; chapter 5 deals with Establishment of National and State Employment Guarantee Funds and Audit; chapter 6 deals with Miscellaneous provisions.

Schedule one highlights the features of the Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme and schedule two, lists out the conditions of the scheme and the minimum entitlement of the labourers.

Important Features (Schedule I & II)

MINIMUM FEATURES OF A RURAL EMPLOYMENT GUARANTEE SCHEME

1. The focus of the scheme shall be on the following works in their order of priority:-
 - i. Water conservation and water harvesting;
 - ii. Drought proofing (including afforestation and tree plantation);
 - iii. Irrigation canals including micro and minor irrigation works;
 - iv. Provision of irrigation facility to land owned by households belonging to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes or to land of beneficiaries of land reforms or that of the beneficiaries under the Indira Awas Yojana of the Government of India;
 - v. Renovation of traditional water bodies including desilting of tanks;
 - vi. Land development;
 - vii. Flood control and protection works including drainage in water logged areas;
 - viii. Rural connectivity to provide all-weather access; and
 - ix. Any other work which may be notified by the Central Government in consultation with the State Government.
2. Creation of durable assets and strengthening the livelihood resource base of the rural poor shall be an important objective of the Scheme.
3. The works taken up under the scheme shall be in rural areas.
4. The State Council shall prepare a list of preferred works for different areas based on their ability to create durable assets.
5. The Scheme shall be subject to appropriate arrangements as may be laid down by the State Government under the rules issued by it for proper maintenance of the public assets created under the Scheme.

6. Under no circumstances shall the labourers be paid less than the wage rate.
7. When wages are directly linked with the quantity of work, the wages shall be paid according to the schedule of rates fixed by the State Government for different types of work every year, in consultation with the State Council.
8. The schedule of rates of wages for unskilled labourers shall be so fixed that a person working for seven hours would normally earn a wage equal to the wage rate.
9. The cost of material component of projects including the wages of the skilled and semi-skilled workers taken up under the Scheme shall not exceed forty per cent of the total project costs.
10. It shall be open to the Programme Officer and Gram Panchayat to direct any person who applied for employment under the Scheme to do work of any type permissible under it.
11. The Scheme shall not permit engaging any contractor for implementation of the projects under it.
12. As far as practicable, a task funded under the Scheme shall be performed by using manual labour and not machines.
13. Every scheme shall contain adequate provisions for ensuring transparency and accountability at all level of implementation.
14. Provisions for regular inspection and supervision of works taken up under the Scheme shall be made to ensure proper quality of work as well as to ensure that the total wages paid for the completion of the work is commensurate with the quality and quantity of work done.
15. The District Programme Coordinator, the Programme Officer and the Gram Panchayat implementing the Scheme shall prepare annually a report containing the facts and figures and achievements relating to the implementation of the Scheme within his or its jurisdiction and a copy of the

same shall be made available to the public on demand and on payment of such fee as may be specified in the Scheme.

16. All accounts and records relating to the Scheme shall be made available for public scrutiny and any person desirous of obtaining a copy or relevant extracts there from may be provided such copies or extracts on demand and after paying such fee as may be specified in the Scheme.
17. A copy of the muster rolls of each Scheme or project under a Scheme shall be made available in the offices of the Gram Panchayat and the Programme Office for inspection by any person interested after paying such fee as may be specified in the Scheme.

Conditions for Guaranteed Rural Employment under a scheme and minimum entitlements of labourers.

1. The adult members of every household who-
 - (i) Reside in any rural areas; and
 - (ii) Are willing to do unskilled manual work,
 May submit their names, age and the address of the household to the Gram Panchayat at the village level in the jurisdiction of which they reside for registration of their household for issuance of a job card.
2. It shall be the duty of the Gram Panchayat to register the household, after making such enquiry as it deems fit and issue a job card containing such details of adult members of the household affixing their photographs, as may be specified by the State Government in the scheme.
3. The registration made shall be for such period as may be laid in the Scheme, but in any case not less than five years, and may be renewed from time to time.
4. Every adult member of a registered household whose name appears in the job card shall be entitled to apply for unskilled manual work under the Scheme.

5. All registered persons belonging to a household shall be entitled to employment in accordance with the Scheme made under the provisions of this Act, for as many days as each applicant may request, subject to a maximum of one hundred days per household in a given financial year.
6. The Programme Officer shall ensure that every applicant shall be provided unskilled manual work in accordance with the provisions of the Scheme within fifteen days of receipt of an application or from the date he seeks work in case of advance application, whichever is later:

Provide that priority shall be given to women in such a way that at least one-third of the beneficiaries shall be women who have registered and requested for work under this Act.
7. Applications for work must be for at least fourteen days of continuous work.
8. There shall be no limit on the number of days of employment for which a person may apply, or on the number of days of employment actually provided to him subject to the aggregate entitlement of the household.
9. Applications for work may be submitted in writing either to the Gram Panchayat or to the Programme Officer, as may be specified in the Scheme.
10. The Gram Panchayat and Programme Officer, as the case may be, shall be bound to accept valid applications and to issue a dated receipt to, the applicant. Group applications may also be submitted.
11. Applicants who are provided with work shall be so intimated in writing, by means of a letter sent to him at the address given in the job card and by a public notice displayed at the office of the Panchayats at the district, intermediate or village level.
12. As far as possible, employment shall be provided within a radius of five kilometers of the village where the applicant resides at the time of applying.
13. A new work under the Scheme shall be commenced only if-
 - (a) At least fifty labourers become available for such work; and

- (b) The labourers cannot be absorbed in the ongoing works;
Provided that this condition shall not be applicable for new works, as determined by the State Government, in hilly areas and in respect of afforestation.
14. In cases the employment is provided outside such radius, it must be provided within the Block, and the labourers shall be paid ten per cent of the wage rate as extra wages to meet additional transportation and living expenses.
 15. A period of employment shall ordinarily be at least fourteen days continuously with not more than six days in a week.
 16. In all cases where unemployment allowance is paid, or due to be paid, the Programme Officer shall inform the District Programme Coordinator in writing the reasons why it was not possible for him to provide employment or cause to provide employment to the applicants.
 17. The District Programme Coordinator shall, in his Annual Report to the State Council, explain as to why employment could not be provided in cases where payment of unemployment allowance is involved.
 18. Provision shall be made in the Scheme for advance applications, that is, applications which may be submitted in advance of the date from which employment is sought.
 19. Provision shall be made in the Scheme for submission of multiple applications by the same person provided that the corresponding periods for which employment is sought do not overlap.
 20. The Gram Panchayat shall prepare and maintain or cause to be prepared and maintained such registers, vouchers and other documents in such form and in such manner as may be specified in the Scheme containing particulars of job cards and passbooks issued, name, age and address of the head of the household
 21. The Gram Panchayat shall send such list or lists of the names and addresses of households and their adult members registered with it and supply such other

information to the concerned Programme Officer at such form as may be specified in the Scheme.

22. A list of persons who are provided with the work shall be displayed on the notice board of the Gram Panchayat and at the office of the Programme Officer and at such other places as the Programme Officer may deem necessary and the list shall be open for inspection by the State Government and any person interested.
23. If the Gram Panchayat is satisfied at any time that a person has registered with it by furnishing false information, it may direct the Programme Office to direct his name to be struck off from the register and direct he applicant to return the job card Provided that no such action under this paragraph shall be directed unless the applicant has been given an opportunity of being heard in the presence of two independent persons.
24. If any personal injury is caused to any person employed under the Scheme by accident arising out of and in the course of his employment, he shall be entitled to, free of charge, such medical treatment as is admissible under the Scheme.
25. Where hospitalization of the injured worker is necessary, the State Government shall arrange for such hospitalization including accommodation, treatment, medicines and payment of daily allowance not less than half of the wage rate required to be paid had the injured been engaged in the work.
26. If a person employed under a Scheme dies or becomes permanently disabled by accident arising out of an injury in the course of employment, he shall be paid by the implementing agency an *ex gratia* payment at the rate of twenty-five thousand rupees or such amount as may be notified by the Central Government, and the amount shall be paid to the legal heirs of the deceased or the disabled, as the case may be.
27. The facilities of safe drinking water, shade for children and periods of rest, first-aid box with adequate material for emergency treatment etc.

28. In case the numbers of children below the age of six years accompanying the women working at any site are five or more, provisions shall be made to depute one of such women worker to look after such children.
29. The person deputed under paragraph 28 shall be paid wage rate.
30. In case the payment of wages is not made within the period specified under the Scheme, the labourers shall be entitled to receive payment of compensation .
31. The wages under a Scheme may be paid either wholly in cash or in cash and kind provided that at least one-fourth of the wages shall be paid in cash only.
32. The State Government may prescribe that a portion of the wages in cash may be paid to the labourers on a daily basis during the period of employment.
33. If any personal injury is caused by accident to a child accompanying any person who is employed under a Scheme, such person shall be entitled to, free of charge, such medical treatment for the child as may be specified in the Scheme and in case of death or disablement, through an *ex gratia* payment as may be determined by the State Government.
34. In case of every employment under the Scheme, there shall be no discrimination solely on the ground of gender and the provisions of the Equal Remuneration Act, 1976 (25 of 1976), shall be complied with.

TABLE 2.6 BUDGET ALLOCATION OF MGNREGA

Years	Amount	Growth
2007-08	12000	-
2008-09	16000	33% (over the P. Y.)
2009-10	39100	144% (over the P. Y.)
2010-11	40100	28.13%
2011-12	40000	-.25%
2012-13	33000	-17.5%

NREG Bulletin & Budget paper.

TABLE 2.7**STATUS OF MGNREGS – KERALA**

	2010-11	2011-12	% increase
No. of families demanded job	1195096	1418062	18%
Families received job	1185172	1416441	19.59%
No. of Employment days created	49322652	63309610	28.36%
Women's participation	90.26%	92.92%	2.9%
No. of families received 100 days	72395	124821	72.46%
Average employment days	41	45	9.7 5%
Total wages paid	63010.72	97166.69	54%
Administrative experience	3219.37	3949.68	Reduced from 4.59 to 3.77%
Total experience	70162.19	106507.49	52%

Source :Information& Public Relations(Hand Book) Govt. of Kerala.

Tables 2.6 present a snap shot of the budget allocation of GOI during the last six years highlighting the trend pattern. Budget allocation in terms of percentage as well as in absolute terms show negative growth in 2012 and 2013.

Table 2.7 exhibits the Status of MGNREGS in Kerala during the last two years. In respect of all parameters examined, a positive tendency is visible.

Table 3.1 analyses the gender pattern of the respondents. As per Table 3.1 it is clear that 97 per cent of the respondents are females while only 3 per cent are males. Proportion of female and male respondents region-wise also presents more or less the same pattern.(see Table 3.1)Thus, it is observed that thumping majority of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS in Kerala ,irrespective of the regions, are females.

