

EPRA International Journal of Economic and Business Review - Peer Reviewed Journal

Volume - 7, Issue -12, December 2019 | e-ISSN : 2347 - 9671 | p- ISSN : 2349 - 0187

SJIF Impact Factor(2019): 8.045||ISI Value:1.433 || Journal DOI URL :https://doi.org/10.36713/epra2012

IMPACT OF MGNREGA ON RURAL LIVELIHOODS OF BALLARI DISTRICT

| V.A. Chowdappa | Assistant Professor, Department of Studies in Economics, Vijayanagara Si Krishnadevaraya University, Post Graduate Centre, Nandihalli-Sandur, |
|-----------------------|---|
| Dr. Basavaraj S Benni | Professor and Director, Department of Studies in Economics, Vijayanagara Si Krishnadevaraya University, Post Graduate Centre, Koppal. |

ABSTRACT

DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra2989

Poverty and unemployment are the main challenges to the economic development. Eradication of these two problems will contribute towards development of the economy to take new heights. Present research has posed the questions either MGNREGA givens positive or negative results? Who can benefit from MGNREGA? With this background, this paper is to find out what is the contribution of MGNREGA towards socio-economic status of the beneficiaries in Sandur and Kudligit taluks of Ballari District. This study used primary as well secondary sources of data. Descriptive statistical tools have been used to analysed the data to get the inferences. Inferences discloses the that the scheme has impacted positively on socio economic status of the beneficiaries.

KEY WORDS: Socio Economic Status, MGNREGA

1.INTRODUCTION

Poverty and unemployment are the main challenges to the economic development. Eradication of these two problems will contribute towards development of the economy to take new heights. India has made a significant improvement in eradication of Poverty and unemployment with all the efforts of the government of India and various state governments. Most of rural families do not have sufficient employment. In this situation, government feels that through MGNREGA it creates employment and support these rural families come forward in good position. Therefore, government has launched MGNREGS on 2nd February 2006 in Anantapur district in Andhrapradesh. Initially this scheme was implemented in 200 districts of the country.

MGNREGA is the most significant act in the history of Indian polity in many ways like grass-root level participation of every citizen and beneficiary through democratic process, multi-layered social audit and transparency mechanism by involvement of civil society, comprehensive planning at village level towards sustainable and equitable development etc. Important salient feature of the Act is to improve the quality of life of rural people who are vulnerable to out-migration in search of daily wage employment by channelizing the wage workforce towards developmental activities at the village level itself

Table 1: Employment Generation under MGNREGA in Ballari district (Year 2018-19)

| Sl No. | Taluks | No. of HH issued job cards | Employment demanded | | Employ Provi | | Average Person | No. of Families |
|-----------|---------------|--|------------------------|---------|-----------------|---------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| | | | Household | Persons | Household | Persons | days per household | Completed 100 days |
| 1 | Ballari | 58391 | 20243 | 48121 | 17919 | 40121 | 39.43 | 908 |
| 2 | Hadagali | 33694 | 20735 | 45134 | 18725 | 39125 | 67.57 | 5265 |
| 3 | H B Halli | 30092 | 21598 | 46867 | 20545 | 43331 | 65.82 | 4651 |
| 4 | Harapanahalli | 50590 | 21426 | 46928 | 19200 | 40038 | 55.74 | 2607 |
| 5 | Hosapete | 29643 | 11858 | 25075 | 10323 | 20372 | 50.60 | 1221 |
| 6 | Kudligi | 47492 | 20342 | 43124 | 18185 | 36191 | 52.24 | 2207 |
| 7 | Sandur | 29044 | 12954 | 30247 | 10029 | 21419 | 49.69 | 1002 |
| 8 | Siruguppa | 33310 | 15480 | 35144 | 14140 | 30616 | 37.96 | 699 |
| | Total | 312256 | 144636 | 320640 | 129066 | 271213 | 53.47 | 18560 |

Source: www.nrega.nic.in

It shows that from Table 1 that the number of households issued job cards, employment demanded and provided. It also reveals that the percentage of average person days of employment per household from MGNREGA was very low in the district of Ballari. only 53% of households benefitted

from the scheme. In Ballari district, Hadagali taluk provides highest employment i.e. 67% of household followed by H.B.Halli and Ballari taluk proved low employment i.e. only 39% followed by Sandur taluk.