2. Age of the Respondents

Table 3.2 : Age of the Respondents

Regions	Below 25		25-35		35-50		Above 50		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
South	0	0%	7	7%	49	49%	44	44%	100	100%
Central	0	0%	5	5%	75	75%	20	20%	100	100%
North	0	0%	10	10%	52	52%	38	38%	100	100%
Total	0	0%	22	7.33%	176	58.67%	102	34%	300	100%
3.2(a)										
Test Statistic	DOF	LOS	Computed Value				Table Values @5%			
Chi-square	6	5%	17.801				12.592			

Source: Primary Data

Table 3.2 analyses the age pattern of the respondents. As per Table 3.2 it is found that 58.67 per cent of the respondents belong to the age 35-50, 34 percent belong to the age group above 50 while only 7.33 per cent belong to 25-35 group. It has to be noted that nobody below 25 years of age joins this poverty eradication scheme. Thus, it is observed that majority of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS in Kerala, irrespective of the regions, belong to upper middle age group. However, wide variations are noted in the pattern of age structure between regions. (See Table 3.2)

In order to test whether there is significant difference in the age structure of the respondents between regions, chi-square test is performed and the result of the test presented in Table 3.2 (a). The Hypothesis tested is “Ho: There is no significant difference in the age structure of the respondents between regions”. Test result shows that computed value of chi-square is far greater than the table value of chi-square @5% level of significance. Hence, the Null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, which implies that there is statistically significant difference in the age structure of the respondents between regions.

3. Marital Status of the Respondents

Table 3.3 **Marital Status**

Regions	Married		Unmarried		Widowed		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
South	96	96%	2	2%	2	2%	100	100%
Central	93	93%	1	1%	6	6%	100	100%
North	98	98%	1	1%	1	1%	100	100%
Total	287	95.66%	4	1.33%	9	3.00%	300	100%
3.3(a)								
Test Statistic		DOF	LOS		Computed Value		Table Values @5%	
Chi-square		4	5%		5.299		9.488	

Source: Primary Data

Table 3.3 analyses the marital status of the respondents. As per Table 3.3 it is found that 95.66 per cent of the respondents belong to the married group, only 1.33 percent belongs to the unmarried group and 3 per cent belong to the widowed group. Thus, it is observed that majority of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS in Kerala, irrespective of the regions, belong to the married group.(see Table 3.3)

In order to test whether there is significant difference in the marital status of the respondents between regions, chi-square test is performed and the result of the test presented in Table 3.3 (a). The Hypothesis tested is “Ho: There is no significant

difference in the marital status of the respondents between regions”. Test result shows that computed value of chi-square is less than the table value of chi-square @5% level of significance. Hence, the Null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted, which implies that there is statistically no significant difference in the marital status of the respondents between regions.

4. Religion of the Respondents

Table 3.4 Religion of the Respondents

Regions	Hindu		Christian		Muslim		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
South	86	86%	9	9%	5	5%	100	100%
Central	85	85%	12	12%	3	3%	100	100%
North	39	39%	59	59%	2	2%	100	100%
Total	210	70.00%	80	26.67%	10	3.33%	300	100%
3.4(a)								
Test Statistic	DOF	LOS		Computed Value	Table Values @5%			
Chi-square	4	5%		80.97	9.488			

Source: Primary Data

Table 3.4 analyses the pattern of religion of the respondents. As per Table 3.4 it is found that 70.00 per cent of the respondents belong to the Hindu religion, 26.67percent belong to the Christian religion and 3.33 per cent belong to the Muslim religion. Thus, it is observed that majority of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS in Kerala, except the North region, belong to the Hindu religion. However, as regards religion, wide variations are noted in the pattern and structure between regions. (see Table 3.4)

In order to test whether there is significant difference in the religious pattern and structure of the respondents between regions, chi-square test is performed and the result of the test presented in Table3.4 (a). The Hypothesis tested is “Ho: There

is no significant difference in the religious pattern and structure of the respondents between regions”. Test result shows that computed value of chi-square is far greater than the table value of chi-square @5% level of significance. Hence, the Null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, which implies that there is statistically significant difference in the religious pattern and structure of the respondents between regions.

5. Qualification of the Respondents

Table 3.5 **Qualification**

Regions	Functional Literate		Upto X		Matriculate		+2		Above +2		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
South	63	63%	23	23%	8	8%	4	4%	2	2%	100	100%
Central	36	36%	43	43%	14	14%	5	5%	2	2%	100	100%
North	43	43%	32	32%	13	13%	9	9%	3	3%	100	100%
Total	142	47.0%	98	33%	35	12%	18	6.0%	7	2.0%	300	100%
3.5(a)												
Test Statistic	DOF	LOS	Computed Value							Table Values @5%		
Chi-square	4	5%	15.68					9.488				

Source: Primary Data

Table 3.5 analyses the level and pattern of educational qualification of the respondents. As per Table 3.5 it is found that 47 percent of the respondents belong to the functionally literate group, 33 percent belong to the “upto X” group and 12 per cent belong to matriculate group. It has to be noted that only a very insignificant proportion of people from the educated section joins this massive poverty eradication scheme. Thus, it is observed that majority of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS in Kerala, irrespective of the regions, belong to less educated group. However, wide variations are noted in the pattern and structure of respondents between regions in this respect. (see Table 3.5)

In order to test whether there is significant difference in the structure and pattern of education-level of the respondents between regions, chi-square test is performed and the result of the test presented in Table 3.5 (a). The Hypothesis tested is “Ho: There is no significant difference in the structure and pattern of education level of the respondents between regions”. Test result shows that computed value of chi-square is far greater than the table value of chi-square @5% level of significance. Hence, the Null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, which implies that there is statistically significant difference in the structure and pattern of education level of the respondents between regions.

6. Occupation of the Head of family

Table 3.6 Occupation of the Head of family

Regions	Agriculture		Daily Wage		Servants		Skilled Work		Self Emp		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
South	22	22%	38	38%	37	37%	2	2%	1	1%	100	100%
Central	12	12%	62	62%	5	5%	17	17%	4	4%	100	100%
North	3	3%	79	79%	3	3%	10	10%	5	5%	100	100%
Total	37	12.0%	179	60.0%	45	15.0%	29	10%	10	3.0%	300	100%
3.6(a)												
Test Statistic		DOF	LOS		Computed Value						Table Values @5%	
Chi-square		8	5%		91.66						15.507	

Source: Primary Data

Table 3.6 analyses the pattern of occupation of the head of the family. As per Table 3.6 it is found that around 60 per cent of the respondents belong to the family where the occupation of the head of the family of the respondent is daily wage., 15

percent are servants, 12 per cent agricultural labourers, 10 percent skilled workers and a negligible 3 percent self employed. Thus, it is observed that majority of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS in Kerala, irrespective of the regions, belong to families where the occupation of the head of family is daily wage earning. However, wide variations are noted in the pattern and structure of respondents between regions in this respect. (see Table 3.6)

In order to test whether there is significant difference in the structure and pattern of the occupation of the head of the families of the respondents between regions, chi-square test is performed and the result of the test presented in Table 3.6(a). The Hypothesis tested is "Ho: There is no significant difference in the structure and pattern of the occupation of the head of the family of the respondents between regions". Test result shows that computed value of chi-square is far greater than the table value of chi-square @5% level of significance. Hence, the Null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, which implies that there is statistically significant difference in this respect between regions.

7. Income Group of the Respondents

Table 3.7 **Income Group of the Respondents**

Regions	APL		BPL		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
South	5	5%	95	95%	100	100%
Central	19	19%	81	81%	100	100%
North	33	33%	67	67%	100	100%
Total	57	19.00%	243	81%	300	100%
3.7(a)						
Test Statistic	DOF	LOS	Computed Value	Table Values @5%		
Chi-square	1	5%	24.57	3.841		

Source: Primary Data

Table 3.7 analyses the pattern of income group of the respondents. As per Table 3.7 it is found that around 81 per cent of the respondents belong to the BPL families whereas only 19 percent belong to the APL families. It has to be noted that MGNREGS is a scheme where income level is not a criterion for getting included in the scheme. Thus, it is observed that majority of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS in Kerala, irrespective of the regions, belong to BPL families where the occupation of the head of family is daily wage earning. However, wide variations are noted in the pattern and structure of respondents between regions in this respect. (see Table 3.7)

In order to test whether there is significant difference in the structure and pattern of the income group of the families of the respondents between regions, chi-square test is performed and the result of the test presented in Table 3.7(a). The Hypothesis tested is “Ho: There is no significant difference in the structure and pattern of the income group of the family of the respondents between regions”. Test result shows that computed value of chi-square is far greater than the table value of chi-square @5% level of significance. Hence, the Null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, which implies that there is statistically significant difference in this respect between regions.

8. Income level of the respondents before joining MGNREGS

Table 3.8. Income level of the respondents before joining MGNREGS

Regions	Below 1000		1000-2000		2000-3000		3000-4000		Above 4000		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
South	76	76%	11	11%	4	4%	3	3%	6	6%	100	100%
Central	49	49%	41	41%	5	5%	2	2%	2	2%	100	100%
North	87	87%	3	3%	4	4%	3	3%	3	3%	100	100%
Total	212	71%	55	18%	13	4%	8	3%	11	4%	300	100%
3.8(a)												
Test Statistic	DOF	LOS	Computed Value				Table Values @5%					
Chi-square	8	5%	56.422				15.507					

Source: Primary Data

Table 3.8 analyses the pattern of income level of the respondents before joining MGNREGS. As per Table 3.8 it is found that around 71 per cent of the respondents belonged to the BPL families whose monthly income was below Rs. 1000 whereas only 4 percent had a monthly income above Rs.4000. Thus, it is observed that majority of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS in Kerala, irrespective of the regions, belonged to BPL families where the monthly income of the family was below Rs.1000 at the time of joining the scheme. However, wide variations are noted in the pattern and structure of respondents between regions in this respect. (see Table 3.8)

In order to test whether there is significant difference in the structure and pattern of the income level of the families of the respondents between regions, chi-square test is performed and the result of the test presented in Table 3.8(a). The Hypothesis tested is “Ho: There is no significant difference in the structure and pattern of the income level of the family of the respondents between regions”. Test result shows that computed value of chi-square is far greater than the table value of chi-square @5% level of significance. Hence, the Null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, which implies that there is statistically significant difference in this respect between regions.

9. Income level of the respondents after joining MGNREGS

Table 3.9 Income level of the respondents after joining MGNREGS

Regions	Below 1000		1000-2000		2000-3000		3000-4000		Above 4000		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
South	19	19%	15	15%	7	7%	25	25%	34	34%	100	100%
Central	48	48%	42	42%	5	5%	2	2%	3	3%	100	100%
North	47	47%	46	46%	2	2%	3	3%	2	2%	100	100%
Total	114	38.0%	103	34.0%	14	5%	30	10.0%	39	13.0%	300	100%
3.9(a)												
Test Statistic	DOF	LOS	Computed Value				Table Values @5%					
Chi-square	8	5%	118.26				15.507					

Source: Primary Data

Table 3.9 analyses the pattern of income level of the respondents after joining MGNREGS. As per Table 3.9 it is found that the percentage of families whose monthly income was below Rs. 1000 per month, fell from 71 percent to 38 percent after joining MGNREGS. Similarly, it is also observed that the percentage of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS whose monthly income above Rs.4000 increased to 13 percent from 4 percent after joining the scheme.

However, wide variations are noted in the pattern and structure of respondents between regions in this respect.(see Table 3.9)

In order to test whether there is significant difference in the structure and pattern of the income level of the families of the respondents between regions, after joining MGNREGS, chi-square test is performed and the result of the test presented in Table 3.9(a). The Hypothesis tested is "Ho: There is no significant difference in the structure and pattern of the income level of the families of the respondents after joining MGNREGS, between regions". Test result shows that computed value of chi-square is far greater than the table value of chi-square @5% level of significance. Hence, the Null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, which implies that there is statistically significant difference in this respect between regions.