Table :2 Employment Generation under MGNREGA in Kudligi Taluk (Year 2018-19)

| S | Table 12 Employ | No. of | | | Employ | | Average | |
|------|-------------------|--------|------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| No. | Panchayats | HH | Employment demanded | | Provided | | person | No. of |
| 110. | | issued | uemanueu 110viueu | | days | Families | | |
| | | job | Household | Persons | Household | Persons | per | Completed |
| | | cards | nouscholu | 1 0130113 | Householu | 1 0130113 | household | 100 days |
| 1 | Aluru | 1715 | 943 | 1940 | 888 | 1746 | 40.63 | 52 (5.5) |
| 2 | Appayyanahalli | 1409 | 851 | 1929 | 809 | 1712 | 64.78 | 115 (13.5) |
| 3 | Badeladaku | 1244 | 518 | 1063 | 493 | 943 | 40.06 | 12 (2.3) |
| 4 | Banavikallu | 1578 | 577 | 1151 | 551 | 1051 | 44.30 | 42 (7.2) |
| 5 | Belligatti | 1577 | 930 | 1697 | 874 | 1484 | 69.31 | 223 (24.0) |
| 6 | Chirabi | 647 | 306 | 727 | 220 | 481 | 46.80 | 24 (7.8) |
| 7 | Chirathagundu | 862 | 596 | 1523 | 572 | 1359 | 49.96 | 30 (5.0) |
| 8 | Chowdapura | 1542 | 511 | 1059 | 456 | 882 | 33.29 | 17 (3.3) |
| 9 | Dupadahalli | 1482 | 758 | 1754 | 690 | 1476 | 53.97 | 81 (10.7) |
| 10 | Gandabommanahalli | 1463 | 1098 | 2506 | 1062 | 2347 | 64.27 | 137 (12.5) |
| 11 | Gudekote | 1475 | 709 | 1461 | 644 | 1269 | 53.05 | 92 (12.9) |
| 12 | Gundumunugu | 1812 | 832 | 1840 | 765 | 1634 | 57.18 | 107 (12.9) |
| 13 | Harakabavi | 1331 | 362 | 716 | 310 | 591 | 60.12 | 68 (18.8) |
| 14 | Herehegdal | 963 | 281 | 669 | 206 | 450 | 38.55 | 12 (4.3) |
| 15 | Herekumbalakunte | 1619 | 530 | 1057 | 415 | 827 | 35.58 | 14 (2.6) |
| 16 | Hosahalli | 2055 | 357 | 833 | 329 | 700 | 40.13 | 19 (5.3) |
| 17 | Hudem | 1424 | 468 | 971 | 395 | 769 | 38.59 | 18 (3.8) |
| 18 | Hurulihal | 1255 | 649 | 1223 | 616 | 1131 | 58.86 | 114 (17.6) |
| 19 | Hyala | 843 | 248 | 538 | 178 | 347 | 72.17 | 57 (22.9) |
| 20 | Jarmali | 1049 | 490 | 820 | 438 | 703 | 45.33 | 44 (8.9) |
| 21 | Jummobanahalli | 1313 | 382 | 770 | 361 | 690 | 49.96 | 42 (11.0) |
| 22 | K. Ayyenahalli | 1978 | 1078 | 2309 | 1001 | 1978 | 52.02 | 100 (9.3) |
| 23 | Kakkuppi | 893 | 263 | 531 | 209 | 380 | 46.03 | 22 (8.3) |
| 24 | Kalapura | 922 | 626 | 1386 | 603 | 1274 | 58.05 | 89 (14.2) |
| 25 | Kandagallu | 1239 | 602 | 1281 | 476 | 915 | 50.22 | 52 (8.4) |
| 26 | Makanadaku | 1410 | 627 | 1149 | 591 | 1024 | 52.26 | 73 (11.6) |
| 27 | Moraba | 888 | 439 | 897 | 406 | 794 | 60.42 | 76 (17.3) |
| 28 | Nagarakatte | 910 | 402 | 944 | 315 | 679 | 68.52 | 97 (24.1) |
| 29 | Nimbalagere | 1350 | 564 | 1315 | 496 | 997 | 52.83 | 60 (10.3) |
| 30 | Pujarahalli | 1490 | 800 | 1631 | 764 | 1505 | 40.55 | 40 (5.0) |
| 31 | Ramadurga | 1443 | 377 | 730 | 203 | 360 | 33.26 | 11 (2.9) |
| 32 | Ramapura | 1372 | 575 | 1271 | 508 | 1021 | 59.53 | 88 (15.3) |
| 33 | Sivapura | 1356 | 355 | 622 | 331 | 553 | 51.32 | 37 (10.4) |
| 34 | Suladahalli | 1266 | 336 | 783 | 206 | 442 | 47.42 | 27 (8.1) |
| 35 | Thulahalli | 933 | 480 | 1120 | 408 | 847 | 53.03 | 62 (12.5) |
| 36 | Ujjini | 1384 | 422 | 908 | 396 | 830 | 56.33 | 53 (12.5) |
| | Total | 47492 | 20342 | 43124 | 18185 | 36191 | 52.24 | 2207 |
| | - | 1 | 20012 | 10121 | 10100 | 30171 | 02.21 | (10.84) |

Source: www.nrega.nic.in

Note: Within the parenthesis indicates that percentage of households provided by employment

Table 2 reveals that the number of households issued job cards, employment demanded and provided in Kudligi taluk. It also discloses that the percentage of average person days of employment per household from MGNREGA was very low in the district of Ballari. only 52.24% of households benefitted

from the scheme. In Kudligi Taluk, Hyala Panchayat provides highest employment i.e. 72 % of household followed by Belligatti and Ramadurga Panchayat taluk proved low employment i.e. only 33.26% followed by Chowdapura taluk.

Table: 3 Employment Generation under MGNREGA in Sandur Taluk (Year 2018-19)

| | | No. of HH issued | Employment demanded | | Employment Provided | | Average person | No. of Families |
|-----|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------|------------------------|---------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Sl | | job | | | | | days per | Completed |
| No. | Panchayats | cards | Household | Persons | Household | Persons | household | 100 days |
| 1 | Agrahara | 871 | 307 | 789 | 162 | 396 | 59.64 | 18(5.9) |
| 2 | Anthapura | 1383 | 706 | 1643 | 453 | 1034 | 39.62 | 10(1.4) |
| 3 | Bandri | 1333 | 536 | 1383 | 446 | 1007 | 24.40 | 4(0.8) |
| 4 | Bannihatti | 795 | 598 | 1283 | 496 | 972 | 64.48 | 119(20) |
| 5 | Bhujanganagara | 1056 | 461 | 847 | 375 | 650 | 42.76 | 0(0) |
| 6 | Bommaghatta | 1543 | 594 | 1482 | 477 | 1090 | 70.95 | 151(25.4) |
| 7 | Choranuru | 1231 | 908 | 1994 | 846 | 1764 | 65.82 | 189(20.8) |
| 8 | Devagiri | 630 | 308 | 619 | 247 | 376 | 48.60 | 16(5.2) |
| 9 | Dharoji | 2100 | 634 | 1331 | 580 | 1159 | 35.76 | 3(0.5) |
| 10 | Errayyanahalli | 1413 | 513 | 1384 | 328 | 768 | 36.82 | 5(1.0) |
| 11 | Gollalingammanahalli | 1744 | 558 | 1317 | 362 | 769 | 36.88 | 14(2.5) |
| 12 | H K Halli | 1133 | 415 | 1164 | 370 | 932 | 47.08 | 44(10.6) |
| 13 | Kalingere | 1628 | 554 | 1313 | 469 | 1032 | 50.08 | 54(9.7) |
| 14 | Krishnanagara | 882 | 274 | 575 | 125 | 209 | 30.86 | 12(4.4) |
| 15 | Metriki | 1168 | 940 | 2275 | 888 | 2015 | 53.24 | 69(7.3) |
| 16 | Narasingapura | 863 | 626 | 1272 | 238 | 439 | 42.30 | 23(3.7) |
| 17 | Nidugurthi | 1228 | 605 | 1490 | 576 | 1378 | 63.86 | 80(13.2) |
| 18 | Shushelanagara | 1631 | 272 | 557 | 161 | 271 | 39.73 | 9(3.3) |
| 19 | Sovenahalli | 706 | 351 | 903 | 213 | 525 | 47.51 | 5(1.4) |
| 20 | Thaluru | 871 | 295 | 683 | 183 | 388 | 38.82 | 7(2.4) |
| 21 | Tharanagara | 804 | 488 | 1026 | 421 | 778 | 55.83 | 28(5.7) |
| 22 | Thoranagallu | 360 | 315 | 607 | 165 | 254 | 44.92 | 6(1.9) |
| 23 | U Rajapura | 858 | 376 | 947 | 270 | 584 | 36.11 | 9(2.4) |