10. (Shift) Change in Income level before and after joining MGNREGS

Table 3.10(Shift) Change in Income level before and after joining MGNREGS

Income level	Before	After	Shift in percentage
Below 1000	212	114	46.23% (-ve)
1000-2000	55	103	87.27% (+ve)
2000-3000	13	14	7.7%
3000-4000	8	30	275%
Above 4000	11	39	254.5%

Source: Primary Data

Table 3.10 analyses the pattern of shift in the income level of the respondents after joining MGNREGS. As per Table 3.10 it is found that the number of respondents belonging to the BPL families whose monthly income was below 1000 fell from 212 to 114 after joining MGNREGS, i.e; a reduction of more than 46 percent. Similarly, the shift in the other income groups also are conspicuous.(see Table 3.10).

11. Type of the Residence of Respondents

Table 3.11 Type of the Residence of Respondents

Regions	HUT		Thatched		Tiled		Concrete		Others		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
South	1	1%	4	4%	36	36%	55	55%	4	4%	100	100%
Central	2	2%	4	4%	38	38%	35	35%	21	21%	100	100%
North	6	6%	21	21%	44	44%	22	22%	7	7%	100	100%
Total	9	3%	29	10%	118	39%	112	37%	32	11%	300	100%
3.11(a)												
Test Statistic	DOF	LOS	Computed Value				Table Values @5%					
Chi-square	8	5%	55.72				15.507					

Source: Primary Data

Table 3.11 analyses the type of the residence of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS. As per Table 3.11 it is found that around 39 per cent of the respondents do have homes which are tiled and 37 percent have concrete building. Thatched homes are only 10 percent and huts only 3 percent. However, wide variations are noted in the pattern of distribution between regions in this respect. (see Table 3.11)

are only 18.67 percent. However, wide variations are noted in the pattern of distribution between regions in this respect. (see Table 3.12)

In order to test whether there is significant difference in the pattern of the distribution of respondents based on the electrified status of the residence, between regions, chi-square test is performed and the result of the test presented in Table 3.12(a). The Hypothesis tested is “Ho: There is no significant difference in the pattern of distribution of the respondents based on the electrified status of their residence, between regions”. Test result shows that computed value of chi-square is far greater than the table value of chi-square @5% level of significance. Hence, the Null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, which implies that there is statistically significant difference in this respect between regions.

13. Ownership of the Residence of the Respondents

Table 3.13 Ownership of the Residence of the Respondents

Regions	Own		Spouse		Others		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
South	42	42%	48	48%	10	10%	100	100%
Central	10	10%	82	82%	8	8%	100	100%
North	21	21%	70	70%	9	9%	100	100%
Total	73	24.33%	200	66.67%	27	9.00%	300	100%
3.13(a)								
Test Statistic	DOF	LOS		Computed Value	Table Values @5%			
Chi-square	4	5%		30.868	9.488			

Source: Primary Data

Table 3.13 analyses the ownership status of the residence of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS. As per Table 3.13 it is found that in the case of around 66.67 percent

of the respondents, the ownership of their houses is vested with their spouses. In the case of 24.33 percent respondents, ownership is vested with themselves and in the case 9 percent, it is with others. However, wide variations are noted in the pattern of distribution between regions in this respect. (see Table 3.13)

In order to test whether there is significant difference in the pattern of the distribution of respondents based on the ownership status of the residence, between regions, chi-square test is performed and the result of the test presented in Table 3.13(a). The Hypothesis tested is “Ho: There is no significant difference in the pattern of distribution of the respondents based on the ownership status of their residence, between regions”. Test result shows that computed value of chi-square is far greater than the table value of chi-square @5% level of significance. Hence, the Null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, which implies that there is statistically significant difference in this respect between regions.

14. Family status of the Respondents

Table 3.14 Family status of the Respondents

Regions	Head of Family		Not the head of family		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
South	54	54%	46	46%	100	100%
Central	77	77%	23	23%	100	100%
North	35	35%	65	65%	100	100%
Total	166	55.33%	134	44.67%	300	100%
3.14(a)						
Test Statistic		DOF	LOS	Computed Value	Table Values @5%	
Chi-square		1	5%	44.67	3.841	

Source: Primary Data

Table 3.14 analyses the status of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS in their families i.e; whether they are heads of the families or not. As per Table 3.14 it is found that around 55.33 per cent of the respondents are heads of families and others are not. However, wide variations are noted in the pattern of distribution of families between regions in this respect. (see Table 3.14)

In order to test whether there is significant difference in the pattern of the distribution of respondents based on their status in the family, between regions, chi-square test is performed and the result of the test presented in Table 3.14(a). The Hypothesis tested is “Ho: There is no significant difference in the pattern of distribution of the respondents based on their status in the family, between regions”. Test result shows that computed value of chi-square is far greater than the table value of chi-square @5% level of significance. Hence, the Null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, which implies that there is statistically significant difference in this respect between regions.

15. Basic Domestic Amenities – Toilet facility

Table 3.15

Toilet facilities of the Beneficiaries of MGNREGS

Regions	Attached		Outside House		Other mode		No facility		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
South	76	76%	17	17%	5	5%	2	2%	100	100%
Central	18	18%	73	73%	6	6%	3	3%	100	100%
North	28	28%	63	63%	7	7%	2	2%	100	100%
Total	122	41%	153	51%	18	6.00%	7	2%	300	100%
3.15(a)										
Test Statistic		DOF	LOS		Computed Value				Table Values @5%	
Chi-square		6	5%		82.87				12.592	

Source: Primary Data

Table 3.15 examines the status of the basic domestic facilities-toilet facility-at the residence of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS. As per Table 3.15 it is found that in the case of around 40 per cent of the respondents, they have toilet facility attached to their houses. In the case of 51 percent respondents, they have facility, outside their house and 6.percent have facilities of other mode and 2.00 percent have no toilet facility, whatsoever. However, wide variations are noted in the pattern of distribution between regions in this respect. (see Table 3.15)

In order to test whether there is significant difference in the pattern of the distribution of respondents based on the toilet facilities at the residence, between regions, chi-square test is performed and the result of the test presented in Table3.15(a). The Hypothesis tested is “Ho: There is no significant difference in the pattern of distribution of the respondents based on the availability of toilet facility at home, between regions”. Test result shows that computed value of chi-square is far greater than the table value of chi-square @5% level of significance. Hence, the Null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, which implies that there is statistically significant difference in this respect between regions.

16. Drinking water facility

Table 3.16

Drinking water facility of the Respondents

Regions	Inside-Pipe		Own well		Common Tap		Neighbouring well		Others		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
South	57	57%	25	25%	6	6%	2	2%	10	10%	100	100%
Central	5	5%	39	39%	7	7%	41	41%	8	8%	100	100%
North	54	54%	9	9%	20	20%	11	11%	6	6%	100	100%
Total	116	39%	73	24.0%	33	11.0%	54	18.0%	24	8.0%	300	100%
3.16(a)												
Test Statistic		DOF	LOS		Computed Value				Table Values @5%			
Chi-square		8	5%		121.03				15.507			

Source: Primary Data

Table 3.16 examines the status of the basic domestic facilities-drinking water facility- at the residence of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS. As per Table 3.16 it is found that in the case of around 39 per cent of the respondents, they have drinking water facility attached to their houses in the form of inside pipe. In the case of 24.00 percent respondents, they have facility, outside their house, in the form of own wells, 11.00 percent have facility of common tap, 18 percent depend on neighbours, and 8.00 have facilities of other mode. However, wide variations are noted in the pattern of distribution between regions in this respect. (see Table 3.16)

In order to test whether there is significant difference in the pattern of the distribution of respondents based on the availability of drinking water facilities at the residence, between regions, chi-square test is performed and the result of the test presented in Table 3.16(a). The Hypothesis tested is “Ho: There is no significant difference in the pattern of distribution of the respondents based on the availability of drinking water facility at home, between regions”. Test result shows that computed value of chi-square is far greater than the table value of chi-square @5% level of significance. Hence, the Null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, which implies that there is statistically significant difference in this respect between regions.

17. Main fuel used at home

Table 3.17
Main fuel used by the Respondents

Regions	LPG		Kerosine		Firewood		Electricity		Others		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
South	86	86%	6	6%	4	4%	2	2%	2	2%	100	100%
Central	65	65%	4	4%	19	19%	2	2%	10	10%	100	100%
North	4	4%	8	8%	82	82%	3	3%	3	3%	100	100%
Total	155	52%	18	6%	105	35%	7	2%	15	5%	300	100%
3.17(a)												
Test Statistic	DOF	LOS	Computed Value				Table Values @5%					
Chi-square	8	5%	177.33				15.507					

Source: Primary Data

Table 3.17 examines the availability of the basic domestic facilities-main fuel - at the residence of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS. As per Table 3.17 it is found that in the case of around 52 per cent of the respondents, they have LPG as their main fuel. In the case of 35 percent respondents, they use firewood as their main fuel and others have facilities of other mode-kerosine, electricity etc. whatsoever. However, wide variations are noted in the pattern of distribution between regions in this respect. (see Table 3.17)

In order to test whether there is significant difference in the pattern of the distribution of beneficiaries based on the availability of fuel facilities at the residence, between regions, chi-square test is performed and the result of the test presented in Table 3.17(a). The Hypothesis tested is “Ho: There is no significant difference in the pattern of distribution of the beneficiaries based on the availability of fuel facility at home, between regions”. Test result shows that computed value of chi-square is far greater than the table value of chi-square @5% level of significance. Hence, the Null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, which implies that there is statistically significant difference in this respect between regions.

18. Household items owned by the Respondents

Table 3.18

Household items held by Respondents

Regions	Mixer	T. V.	Fridge	Mobile	Sewing machine	Two-wheeler	Total
	Nos.	Nos.	Nos.	Nos.	Nos.	Nos.	Total
South	98 (98)	92 (92)	72 (72)	93 (93)	24 (24)	33 (33)	412
Central	56 (56)	85 (85)	43 (43)	93 (93)	9 (9)	6 (6)	292
North	61 (61)	55 (55)	10 (10)	62 (62)	9 (9)	12 (12)	209
Total	215	232	125	248	42	51	913
3.18(a)							
Test statistic		DOF	LOS	Computer Value		Table Values @5%	
Chi-square		10	5%	44.77		18.307	

Source: Primary Data (Figures in parenthesis represent percentages)

Table 3.18 examines the availability of household items at the residence of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS. As per Table 3.18 it is found that in the case of majority of the respondents, they have commonly used household items like mixer, TV, fridge and mobile phones. Two-wheelers and sewing machines are only rare. The prevalence of mobile phones is, however, noteworthy. However, wide variations are noted in the pattern of distribution between regions in this respect. (see Table 3.18)

In order to test whether there is significant difference in the pattern of the distribution of families based on the possession of household items, between regions, chi-square test is performed and the result of the test presented in Table 3.18(a). The Hypothesis tested is “Ho: There is no significant difference in the pattern of distribution of the families based on the possession and use of household items at home, between regions”. Test result shows that computed value of chi-square is far greater than the table value of chi-square @5% level of significance. Therefore, there is strong evidence against the Hypothesis. Hence, the Null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, which implies that there is statistically significant difference in this respect between regions.

19. No. of working days provided under MGNREGS.

Table 3.19
Working Days Provided

Regions	100 days		75-100		50-75		25-50		Below 25		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
South	3	3%	27	27%	59	59%	8	8%	3	3%	100	100%
Central	6	6%	6	6%	14	14%	52	52%	22	22%	100	100%
North	35	35%	11	11%	7	7%	37	37%	10	10%	100	100%
Total	44	14.0%	44	15.0%	80	26.0%	97	33%	35	12%	300	100%
3.19(a)												
Test Statistic		DOF	LOS		Computed Value				Table Values @5%			
Chi-square		8	5%		165.502				15.507			

Source: Primary Data

Table 3.19 examines the status of the number of working days provided to the beneficiaries of MGNREGS under the scheme. As per Table 3.19 it is found that in the case of 14 per cent of the respondents only, they have been provided with 100 days work as envisaged in the Act. In the case of 15 percent respondents, they have been provide with work between 50-75 days, 26.00 percent get works for a period between 50-75 days, while almost half of them (45 percent) get work only for a period less than 50 days. Of this, 12 percent get only less than 25 days work. Wide variations are also noted in the pattern of distribution between regions in this respect. (see Table 3.19)

In order to test whether there is significant difference in the pattern of the distribution of respondents based on the availability of work between regions, chi-square test is performed and the result of the test presented in Table 3.19(a). The Hypothesis tested is “Ho: There is no significant difference in the pattern of distribution of the respondents based on the availability of work between regions”. Test result shows that computed value of chi-square is far greater than the table value of chi-square @5% level of significance. There is very strong evidence against the Hypothesis. Hence, the Null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, which implies that there is statistically significant difference in this respect between regions.

20. Type of work undertaken and offered to beneficiaries of MGNREGS

Table 3.20

Type of Works Offered

Regions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
South	93%	90%	41%	2%	43%	94%	86%	50%	41%
Central	94%	92%	74%	00%	75%	92%	74%	95%	70%
North	86%	66%	0%		49%	91%	6%	89%	9%
Total	91%	84%	38%	11%	56%	92%	55%	78%	40%

(1) Water conservation and allied works, (2) Drought Relief & Aforestation, (3) Minor Irrigation, (4) Irrigation in SC/ST land, (5) Revival of water bodies, (6) Land improvement, (7) Flood Control, (8) Rural Roads, (9) Others.

Source: Primary Data

(NB: Total of the rows and columns will not equal to 100)

Table 3.20 examines the types of work undertaken by the panchayat and offered to the beneficiaries of MGNREGS under the scheme. As per Table 3.20 it is found that 91 per cent of the respondents opine that they have been provided with water conservation and allied works as envisaged in the Act. 84 percent respondents opine that drought relief and afforestation works are also offered to them. It is, however, observed that Minor irrigation and Irrigation in SC/ST land are areas attracting scanty attention of the authorities while preparing shelf of projects and allotting jobs. Wide variations are also noted in the pattern of distribution also, between regions in this respect. (see Table 3.20)

21. Duration worked in MGNREGS.

Table 3.21

Period worked in MGNREGS

Regions	0-1		1-2		2-3		3-4		4-5		Above 5		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
South	1	1%	3	3%	30	30%	54	54%	8	8%	4	4%	100	100%
Central	2	2%	4	4%	8	8%	26	26%	57	57%	3	3%	100	100%
North	2	2%	10	10%	9	9%	10	10%	24	24%	45	45%	100	100%
Total	5	2%	17	6%	47	16%	90	30%	89	29%	52	17%	300	100%
3.21(a)														
Test Statistic		DOF		LOS		Computed Value		Table Values @5%						
Chi-square		10		5%		166.59		18.307						

Source: Primary Data

Table 3.21 examines the status of the number of years after joining as the beneficiaries of MGNREGS. As per Table 3.21 it is found that majority of the respondents (around 76 %) have worked under this scheme for a period more than three years. However, Wide variations are also noted in the pattern of distribution between regions in this respect. (see Table 3.21)

In order to test whether there is significant difference in the pattern of the distribution of respondents based on the period of work done under MGNREGS, between regions, chi-square test is performed and the result of the test presented in Table 3.21(a). The Hypothesis tested is “Ho: There is no significant difference in the pattern of distribution of the respondents based on the period of work done under MGNREGS, between regions”. Test result shows that computed value of chi-square is far greater than the table value of chi-square @5% level of significance. There is very strong evidence against the Hypothesis. Hence, the Null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, which implies that there is statistically significant difference in this respect between regions.

22. Land holdings of the Respondents

Table 3.22

Area of Land holdings in cents

Regions	0-4		4-8		8-12		Above 12		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
South	33	33%	42	42%	18	18%	7	7%	100	100%
Central	27	27%	46	46%	11	11%	16	16%	100	100%
North	8	8%	21	21%	23	23%	48	48%	100	100%
Total	68	23%	109	36%	52	17%	71	24%	300	100%
3.22(a)										
Test Statistic	DOF	LOS	Computed Value				Table Values @5%			
Chi-square	6	5%	68.39				12.592			

Source: Primary Data

Table 3.22 examines the status of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS as regards the area of landholdings in their possession. As per Table 3.22 it is found that in the

case of 23 per cent of the respondents , they have only less than 4 cents of land in their possession. 36 percent respondents have land between 4 and 8cents, 17 percent have between 8 and 12 cents , while 24 percent have more than 12cents. However, wide variations are noted in the pattern of distribution between regions in this respect.(see Table 3.22)

In order to test whether there is significant difference in the pattern of the distribution of families based on the availability landholding, between regions, chi-square test is performed and the result of the test presented in Table3.22(a). The Hypothesis tested is “Ho: There is no significant difference in the pattern of distribution of the families based on the possession of landholdings, between regions”. Test result shows that computed value of chi-square is far greater than the table value of chi-square @5% level of significance. There is very strong evidence against the Hypothesis. Hence, the Null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, which implies that there is statistically significant difference in this respect between regions.

23. Average income before and after joining MGNREGS.

Table 3.23

Average Monthly Income Before & After joining MGNREGS

Region	Rs.Before	Rs.After	% increase
South	834.89	2973.91	256.04
Central	736.23	1364.38	85.32
North	870.20	1533.00	76.17
Total	811.98	2069.87	154.92

Source: Primary Data

Table 3.23 examines the average income position of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS before and after joining MGNREGS. The Table brings out that the average income before joining the scheme was only Rs.811.98 and it rises to Rs.2069.87 after joining the scheme; i.e; an increase of 154.92%. However ,

between the regions, wide variations can be observed as regards the percentage increase. (see Table 3.23)

24. Spending pattern of Respondents

Table 3.24

Average Spending on various items

Region	Food	Health care	Educa- tion	Entertain- ment	Communi- cation	Others
	%	%	%	%	%	
South	26.36%	18.32%	20.67%	10.17%	12.68%	11.80%
Central	21.13%	26.20%	26.77%	6.83%	12.18%	6.88%
North	40.90%	16.13%	21.32%	5.00%	13.75%	2.90%
Total	29.46%	20.22%	22.92%	7.33%	12.87%	7.19%

Source: Primary Data

Table 3.24 examines the average spending patterns of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS. The Table brings out that on an average 29.46% of the income is spent on food items across the regions, 20.22% on healthcare, 22.92% on education of their children, 7.33% on entertainment, 12.87% on communication purpose (phone bills etc;) and 7.19% for other miscellaneous needs. However, between the regions, wide variations can be observed as regards the spending patterns. (see Table 3.24)

Analyses of the opinions and perceptions of the Respondents

Tables 3.25 to 3.42 analyse the opinions and perceptions of the respondents regarding various aspects of implementation of the scheme which throw light on the degree of effectiveness as well as lacunae on the part of the implementing authorities, using Likert's Scaling Technique. (A weighted score of more than 900 is indicative of favourable opinion on aggregate basis and a weighted score of more than 300 is indicative of favourable response region-wise)

25. Perception on the Promptness of the wage distribution under MGNREGS.

TABLE 3.25

Perception of the Respondents on the promptness of wage distribution

Perception	SOUTH			CENTRAL		NORTH		TOTAL
	W	NR	I NR X W	NR	II NR X W	NR	III NR X W	I+II+III
Strongly Agree	5	1	5	5	25	41	205	235
Agree	4	46	184	47	188	17	68	440
No opinion	3	9	27	43	129	13	39	195
Disagree	2	43	86	2	4	6	12	102
Strongly Disagree	1	1	1	3	3	23	23	27
		100	303	100	349	100	347	999/1500 (66.6%)
TABLE 3.1 (a)								
Test Statistic				DOF		Computed Value		TV@5%
Chi-square				8		202.677		15.507

Source: Primary Data .DOF=Degree of Freedom; TV= Table Value

Table 3.25 analyses and evaluates the opinions of the respondents as regards the promptness of wage distribution under MGNREGS in Kerala. The Table presents the total weighted scores region-wise as well as in aggregate. The aggregate weighted score is 999/1500 which shows that around 66.6% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that wage payment takes place promptly under MGNREGS. The region-wise weighted scores of both Central and North Regions are close to each other- 349/500 & 347/500, i.e., 69.8% & 69.4%, where as it is only 303/500 (i.e., 60.6% in the South region).

In order to test the homogeneity of the opinions of the respondents between regions, Chi-square test for homogeneity is applied. The hypothesis tested is –‘Ho: Opinions are homogenous with respect to promptness of wage payment between the regions.’ Result is presented in Table 3.25(a). Computed value of the Chi-square shows strong evidence against the Null Hypothesis, which implies that opinions of

respondents across the regions are not homogeneous with respect to the promptness of wage payment.

26. Opinion regarding unemployment wages under MGNREGS

TABLE3. 26

Perception	SOUTH			CENTRAL		NORTH		TOTAL
	W	NR	I NR X W	NR	II NR X W	NR	III NR X W	I+II+III
Strongly Agree	5	4	20	3	15	6	30	65
Agree	4	45	180	8	32	9	36	248
No opinion	3	6	18	14	42	6	18	78
Disagree	2	3	6	10	20	47	94	120
Strongly Disagree	1	42	42	65	65	32	32	139
		100	266	100	174	100	210	650/1500 (43.33%)
TABLE 3.26 (a)								
Test Statistic				DOF		Computed Value		TV@5%
Chi-square				8		117.26		15.507

Source: Primary Data . DOF=Degree of Freedom; TV= Table Value .

Table 3.26 analyses and evaluates the opinions of the respondents as regards the payment of unemployment wage under MGNREGS. The Table presents the total weighted scores region-wise as well as in aggregate. The aggregate weighted score of 650/1500, shows that only around 43.33% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that unemployment wage payment takes place promptly under MGNREGS. The region-wise weighted scores of both south and North Regions are close to each other, being 266/500 & 210/500, i.e., 53.2% & 42%, where as it is only 174/500 (i.e., 34.8% in the central region).

In order to test the homogeneity of the opinions of the respondents between the regions, Chi-square test for homogeneity is applied. The hypothesis tested is Ho: "Opinions are homogenous between the regions with respect to promptness of unemployment wage payment ." Result is presented in Table 3.26(a). Computed

value of the Chi-square shows very strong evidence against the Null Hypothesis, which implies that opinions of respondents across the regions are not homogeneous with respect to the promptness of unemployment wage payment.

27. Opinion regarding preparation of shelf of projects under MGNREGS.

TABLE 3.27

Responses as regards preparation of shelf of projects under MGNREGS.