| 24 | Vaddu | 645 | 205 | 547 | 167 | 409 | 55.18 | 26(12.7) |
| 25 | Vittalapura | 1232 | 644 | 1726 | 600 | 1426 | 58.87 | 84(13.1) |
| 26 | Yashwanthanagara | 936 | 471 | 1090 | 411 | 794 | 39.86 | 17(3.6) |
| | Total | 29044 | 12954 | 30247 | 10029 | 21419 | 49.69 | 1002(7.74) |

Source: www.nrega.nic.in

Note: Within the parenthesis indicates that percentage of households provided by employment

Table 3 reveals that the number of households issued job cards, employment demanded and provided in Sandur taluk. It also shows that the percentage of average person days of employment per household (7.74) from MGNREGA was very low in Sandur taluk. Only 52.24% of households benefitted from the scheme. In Sandur Taluk, Bommaghatta Panchayat provides highest employment i.e. 70 % of household followed by Choranuru and Bandri Panchayat taluk proved low employment i.e. only 24.40 % followed by Krishnanagara taluk.

2.REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Narayan (2008) has studied the impact of MGNREGA in Villupuram district of Tamil Nadu. He used both primary and secondary data to collect the data relating to the MGNREGA. he found MGNREGA as essential and an employment prospect for the women in Tamil Nadu and 41% of MGNREGA women have acknowledged it as the basis of revenue for their families.

Sankari. And Sivamurugan (2009), in their research article has analysed that unemployment is the main reason for the existence of poverty in rural areas in India. For that the

government has launched many employment generations programmes, mere providing such employment programmes in it does not improve their economic condition. But with the launching of the NREGP it has improved the economic condition of the poor people by giving employment opportunities to the rural poor in the country, with a special social safety needs, helping in reduction of poverty and improves the rural infrastructure in many ways.

Mahapatra (2010) examined MGNREGA in Kerala, Tamil Nadu and Rajasthan. The researcher found that the women's work contribution is more than men under the programme and this guaranteed employment had turned as an opportunity of economic freedom for women workers. In Kerala all the worksite managements have been put on the responsibility of Self-help groups i.e. on Kudumbashree. Further he found that half of the representation in Panchayats and village development plan are from the women workers.

Roy (2013) the study emphasized the features of MGNREGA. The study reveals that the scheme is very effective in addressing the problem of poverty in India which is the main cause of vulnerability of life. By creating income,

it has been acting as a helpline in accessing social services for MGNREGA workers.