Perception	SOUTH			CENTRAL		NORTH		TOTAL
	W	NR	I NR X W	NR	II NR X W	NR	III NR X W	I+II+III
Strongly Agree	5	5	25	6	30	46	230	285
Agree	4	60	240	30	120	32	120	480
No opinion	3	4	12	55	165	8	15	192
Disagree	2	27	54	4	8	7	10	72
Strongly Disagree	1	4	4	5	3	7	4	11
		100	335	100	326	100	379	1040/1500 (69.33%)
TABLE 3.27 (a)								
		Test Statistic		DOF		Computed Value		TV@5%
		Chi-square		8		180.32		15.507

Source: Primary Data . DOF=Degree of Freedom; TV= Table Value

Table 3.27 analyses and evaluates the opinions of the respondents as regards the preparation of shelf of projects by the panchayat authorities ,as required under MGNREGS . The Table presents the total weighted scores region-wise as well as in aggregate. The aggregate weighted score of 1040/1500, shows that around 69.6% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that shelf of projects as required by the Act are promptly prepared under MGNREGS. The weighted scores of all the Regions are close to each other 335/500 , 326/500& 379/500.

However, in order to test the homogeneity of the opinions, chi-square test for homogeneity is applied. The hypothesis tested is Ho: "Opinions are homogenous

between the regions with respect to the preparation of shelf of projects.” Result is presented in Table 3.27(a). Computed value of the chi-square shows strong evidence against the Null Hypothesis which implies that opinions of respondents across the regions are not homogeneous with respect to the preparation of shelf of projects.

28. Opinion regarding preparation of muster roll under MGNREGS.

TABLE 3.28

Responses regarding preparation of muster roll under MGNREGS.

Perception	W	SOUTH		CENTRAL		NORTH		TOTAL
		NR	I NR X W	NR	II NR X W	NR	III NR X W	I+II+III
Strongly Agree	5	4	20	40	200	45	180	400
Agree	4	86	336	43	172	33	132	640
No opinion	3	3	9	7	21	17	51	81
Disagree	2	4	8	6	12	3	6	26
Strongly Disagree	1	3	3	4	4	2	4	11
		100	376	100	409	100	373	1158/1500 (77.2%)
TABLE 3.28 (a)								
Test Statistic				DOF		Computed Value		. TV@5%
Chi-square				8		75.93		15.507

Source: Primary Data . DOF=Degree of Freedom; TV= Table Value

Table 3.28 analyses and evaluates the opinions of the respondents as regards the preparation of muster roll by the authorities under MGNREGS. The Table presents the total weighted scores region-wise as well as in aggregate. The aggregate weighted score of 1158/1500, shows that around 77.20% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that muster rolls are prepared and maintained properly under MGNREGS. The region-wise weighted scores of both south and

North Regions are close to each other, being 376/500 & 373/500, where as it is 409/500 in the central region.

In order to test the homogeneity of the opinions of the respondents between the regions, Chi-square test for homogeneity is applied. The hypothesis tested is Ho: "Opinions are homogenous between the regions with respect to promptness of the preparation of muster rolls ." Result is presented in Table 3.28(a). Computed value of the Chi-square shows very strong evidence against the Null Hypothesis, which implies that opinions of respondents across the regions are not homogeneous with respect to the promptness of the preparation and maintenance of muster rolls.

29. Opinion regarding conducting of Gramsabhas under MGNREGS.

TABLE 3.29

Responses regarding conducting of Gramasabhas under MGNREGS

Perception	SOUTH			CENTRAL		NORTH		TOTAL
	W	NR	I NR X W	NR	II NR X W	NR	III NR X W	I+II+III
Strongly Agree	5	4	20	8	40	44	220	280
Agree	4	84	336	47	188	30	120	644
No opinion	3	4	12	33	99	17	51	162
Disagree	2	5	10	6	12	4	8	30
Strongly Disagree	1	4	4	6	6	5	5	15
			382	100	346	100	404	1131/1500 (75.4%)
TABLE 3.29 (a)								
Test Statistic				DOF		Computed Value		T. V.
Chi-square				8		104.601		15.507

Table 3.29 analyses and evaluates the opinions of the respondents as regards the conducting of Gramasabhas under MGNREGS. The Table presents the total weighted scores region-wise as well as in aggregate. The aggregate weighted score of 1131/1500, shows that around 75.40% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that Gramsabhas are conducted promptly under MGNREGS. The region-wise weighted scores of both south and North Regions are close to each other, being 386/500 & 404/500, where as it is only 346/500 in the central region.

In order to test the homogeneity of the opinions of the respondents between the regions, Chi-square test for homogeneity is applied. The hypothesis tested is Ho: "Opinions are homogenous between the regions with respect to promptness of conducting gramsabhas." Result is presented in Table 3.29(a). Computed value of the Chi-square shows very strong evidence against the Null Hypothesis, which implies that opinions of respondents across the regions are not homogeneous in this respect.

30. Opinion regarding conducting of social audit under MGNREGS

TABLE 3.30

Opinion regarding conducting of social audit under MGNREGS

Perception	SOUTH			CENTRAL		NORTH		TOTAL
	W	NR	I NR X W	NR	II NR X W	NR	III NR X W	I+II+III
Strongly Agree	5	7	35	7	35	18	90	160
Agree	4	79	346	50	200	40	120	636
No opinion	3	8	24	30	90	27	81	195
Disagree	2	4	8	7	14	7	14	36
Strongly Disagree	1	3	3	6	6	8	8	17
		100	386	100	345	100	313	1044/1500 (69.6%)

TABLE 3.30 (a)			
Test Statistic	DOF	Computed Value	T. V.
Chi-square	8	38.42	15.507

Source: Primary Data . DOF=Degree of Freedom; TV= Table Value

Table 3.30 analyses and evaluates the opinions of the respondents as regards the conducting of social audit under MGNREGS. The Table presents the total weighted scores region-wise as well as in aggregate. The aggregate weighted score of 1044/1500, shows that around 69.60% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that social audits are conducted promptly under MGNREGS. The region-wise weighted scores of both south and central regions are close to each other, being 386/500 & 345/500, where as it is only 313/500 in the north .

In order to test the homogeneity of the opinions of the respondents between the regions, Chi-square test for homogeneity is applied. The hypothesis tested is Ho: "Opinions are homogenous between the regions with respect to promptness of conducting social audits." Result is presented in Table 3.30(a). Computed value of the Chi-square shows very strong evidence against the Null Hypothesis, which implies that opinions of respondents across the regions are not homogeneous in this respect.

31. Opinion regarding making available the records for social audit.

TABLE 3.31

Opinion regarding making available the records for social audit

Perception	SOUTH			CENTRAL		NORTH		TOTAL
	W	NR	I NR X W	NR	II NR X W	NR	III NR X W	I+II+III
Strongly Agree	5	4	20	5	20	20	100	140
Agree	4	84	336	50	200	43	172	708
No opinion	3	8	24	31	93	25	75	192
Disagree	2	2	4	8	16	6	12	32
Strongly Disagree	1	2	2	6	6	6	6	14
		100	386	100	335	100	365	1086/1500 (72.4%)
TABLE 3.31 (a)								
Test Statistic				DOF		Computed Value		T. V.
Chi-square				8		52.06		15.507

Source: Primary Data . DOF=Degree of Freedom; TV= Table Value

Table 3.31 analyses and evaluates the opinions of the respondents as regards making available the records of the MGNREGS for social audit by the authorities. The Table presents the total weighted scores across the regions as well as the aggregate. The aggregate weighted score of 1086/1500, shows that around 72.40% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that authorities make available the records properly for social audit. The region-wise weighted scores of all the regions are close to each other. (see Table 3.31)

In order to test the homogeneity of the opinions between regions, chi-square test for homogeneity is applied. The hypothesis tested is H_0 . "Opinions are

homogenous between regions as regards making available the records for social audit.” Result is presented in Table 3.31(a). Computed value of the chi-square shows strong evidence against the Null Hypothesis, which implies that opinions between regions are not homogeneous in this respect.

32. Opinion regarding keeping complaint register by programme officer

TABLE - 3.32

Responses regarding keeping complaint register by programme officer

Perception	SOUTH			CENTRAL		NORTH		TOTAL
	W	NR	I NR X W	NR	II NR X W	NR	III NR X W	I+II+III
Strongly Agree	5	6	30	3	15	16	80	125
Agree	4	80	320	30	120	46	184	624
No opinion	3	6	18	57	171	26	78	267
Disagree	2	4	8	6	12	7	14	34
Strongly Disagree	1	4	4	4	4	5	5	13
		100	380	100	322	100	361	1063/1500 (70.86%)
TABLE 3.32 (a)								
		Test Statistic		DOF		Computed Value		T. V.
		Chi-square		8		81.69		15.507

Source: Primar Data. DOF=Degree of Freedom; TV= Table Value

Table 3.32 analyses and evaluates the opinions of the respondents as regards keeping complaint register by the programme officer of the MGNREGS. The Table presents the total weighted scores across the regions as well as the aggregate. The aggregate weighted score of 1063/1500, shows that around 70.86% of the respondents are of the opinion that complaint register is being kept by the programme officer of the MGNREGS. The region-wise weighted scores of all the regions are somewhat close to each other. (see Table 3.32)

However, in order to test the homogeneity of the opinions between regions, chi-square test for homogeneity is applied. The hypothesis tested is Ho. “Opinions

are homogenous between regions as regards keeping the complaint register .” Result is presented in Table 3.32(a). Computed value of the chi-square shows strong evidence against the Null Hypothesis, which implies that opinions between regions are not homogeneous in this respect.

33. Opinion regarding recording complaints in register by programme officer

TABLE 3.33

Opinion regarding recording complaints in register by programme officer

Perception	SOUTH			CENTRAL		NORTH		TOTAL
	W	NR	I NR X W	NR	II NR X W	NR	III NR X W	I+II+III
Strongly Agree	5	4	20	5	25	12	60	105
Agree	4	86	344	33	132	53	212	688
No opinion	3	6	18	54	162	26	78	258
Disagree	2	2	4	5	10	4	8	22
Strongly Disagree	1	2	2	3	3	5	5	10
		100	388	100	332	100	363	1083/1500 (72.2%)
TABLE 3.33 (a)								
		Test Statistic		DOF		Computed Value		T. V.
		Chi-square		8		73.65		15.507

Source: Primary Data . DOF=Degree of Freedom; TV= Table Value

Table 3.33 analyses the opinions of the respondents as regards proper recording complaints in the register by the programme officer. The Table presents the total weighted scores across the regions as well as the aggregate. The aggregate weighted score of 1083/1500, shows that around 72.20% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that there is proper recording of complaints in the register by the programme officer of the MGNREGS. The weighted scores of both South and North Regions are close to each other.(see Table 3.33).

However, in order to test the homogeneity of the opinions, chi-square test for homogeneity is applied. The hypothesis tested is Ho. “Opinions are homogenous between regions with respect to promptness of recording complaints.” Result is

presented in Table 3.33(a). Computed value of the chi-square shows strong evidence against the Null Hypothesis, which indicates that opinions in this respect between regions are not homogeneous.

34. Opinion regarding complaints redressal mechanism at district and block level

TABLE 3.34

Opinion regarding complaints redressal mechanism at district and block level

Perception	SOUTH			CENTRAL		NORTH		TOTAL
	W	NR	I NR X W	NR	II NR X W	NR	III NR X W	I+II+III
Strongly Agree	5	3	15	4	20	8	40	75
Agree	4	84	336	36	144	55	220	700
No opinion	3	6	18	53	159	23	69	246
Disagree	2	4	8	4	8	9	18	34
Strongly Disagree	1	3	3	3	3	5	5	11
		100	380	100	334	100	352	1066/1500 (71.6%)
TABLE 3.34 (a)								
Test Statistic				DOF		Computed Value		T. V.
Chi-square				8		67.94		15.507

Source: Primary Data . DOF=Degree of Freedom; TV= Table Value

Table 3.34 analyses the opinions of the respondents as regards the complaint redressal mechanism in the district and block level. The Table presents the total weighted scores across the regions as well as the aggregate. The aggregate weighted score of 1066/1500, shows that around 71.60% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that there is proper complaints redressal mechanism in the district and block level. The weighted scores of all the Regions are close to each other.(see Table 3.34).

However, in order to test the homogeneity of the opinions, chi-square test for homogeneity is applied. The hypothesis tested is Ho. "Opinions are homogenous between regions with respect to the district and block level complaints redressal mechanism." Result is presented in Table 3.34(a). Computed value of the chi-square

shows strong evidence against the Null Hypothesis, which indicates that opinions in this respect between regions are, however, not homogeneous.

35. Opinions regarding appointment of contractors for undertaking projects

TABLE 3.35

Responses regarding appointment of contractors for undertaking projects

Perception	SOUTH			CENTRAL		NORTH		TOTAL
	W	NR	I NR X W	NR	II NR X W	NR	III NR X W	I+II+III
Strongly Agree	5	2	10	36	180	7	35	225
Agree	4	89	356	53	212	55	220	788
No opinion	3	4	12	3	9	23	69	90
Disagree	2	2	4	4	8	9	18	30
Strongly	1	4	4	4	4	6	6	14
		100	386	100	413	100	348	1147/1500 (76.46%)
TABLE 3.35(a)								
Test Statistic				DOF		Computed Value		T. V.
Chi-square				8		88.61		15.507

Source: Primary Data . DOF=Degree of Freedom; TV= Table Value

Table 3.35 analyses and evaluates the opinions of the respondents as regards appointing contractors for undertaking projects under MGNREGS. The Table presents the total weighted scores region-wise as well as in aggregate. The aggregate weighted score of 1147/1500, shows that around 76.46% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that contractors are not appointed under MGNREGS to undertake projects. The region-wise weighted scores of both south and central regions are close to each other, being 386/500 & 413/500, where as it is only 348/500 in the south region.

In order to test the homogeneity of the opinions of the respondents between the regions, Chi-square test for homogeneity is applied. The hypothesis tested is Ho: "Opinions are homogenous between the regions as regards the appointment of contractors to undertake projects." Result is presented in Table 3.35(a). Computed value of the Chi-square shows very strong evidence against the Null Hypothesis, which implies that opinions of respondents across the regions are not homogeneous in this respect.

36. Opinion regarding getting jobs within 5 kms. Of the residence of the beneficiaries.

TABLE 3.36

Opinion regarding getting jobs within 5 kms. of the residence of the beneficiaries residence

Perception	SOUTH			CENTRAL		NORTH		TOTAL
	W	NR	I NR X W	NR	II NR X W	NR	III NR X W	I+II+III
Strongly Agree	5	4	20	10	50	6	30	100
Agree	4	85	340	51	205	60	240	785
No opinion	3	6	18	27	81	24	72	171
Disagree	2	3	6	6	12	5	10	28
Strongly Disagree	1	2	2	6	6	5	5	13
		100	386	100	354	100	357	1097/1500 (73.13%)
TABLE 3.36 (a)								
Test Statistic				DOF		Computed Value		T. V.
Chi-square				8		28.88		15.507

Source: Primary Data DOF=Degree of Freedom; TV= Table Value

Table 3.36 analyses and evaluates the opinions of the respondents as regards getting jobs within 5kms. Of the residence of the beneficiaries under MGNREGS. The Table presents the total weighted scores region-wise as well as in aggregate. The aggregate weighted score of 1097/1500, shows that around 73.13% of the

beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that they get jobs within 5 kms. Of their residence. The region-wise weighted scores of all the regions are somewhat close to each other.(see Table 3.36)

In order to test the homogeneity of the opinions of the respondents between the regions, Chi-square test for homogeneity is applied. The hypothesis tested is Ho: "Opinions are homogenous between the regions as regards getting jobs within 5 kms. Of the residence." Result is presented in Table 3.36(a). Computed value of the Chi-square shows very strong evidence against the Null Hypothesis, which implies that opinions of respondents across the regions are not homogeneous in this respect.

37. Opinion regarding getting extra wages to compensate distant jobs

TABLE 3.37

Perception	SOUTH			CENTRAL		NORTH		TOTAL
	W	NR	I NR X W	NR	II NR X W	NR	III NR X W	I+II+III
Strongly Agree	5	0	0	4	20	37	185	205
Agree	4	37	148	32	128	6	24	300
No opinion	3	5	15	31	93	7	21	129
Disagree	2	5	10	7	14	17	34	58
Strongly Disagree	1	52	52	26	26	33	33	111
		100	225	100	281	100	297	803/1500 (53.53%)
TABLE 3.37 (a)								
Test Statistic				DOF		Computed Value		T. V.
Chi-square				8		129.95		15.507

Source: Primary Data DOF=Degree of Freedom; TV= Table Value

Table 3.37 analyses and evaluates the opinions of the respondents as regards getting extra wages for jobs provided beyond 5 kms. from residence. The Table presents the total weighted scores region-wise as well as in aggregate. The aggregate weighted score of 803/1500, shows that only around 53.53% of the

beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that they get extra wages to which they are eligible under MGNREGA. The region-wise weighted scores of all the regions are close to each other and below the cut-off point(300) indicating the agreement to the opinion.(see Table 3.37)

In order to test the homogeneity of the opinions of the respondents between the regions, Chi-square test for homogeneity is applied. The hypothesis tested is Ho: "Opinions are homogenous between the regions as regards getting extra wages for distant jobs." Result is presented in Table 3.37(a). Computed value of the Chi-square shows very strong evidence against the Null Hypothesis, which implies that opinions of respondents across the regions are not homogeneous in this respect.

38. Opinion regarding getting medical facilities at work sites

TABLE 3.38

Perception	SOUTH			CENTRAL		NORTH		TOTAL
	W	NR	I NR X W	NR	II NR X W	NR	III NR X W	I+II+III
Strongly Agree	5	5	25	6	30	40	200	255
Agree	4	83	332	34	136	20	80	548
No opinion	3	6	18	32	96	26	78	192
Disagree	2	4	8	4	8	7	14	30
Strongly Disagree	1	2	2	24	24	7	7	33
		100	385	100	294	100	379	1058/1500 (70.53%)
TABLE 3.38 (a)								
		Test Statistic		DOF		Computed Value		T. V.
		Chi-square		8		137.39		15.07

Source: Primary Data

Table 3.38 analyses and evaluates the opinions of the respondents as regards getting medical facilities at work sites. The Table presents the total weighted scores region-wise as well as in aggregate. The aggregate weighted score of 1058/1500, shows that around 70.53% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that

they get medical facilities at work sites to which they are eligible under MGNREGA. The region-wise weighted scores of south and north regions are close to each other.(see Table 3.38)

In order to test the homogeneity of the opinions of the respondents between the regions, Chi-square test for homogeneity is applied. The hypothesis tested is Ho: "Opinions are homogenous between the regions as regards getting medical facilities at work sites." Result is presented in Table 3.38(a). Computed value of the Chi-square shows very strong evidence against the Null Hypothesis, which implies that opinions of respondents across the regions are not homogeneous in this respect.

39. Opinion regarding getting drinking water facilities at work sites

TABLE 3.39

Responses regarding providing drinking water facilities at work sites

Perception	SOUTH			CENTRAL		NORTH		TOTAL
	W	NR	I NR X W	NR	II NR X W	NR	III NR X W	I+II+III
Strongly Agree	5	5	25	3	15	4	20	60
Agree	4	84	336	53	212	61	244	792
No opinion	3	4	12	34	102	24	72	186
Disagree	2	4	8	5	10	7	14	32
Strongly Disagree	1	3	3	5	5	4	4	12
		100	384	100	344	100	354	1082/1500 (72.13%)
TABLE 3.39 (a)								
Test Statistic				DOF		Computed Value		T. V.
Chi-square				8		32.31		15.507

Source: Primary Data DOF=Degree of Freedom; TV= Table Value

Table 3.39 analyses and evaluates the opinions of the respondents as regards getting drinking water facilities at work sites, for which there is provision in the

MGNREGA. The Table presents the total weighted scores region-wise as well as in aggregate. The aggregate weighted score of 1082/1500, shows that around 72.13% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that they get drinking water facilities at work sites to which they are eligible under MGNREGA. The region-wise weighted scores of all the regions are close to each other. (see Table 3.39)

In order to test the homogeneity of the opinions of the respondents between the regions, Chi-square test for homogeneity is applied. The hypothesis tested is H_0 : "Opinions are homogenous between the regions as regards getting drinking water facilities at work sites." Result is presented in Table 3.37(a). Computed value of the Chi-square shows very strong evidence against the Null Hypothesis, which implies that opinions of respondents across the regions are not homogeneous in this respect.

40. Opinion regarding providing shade facilities for children at work sites

TABLE 3.40

Perception	SOUTH			CENTRAL		NORTH		TOTAL
	W	NR	I NR X W	NR	II NR X W	NR	III NR X W	I+II+III
Strongly Agree	5	6	30	3	15	8	40	85
Agree	4	82	328	55	220	58	240	788
No opinion	3	6	18	34	102	22	66	186
Disagree	2	3	6	4	8	5	10	24
Strongly Disagree	1	3	3	4	34	7	7	14
		100	385	100	349	100	363	1097/1500 (73.13%)
TABLE 3.16 (a)								
Test Statistic				DOF		Computed Value		T. V.
Chi-square				8		30.43		15.507

Source: Primary Data DOF=Degree of Freedom; TV= Table Value

Table 3.40 analyses and evaluates the opinions of the respondents as regards getting shade facilities at work sites for children accompanying the female workers for which there is provision in the MGNREGA. The Table presents the total weighted scores region-wise as well as in aggregate. The aggregate weighted score

of 1097/1500, shows that around 73.13% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that they get shade facilities for their children at work sites to which they are eligible under MGNREGA. The region-wise weighted scores of all the regions are close to each other.(see Table 3.40)

However, in order to test the homogeneity of the opinions of the respondents between the regions, Chi-square test for homogeneity is applied. The hypothesis tested is H_0 : "Opinions are homogenous between the regions as regards getting shade facilities at work sites." Result is presented in Table 3.37(a). Computed value of the Chi-square shows very strong evidence against the Null Hypothesis, which implies that opinions of respondents across the regions are not homogeneous in this respect.