3.STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Poverty and Unemployment are the main socio-economic problems of any country. Eradication of these two problems will contribute towards development of the country necessary to take the economy to new heights. India has made a considerable progress in eradication of these two problems with all the efforts of the government of India. To provide 100 days employment to non-skilled laborers of rural areas MGNREGA had introduced. Because it assures that households are getting basic minimum income. Having this background in mind the study put forward the following Question. What is the socio-economic situation of MGNREGA beneficiaries? are any change after MGNERGA or not? With this background this paper is to find out what is the contribution of MGNREGA towards socio-economic status and change in employment after MGNREGA in Sandur and Kudligi taluks of Ballari District.

4.OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Objectives are nothing but the targeted goals which the researcher proposes to justify with the due some aims behind it. hence, this study will be carried out by keeping in mind the two major objectives.

 to know the socio-economic conditions of MGNREGA beneficiaries 2. To analyse the impact of MGNREGA on the beneficiaries and their livelihood in the study area.

5.METHODOLOGY

Ballari district is situated in Kalyana Karnataka region. The aim was to obtain first-hand information about the impact of MGNREGA on socio-economic conditions and their livelihood. The study was based on primary data collected from the beneficiaries residing in Kudligi and Sandur Taluks of Ballari District. A sample of 200 respondents was conveniently selected for the study 100 from each taluk. A structured questionnaire was framed in keeping view the purposes of the study to examine the socio-economic status, livelihood patterns of the respondents. The data has been analysed by using suitable statistical methods.

6.LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The present study has got certain limitations which actually paves way for future researches in this area. The limitations are:

- The present study considered only 200 samples.
- > The study analysed samples from only from 2 taluks of Ballari district.

7.ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSIONS 7.1 Socio-economic characteristics of the respondents:

In any economic activities, the socio-economic position of respondents is said to have a greater behaviour on the concert in the action selected.

Table: 4 Socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents.

| Sl No | No Socio-Economic Characteristics | | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-----------|------------|
| | of the Resi | | | |
| 1 | Gender | Male | 129 | 64.5 |
| | | Female | 71 | 35.5 |
| | Total | | 200 | 100 |
| 2 | Age | 21-30 | 56 | 28 |
| | | 31-40 | 73 | 36.5 |
| | | 41-50 | 48 | 24 |
| | | 50 and above | 23 | 11.5 |
| | Total | | 200 | 100 |
| 3 | Marital status | Married | 169 | 84.5 |
| | | Unmarried | 31 | 15.5 |
| | Total | | 200 | 100 |
| 4 | Education Status | Illiterate | 19 | 9.5 |
| | | Primary | 58 | 29 |
| | | High school | 65 | 32.5 |
| | | Intermediate | 46 | 23 |
| | | Degree and above | 12 | 6 |
| | Total | | 200 | 100 |
| 5 | Religion | Hindu | 165 | 82.5 |
| | | Muslim | 19 | 9.5 |
| | | Others | 16 | 8 |
| | Total | | 200 | 100 |
| 6 | Average Land Holding | Landless | 36 | 18 |
| | size of Beneficiaries | Less than 3 acres | 106 | 53 |
| | | 3 to 5 acres | 52 | 26 |
| | | More than 5 acres | 6 | 3 |
| | Total | | 200 | 100 |
| 7 | Average monthly | Less than 2000 | 25 | 12.5 |
| | income of the | 2000 to 4000 | 111 | 55.5 |
| | Respondents | spondents 4000 to 6000 | | 28 |
| | | 8 | 4 | |
| | Total | | 200 | 100 |

Source: Primary data

Table 4 shows the socio-economic aspects of the respondents in the study area like Gender, age, marital Status, Education status, religion average land holding size and average monthly income. Out of the total respondents 64.5 % were male and 35.5% were female. 84.5 % respondents were married and 15.5 % were unmarried. Coming to the education status 9.5 % are illiterate, 29% and 32.5 %, 23% and 6% of the respondents are educated primary, high school, intermediate, graduate and above level respectively.