41. Opinion regarding providing service of female worker to look after children at work sites

TABLE 3.41

Responses regarding providing service of female worker to look after children at work sites

Perception	SOUTH			CENTRAL		NORTH		TOTAL
	W	NR	I NR X W	NR	II NR X W	NR	III NR X W	I+II+III
Strongly Agree	5	3	15	4	20	6	30	65
Agree	4	86	346	56	224	61	244	814
No opinion	3	3	9	34	102	22	66	177
Disagree	2	5	10	3	6	6	12	28
Strongly Disagree	1	3	3	3	3	5	5	11
		100	383	100	355	100	347	1095/1500 (73%)
TABLE 3.41 (a)								
Test Statistic				DOF		Computed Value		T. V.
Chi-square				8		35.29		15.507

Source: Primary Data DOF=Degree of Freedom; TV= Table Value

Table 3.41 analyses and evaluates the opinions of the respondents as regards getting service of female worker to look after the children of female workers who accompany them at work sites, for which there is provision in the MGNREGA. The Table presents the total weighted scores region-wise as well as in aggregate. The aggregate weighted score of 1095/1500, shows that around 73% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that they get this facility at work sites to which they are eligible under MGNREGA. The region-wise weighted scores of all the regions are close to each other.(see Table 3.41)

In order to test the homogeneity of the opinions of the respondents between the regions, Chi-square test for homogeneity is applied. The hypothesis tested is Ho: "Opinions are homogenous between the regions as regards getting service of female worker to look after children accompanying at work sites." Result is presented in Table 3.41(a). Computed value of the Chi-square shows very strong evidence against the Null Hypothesis, which implies that opinions of respondents across the regions are not homogeneous.

42. Opinion regarding appointment of full-time programme officer

TABLE3.42

Opinion regarding appointment of full-time programme officer

Perception	SOUTH			CENTRAL		NORTH		TOTAL
	W	NR	I NR X W	NR	II NR X W	NR	III NR X W	I+II+III
Strongly Agree	5	7	35	5	25	7	35	95
Agree	4	77	308	54	216	55	220	744
No opinion	3	6	18	32	96	22	66	180
Disagree	2	6	12	5	10	11	22	44
Strongly Disagree	1	4	4	4	4	5	5	13
		100	377	100	351	100	348	1076/1500 (71.73%)
TABLE 3.42 (a)								
Test Statistic				DOF		Computed Value		T. V.
Chi-square				8		26.04		15.507

Table 3.42 analyses and evaluates the opinions of the respondents as regards appointment of fulltime programme officers, for which there is provision in the MGNREGA. The Table presents the total weighted scores region-wise as well as in aggregate. The aggregate weighted score of 1076/1500, shows that around 71.73% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that fulltime programme officers are appointed. The region-wise weighted scores of all the regions are close to each other. (see Table 3.42)

However, in order to test the homogeneity of the opinions of the respondents between the regions, Chi-square test for homogeneity is applied. The hypothesis tested is H_0 : "Opinions are homogenous between the regions as regards the appointment of fulltime programme officers." Result is presented in Table 3.42(a). Computed value of the Chi-square shows very strong evidence against the Null Hypothesis, which implies that opinions of respondents between the regions are not homogeneous in this respect.

CHAPTER - 4

FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

On the basis of the extensive analyses of the data collected, classified and tabulated using statistical tables and processed using various statistical tools and put to hypothesis testing using chi-square test with the help of an online computer programme offered by a web site- www.statpages.net, the following findings have been arrived at regarding the effectiveness of the implementation of MGNREGS in the state of Kerala.

- 1) As regards the gender of the respondents, it is found that 97 per cent of the respondents are females while only 3 per cent are males. Proportion of female and male respondents region-wise also presents more less the same pattern.
- 1) It is found that 58.67 per cent of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS belong to the age group 35-50, 34 percent belong to the age group above 50 while only 7.33 per cent belong to 25-35 group. It has to be noted that nobody below 25 years of age joins this poverty eradication scheme. Thus, it is observed that majority of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS in Kerala, irrespective of the regions, belong to upper middle age group.
- 2) 95.66 per cent of the respondents belong to the married group, only 1.33 percent belongs to the unmarried group and 3 per cent belong to the widowed group. Thus, it is observed that majority of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS in Kerala, irrespective of the regions, belong to the married group.
- 3) As regards the religion of the respondents, it is found that 70.00 per cent of the respondents belong to the Hindu religion, 26.67 percent belong to the Christian religion and 3.33 per cent belong to the Muslim religion. Thus, it is observed that majority of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS in Kerala, except the North region, belong to the Hindu religion.
- 4) As regards the level and pattern of educational qualification of the respondents it is found that 47 per cent belong to the functionally literate

group, 33 percent to the “upto X” group and 12 per cent to matriculate group. Only a very insignificant proportion of people from the educated section join this massive poverty eradication scheme. Thus, it is observed that majority of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS in Kerala, irrespective of the regions, belong to less educated group

- 5) As regards the pattern of occupation of the head of the family, it is found that around 60 per cent of the respondents belong to the family where the occupation of the head of the family is daily wage., 15 percent are servants, 12 per cent agricultural labourers, 10 percent skilled workers and a negligible 3 percent self employed. Thus, it is observed that majority of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS in Kerala, irrespective of the regions, belong to families where the occupation of the head of family is daily wage earning.
- 6) As regards the pattern of income group of the respondents, it is found that around 81 per cent of the respondents belong to the BPL families whereas only 19 percent belong to the APL families. Thus, it is observed that majority of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS in Kerala, irrespective of the regions, belong to BPL families.
- 7) In respect of the pattern of income level of the respondents before joining MGNREGS, it is found that around 71 per cent of the respondents belonged to the BPL families whose monthly income was below 1000 whereas only 4 percent had a monthly income above Rs.4000. Thus, it is observed that majority of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS in Kerala, irrespective of the regions, belonged to BPL families where the monthly income of the family was below Rs.1000 at the time of joining the scheme.
- 8) As regards the pattern of income level of the respondents after joining MGNREGS it is found that the percentage of families whose monthly income was below 1000 p. m. fell from 71 percent to 38 percent after joining MGNREGS. Similarly, it is also observed that the percentage of the

beneficiaries of MGNREGS whose monthly income above Rs.4000 increased to 13 percent from 4 percent after joining the scheme.

- 9) AS regards the pattern of shift in the income level of the respondents after joining MGNREGS it is found that the number of respondents belonging to the BPL families whose monthly income was below 1000 fell from 212 to 114 after joining MGNREGS, i.e; a reduction of more than 46 percent. Similarly, the shifts in the other income groups also are conspicuous.
- 10) AS regards the type of the residence of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS it is found that in the case of around 39 per cent of the respondents, homes have tiled roof and 37 percent respondents have concrete building. Thatched homes are only 10 percent and huts only 3 percent. However, wide variations are noted in the pattern of distribution between regions in this respect.
- 13) As regards the electrified status of the residence of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS, it is found that around 81.33 per cent of the respondents do have homes which are electrified, whereas not-electrified homes are only 18.67 percent.
- 14) As regards the ownership status of the residence of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS, it is found that in the case of around 66.67 per cent of the respondents, the ownership of their houses are vested with their spouses. In the case of 24.33 percent respondents, ownership is vested with themselves and in the case 9 percent, it is with others.
- 15) As regards the status of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS in their families i.e; whether they are heads of the families or not, it is found that around 55.33 per cent of the respondents are heads of families and others are not. However, wide variations are noted in the pattern of distribution of families between regions in this respect.
- 16) As far as the status of the basic domestic facilities-toilet facility- at the residence of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are concerned, it is found that in the case of around 40 per cent of the respondents , they have toilet facility

attached to their houses. In the case of 51 percent, outside their house and 6 percent have facilities of other mode and 2.00 percent have no toilet facility.

- 17) In respect of the availability of the basic domestic facilities-drinking water facility- at the residence of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS, it is found that in the case of 39 per cent of the respondents, they have drinking water facility attached to their houses in the form of inside pipe. In the case of 24 percent, outside their house in the form of own wells, 11 percent have facility of common tap, 18 percent depend on neighbors, and 8 have facilities of other mode.
- 18) With respect to the availability of the basic domestic facilities-main fuel - at the residence of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS, it is found that in the case of 52 per cent of the respondents, they have LPG as their main fuel. 35 percent use firewood as their main fuel and others have facilities of other mode- kerosine, electricity etc.
- 19) I respect of the possession of household items at the residence of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS, it is found that in the case of majority of the respondents, they have commonly used household items like mixer, TV, fridge and mobile phones. Two-wheelers and sewing machines are only rare. The prevalence of mobile phones is, however, noteworthy
- 19) As regards the number of working days provided to the beneficiaries, it is found that in the case of 14 per cent of the respondents only, they are provided with 100 days work as envisaged in the Act. In the case of 15 percent respondents, work between 50-75 days and 26 percent, work between 50-75 days have been provided, while almost half of them (45 percent)) get work only for a period less than 50 days.
- 20) As regards the type of works offered, it is found that 91 per cent of the respondents opine that they have been provided with water conservation and allied works as envisaged in the Act. 84 percent respondents opine that drought relief and aforestation works are also offered to them. It is, however,

observed that Minor irrigation and Irrigation in SC/ST land are areas attracting scanty attention of the authorities while preparing shelf of projects and allotting jobs.

- 21) As regards period worked under this scheme, it is found that majority of the respondents (around 76 %) have worked under this scheme for a period more than three years.
- 22) In respect of the area of landholdings by the beneficiaries, it is found that in the case of 23 per cent of the respondents, they have only less than 4 cents of land in their possession. 36 have percent respondents have land between 4 and 8cents. Thus, majority have only less than 8 cents of land.
- 23) As regards the income before and after joining the MGNREGS, it is found that the average income before joining the scheme was only Rs.811.98 and it rises to Rs.2069.87 after joining the scheme; i.e; an increase of 154.92%.
- 24) AS regards the spending patterns of the beneficiaries, it is found that on an average 29.46% of the income is spent on food items across the regions, 20.22% on healthcare, 22.92% on education of their children, 7.33% on entertainment, 12.87% on communication purpose(phone bills etc;) and 7.19% for other miscellaneous needs.
- 25) As regards the opinions of the respondents as regards the promptness of wage distribution under MGNREGS in Kerala, around 66.6% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS favour with the statement that wage payment takes place promptly under MGNREGS However, as per the result of the test of hypothesis, the region-wise, opinions are not homogeneous.
- 26) In respect of the opinions of the respondents as regards the payment of unemployment wage under MGNREGS, only around 43.33% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS favours the opinion that unemployment wage payment takes place promptly under MGNREGS.

- 28) With respect to the opinions of the respondents as regards the preparation of shelf of projects by the panchayat authorities ,as required under MGNREGA, around 69.6% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that shelf of projects as required by the Act are promptly prepared under MGNREGS.
- 29) As regards the opinions of the respondents as regards the preparation of muster roll by the authorities under MGNREGS, around 77.20% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that muster rolls are prepared and maintained properly under MGNREGS.
- 30) With respect to the opinions of the respondents as regards the conducting of Gramsabhas under MGNREGS, around 75.40% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that Gramsabhas are conducted promptly.
- 31) As regards the opinions of the respondents in respect of conducting the social audit under MGNREGS, around 69.60% of the beneficiaries are of the opinion that social audits are conducted promptly under MGNREGS.
- 32) In the case of the opinions of the respondents as regards making available the records of the MGNREGS for social audit by the authorities, around 72.40% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that authorities make available the records properly for social audit.
- 33) In respect of the opinions of the respondents as regards keeping complaint register by the programme officer of the MGNREGS, around 70.86% of the respondents are of the opinion that complaint register is being kept properly.
- 34) With regard to the opinions of the respondents as regards the complaints redressal mechanism in the district and block level, around 71.60% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that there is proper complaints redressal mechanism in the district and block level. .
- 35) In the case of the opinions of the respondents as regards appointing contractors for undertaking projects under MGNREGS, around 76.46% of the

beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that contractors are not appointed under MGNREGS to undertake projects.

- 36) In respect of the opinions of the respondents as regards getting jobs within 5kms.of the residence of the beneficiaries under MGNREGS, 73.13% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that they get jobs within 5 kms. of their residence.
- 37) With respect to the opinions of the respondents as regards getting extra wages for jobs provided beyond 5 kms. from residence, 53.53% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that they get extra wages to which they are eligible under MGNREGA. .
- 38) In respect of the opinions of the respondents as regards getting medical facilities at work sites, 70.53% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that they get medical facilities at work sites to which they are eligible under MGNREGA. .
- 39) As regards the opinions of the respondents regarding getting drinking water facilities at work sites, for which there is provision in the MGNREGA, 72.13% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that they get drinking water facilities at work sites.
- 40) In respect of the opinions of the respondents as regards getting shade facilities at work sites for children accompanying the female workers for which there is provision in the MGNREGA, 73.13% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that they get shade facilities for their children at work sites.
- 41) With respect to the opinions of the respondents as regards getting service of female worker to look after the children of female workers who accompany them at work sites, for which there is provision in the MGNREGA, 73% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS are of the opinion that they get this facility at work sites.

- 42) In respect of the opinions of the respondents as regards appointment of fulltime programme officers, for which there is provision in the MGNREGA, 71.73% of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS favour the opinion that fulltime programme officers are appointed. .
- 43) Except with regard to the marital status of the beneficiaries the responses of the beneficiaries are not homogeneous across the regions as indicated by the results of chi-square tests.
- 44) Like-wise, except in respect of payment of unemployment wages, all the responses are favourable to the opinions examined which are indicative of the effectiveness of implementation of the MGNREGS. However, between regions, opinions are not homogeneous, as evidenced by the results of statistical tests performed.

Conclusion

On the basis findings that have been arrived at, the study concludes with the following observations.

- 1) Participation of the male members in the MGNREGS is negligible. It is fully dominated by females.
- 2) Majority of the beneficiaries are not only females, but mostly upper-middle aged and married. Young and unmarried beneficiaries are negligible.
- 3) All sections of the society are not found taking advantage of this mega wage-employment scheme.
- 4) Only less educated section of the society are found attracted to this scheme as well as most of them are from the BPL category, though there is no restriction of any sort on the APL category to join the scheme.
- 5) The income levels of the beneficiaries are found to rise considerably after joining the MGNREGS.

- 6) The houses of most of the respondents have either tiled roof or concrete roof and mostly electrified also. Ownership is vested either with themselves or with their spouses, in most of the cases.
- 7) Almost all the families of the respondents have basic domestic facilities such as toilet, drinking water, LPG as main fuel and majority own amenities of life such as mixer, TV, fridge, mobile phones etc.
- 8) The guaranteed 100 days are found to have provided only to a very minority of beneficiaries; whereas majority of the projects undertaken are in conformity with the schedule of projects envisaged in the Act. However, only scanty attention is found to have given on minor irrigation and irrigation of SC/ST land.
- 9) Majority of the respondents have more than three years' experience in the scheme.
- 10) Majority of respondents hold only less than 8 cents land; however, there is considerable rise in their monthly income after joining the scheme.
- 11) The spending pattern of most of the beneficiaries is more or less balanced covering the necessities of life and at least some areas of comforts.
- 12) In respect of most of these factors, wide variations in the patterns are found across the regions.
- 13) Perceptions of the respondents on various implementation aspects of the schemes which throw light on the effectiveness of the implementation are mostly positive and favourable . However, in this respect also, homogeneity is not found between the regions.

In the light of all these observations and inferences, it can, thus be concluded that MGNREGS acts as an effective and useful tool to alleviate the problem of poverty, to a considerable extent, in the state of Kerala. It is successful in enhancing livelihood security of households in rural areas and the scheme is successful in

creating durable assets and strengthening the livelihood resource –base of the rural poor. It can be observed that the works by the schemes address the causes of chronic poverty, like drought, deforestation and soil erosion and the process of employment generation is more or less on a sustainable basis. The scheme is able to improve the purchasing power of the rural people below poverty line, and it can be said that introduction of scheme has led to the shifting of the economic basis of the rural poor and in the execution of the scheme, priority as envisaged in the Act is given to the rural women (33% is set apart for women). Though there are divergent views on the working and success of the schemes and adverse reports from various corners, it can be said that, to a considerable extent, the implementing authority is properly adhering to the various provisions of the Act for its proper execution by preparing the shelf of projects promptly and by constituting proper redressal mechanism etc.

Suggestions

The success of any programme or scheme, whether governmental, private or otherwise, depends on the active involvement and participation of all the stakeholders. In the case of MGNREGS also, it is true and applicable. The implementing machinery has to be so harnessed to attract all the constituents in the target group to the scheme and take the expected advantage out of it. Some of the thrust areas found neglected or side-tracked must be brought to the mainstream along with the other areas. Efforts must be made to fully comply with the guarantee of 100 days to all the job-seekers who are willing to work.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ashok K. Pankaj, (2012) "Right to Work and Rural India" SAGE publications India Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi

Bagchi ,K.K, (2011), "MGNREGA-As Right to Employment" Abhijeet Publications, New Delhi.

Gopalan C; B. V Rama Sastri, (1999) "Nutritive Value of Indian Foods", National Institute of Nutrition, Hyderabad.

Jha .S.Chandra (2013), "Poverty, Unemployment and National Rural Livelihood Mission", Abhijeet Publications, New Delhi

Kannan ,N (2008), "Rural Development and Social Change", Abhijeet Publications, New Delhi.

Lal H.K, (2012) "Empowering Rural Development through Panchayats", Mohit Publications, New Delhi.

Lalitha N and Nagarajan B.S (2002), "Self Help Groups in Rural Development," Dominant Publishers, New Delhi.

Mishra A .K, (1998) " Rural Tension In India" Discovery Publishing House, New Delhi.

Narwani, (2002) " Training for Rural Development", Rawat Publications, Jaipur.

Patil B.S (2012)-The Dynamics of Global Poverty, Pearl Books, Daryaganj, New Delhi

Purohit M.K (2014), "Self Help Groups in Rural Development, ASTHA Publishers, New Delhi

Sarkar S. S and Papori Barua, (2007) "Rural Development: Socio- Economic Perspective" Mangal Deep Publication, Jaipur.

Samanta , R.K (2000) "New Vista in Rural Development-Strategies and Approaches", B.R Publishing Corporation, New Delhi

Sam, Bob B, (1998) "Participation of the poor in Rural Development Programme- Selected Case Studies" Discovery Publishing House, New Delhi.

Shepherd,Andrew (1998)"Sustainable Rural Development", Palgrave, McMillan

Singh ,Bhagirath (2001) "Rural Finance" R B S A Publishers, Jaipur.

Singh ,R.P (1987) "Sociology of Rural Development in India", Discovery Publishing House New Delhi.

Suguna B, (2006)"Empowerment of Rural Women Through Self Help Groups", Discovery Publishing House, New Delhi

Tamilarasan.M (2012)-"Poverty Alleviation and Rural Development", Abhijeet Publications, New Delhi

Print Media

The Hindu

Malayala Manorama

Web sites

www.nrega.nic.in

www.rural.nic.in

www.indiastat.com

www.indiaenvironmentportal.org.in

APPENDIX

Schedule of Questions

A STUDY ON EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF MGNREGS AS A MEASURE OF POVERTY ALLEVIATION IN KERALA STATE

PERSONAL DETAILS

1. Name and Address :

District :

Panchayat :

2. Gender : Male / Female

3. Age :

Age Group (Yrs)	<25	25-35	35-50	Above 50
Put ✓ mark				

4. Mother Tongue :

Malayalam	Tamil	Others (Specify)

5. Place of Residence :

Rural	Semi-urban	Urban

6. Marital Status :

Married	Un-married	Divorced	Separated	Widowed	Others (Specify)

7. Religion :

Hindu	Christian	Muslim	Others (Specify)

8. Educational Qualifications :

Functional Literate	Upto 10	10 th Std.	+2	Graduate	P. G.	Others (Specify)

9. Occupation of the Head of the House :

Self employed	Agricultural Labourer	Domestic Servant	Construction Worker	Coolie	Artisan	Others (Specify)

10. Whether belonging to :

APL	BPL

11. Monthly Income :

Income	Below 1000	1000- 2000	2000- 3000	3000- 4000	Above 4000
At Entry					
At Present					

12. Are you staying in: Put ✓ mark.

Type of occupancy	Type of building	Hut	Thatched	Tiled	Concrete	Others (Specify)
Own						
	At Present					
Rented (Specify and)	At Entry					
	At Present					
Use without rent	At Entry					
	At Present					
Others (Specify)	At Entry					
	At Present					

13. Is the House Electrified ?

Yes	No

14. Title of the house belongs to ?

Times period	Particulars	Self	Spouse / Any others	Others (Specify)

15. Are you head of the Household

Yes	No

16. Your Income :

Source		At Entry	At Present
Self	NREG		
	Others		
	Total		

17. Specify the following features. Put ✓ mark.

Particulars	
A. Bathing & Toilet facilities in the house 1. Attached Bathroom 2. Outside the house 3. Any others	
B. Drinking water facilities 1. Piped with the dwelling/compound 2. Own well 3. Public outdoor Tap 4. Community well 5. Access to, other HH's Private Water Source 6. Any others (Specify)	
C. Main Fuel 1. LPG 2. Kerosene 3. Electricity 4. Firewood 5. Any others (Specify)	
Method of Lighting 1. Electricity 2. Kerosene 3. Any others (Specify)	

18. Details of Assets :

Name of Asset		
	Qty	Value (Amount)

19. House hold Appliances

Items		
	Qty	Value
1. Mixer / Grinder		
2. Two - wheeler		
3. TV & Cable		
4. Fridge		
5. Telephone - Mobile		
6. Sewing Machine		
7. Others (Specify)		

20. How many years you have been in MGNREGS

From the beginning	0-1	1-2	2-3	3-4	4-5	Above 5

21. Do you have a Bank Account ?

Yes	No

22. Items of Expenditure

Items		%
Food		

Healthcare		
Education of Children's		
Entertainment		
Communication (Phone bill etc.)		
Others (Specify)		

23. Your Personal Savings

At Entry	At Present

24. No. of days work received in a year.

100 days	75-100	50-75	25-50	Less than 25

25. Wage payment under MGNREGS is prompt and regular

Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

26. When no job is given, get unemployment wages

Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

27. Shelf of project is promptly prepared

Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

28. The muster roll is properly prepared and kept in your Panchayat?

Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

29. The Gramasabha properly monitors the execution of the project?

Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

30. Gramasabha conduct regular social audit of all the projects

Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

31. Gram Panchayat properly keep and make available all relevant documents for social audit

Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

32. The Programme Officer maintain complaint register?

Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

33. There are grievance redressal mechanisms at block and District level

Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

34. The mechanism work well?

Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

35. The Panchayat does not engage contractors for implementing the projects

Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

36. We get employment within 5 km of your resides

Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

37. We get the following facilities at work place.

	Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Medical care					
Drinking water					
Shade for children					
Service of a woman to look after children where more than 5.					