Religion of respondents in the study area depicts that 82.5 % of respondents were Hindu and 9.5 % were Muslims, Other religious community are 8 %. In Land holdings, the 18% people are landless and 53%, 26% and 3% of the

respondents up to 3 acres, 3 to 5 acres and more than 5 acreshave land holdings respectively. Out of the 200 respondents, 12.5%, 55.5%, 28% and 4% of the respondents have income less than 2000, 2000 to 4000, 4000 to 6000 and >6000 respectively.

7.2Impact of MGNREGA on beneficiaries

In order to minimize unemployment in rural areas, the government of India launched a number of programmes and schemes from time to time. This segment is trying to bring out the impact of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act scheme on various important attributes which contribute to the enhancement of quality of life.

Table:5 Socio-economic of MGNREGA on the respondents

| Sl. No | Impact opinion | Frequency | Percent |
|--------|---|-----------|---------|
| 1 | MGNREGA has improve the equal status of male and female | 145 | 72.5 |
| 2 | MGNREGA has improve the employment in rural areas | 120 | 60 |
| 3 | MGNREGA has led to the increase in the income of the workers. | 168 | 84 |
| 4 | MGNREGA has improved the Purchasing capacity. | 158 | 79 |
| 5 | MGNREGA has impacted on hike in wages paid to male/female workers | 175 | 87.5 |
| | other than MNREGA works. | | |
| 6 | MGNREGA has increased non-food expenditure. | 156 | 78 |
| 7 | MGNREGA has increased rural savings | 146 | 73 |
| 8 | MGNREGA has Increased repayment of Debt | 123 | 61.5 |
| 10 | MGNREGA overall socio-economic aspects of life | 178 | 89 |

Source: Primary Data

8.SUGGESTIONS

In order to make the programme more fruitful, following suggestions on the basis of study are given which are required to be implemented

- The quality of training programmes to the personnel employed in the MGNREGA should be enhanced so that the overall process, content and delivery of the schemes should be optimally delivered to the beneficiaries.
- Appointing full-time professionals for implementing MGNREGA at all levels which is vitally necessary to implement the scheme.
- The workforce should be more professional in their orientation. They should have a proper information about the profile of their work to attain the objective of development in the region.
- 4. The involvement of local people should be considered in framing the development policies.
- There is a greater need of transparency in all the aspects of MGNREGA and it should be visible to all the stakeholders of the rural development organizations.
- Rural masses should be made more aware about latest schemes and programmes.

9.CONCLUSION

It was found from the study results that MGNREGA had clear-cut objectives to provide job opportunities for rural masses. The objectives of the act is to maintain equality among the various groups of the society and to promote standard of living thereby contributing to economical improvement of the people of the rural areas. It was revealed from hypothesis testing that the programme has done a great job in improving the economies of rural areas by raising their socio-economic status. The study also revealed that there is a need to amend the structure of the programme by introducing more transparent and responsible system and to make it objective specific and goal oriented.

10.REFERENCES

- Prasanna, N, Natarajamurthy, P, Kurinjimalar, R, (2014), Socio-economic impact of MGNREGA in Tamil Nadu, India
- Prattoy Sarkar, Jagdish Kumar and Supriya, (2011) Impact
 of MGNREGA on reducing rural poverty and improving
 socio-economic status of rural poor: A Study in Burdwan
 district of West Bengal, Agricultural Economics Research
 Review.
- 3. Narayan, S., (2008). Employment guarantee, women's work, and childcare. Economic and
- 4. PoliticalWeekly, 43(9), 10-13.
- Sankari.V and Dr.Sivamurugan (2011), Economic impact of NREGP on employment generation- A case study.
- Roy, C. S. (2013). Right based approach in accessing social sector services - A case study of MGNREGA. Global Research Methodology Journal, 2 (8) (March - April), 1-12.