International Journal of Applied and Advanced Scientific Research (IJAASR)
Impact Factor: 5.655, ISSN (Online): 2456 - 3080
(www.dvpublication.com) Volume 3, Issue 1, 2018

SOCIO - ECONOMIC IMPACT OF MAHATMA GANDHI NATIONAL RURAL EMPLOYMENT GUARANTEE ACT (MGNREGA) BENEFICIARIES IN SALEM DISTRICT OF TAMILNADU

R. Kanimozhi* & T. Kalidasan**

* PG Scholar, Department of Agricultural Extension, Faculty of Agriculture, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar, Tamilnadu

** Assistant Professor, Department of Agricultural Extension, Faculty of Agriculture, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar, Tamilnadu

Cite This Article: R. Kanimozhi & T. Kalidasan, "Socio - Economic Impact of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) Beneficiaries in Salem District of Tamilnadu", International Journal of Applied and Advanced Scientific Research, Volume 3, Issue 1, Page Number 298-301, 2018.

Abstract:

A study mainly focuses on socio-economic impact of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act beneficiaries in Salem District. The present study was conducted in Thalaivasal block of Salem District. Salem district has been administratively divided in to twenty blocks. Out of these blocks Thalaivasal block has higher number of beneficiaries. So, it was selected as a study area. For the selection of the respondents based on the proportionate random sampling technique was followed to select a sample size of one hundred twenty respondents. The data were collected from each of the respondent through personal interview methods with the help of interview schedule. The result revealed that the socio-economic impact was found to be migration, housing, media participation, food habits, personal changes, education to children, contact with development personnel, income and savings and dressing pattern.

Introduction:

India is the country of villages and even today around 70.00 per cent of its population is residing in the villages of which 28.30 per cent live below poverty line (World Bank, 2011). The rural character of the economy as stated by Mahatma Gandhi is not found in cities but in its villages. Mahatma Gandhi's human capital model of development appears to be the most suitable for labour surplus country like ours upliftment of villages will continue to be the major area of achievement in all the discussions pertaining to economic growth of our country.

To overcome the above problems and deficiencies of the earlier wage employment programmes, Government of India took a historic step by enacting the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) in 2005 by merging Swarnajayanthi Gram Swarojgar Yojana (SGSY) and National Food for Work Programme (NFFWP) for providing livelihood security to rural unemployed.

The law was initially called the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) but was renamed as Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) on 2nd October 2009. This act was introduced with an aim of improving the purchasing power of the rural people, primarily semi or unskilled work to people living in rural India, whether or not they are below the poverty line.

Based on man days working on the project, the MGNREGA districts were classified into good performing districts and poor performing districts. Researcher is particularly interested in good performing districts as there is lot of research studies in poor performing districts. Among the good performing districts, Salem was selected for the study. Considering the above discussion, it is essential to study about the Socio-economic impact of the MGNREGA beneficiaries. Hence, the present study was entitled with "Socio- economic impact of MGNREGA beneficiaries in Salem District".

Methodology:

The present study was conducted in Salem district of Tamil Nadu state. Salem district has been administratively divided into twenty blocks. Out of these blocks, higher beneficiaries of MGNREGA were noticed in Thalaivasal block. Hence, Thalaivasal block has been selected for the purpose of study. Thalaivasal block had thirty five panchayat villages and eight villages were purposively selected based upon its maximum number of beneficiaries.

For the selection of the respondents based on the proportionate random sampling technique was followed to select a sample size of one hundred and twenty respondents. For the purpose of data collection only the heads of households were introduced. In consultation with extension scientists and reviewing literature ten socio-economic indicators were identified. The socio-economic impact due to MGNREGA was studied. The socio-economic indicators identified were listed as follows. Food habit, dressing pattern, housing, education to children, income and savings, personal changes, contact with development personnel, social participation, media participation and migration. The socio-economic impact of MGNREGA beneficiaries was interpreted by percentage analysis.

Findings and Discussions:

Socio- Economic Impact of MGNREGA Beneficiaries:

To study the socio- economic impact experienced by the beneficiaries as a result of the participation in MGNREGA, data were collected, analysed and presented in Table-1.

Table 1: Socio-economic impact encountered by the beneficiaries as a result of MGNREGA

(n=120)

S.No	Particulars	Number	Percent
A.	**Food habits**		
1.	Expenditure on food items increased	105	87.50
2.	Quantity of vegetables taken/month	105	87.50
3.	Frequency of non-vegetarian taken/month	14	11.67
4.	No. of eggs taken/month/head	75	62.50
5.	Number of times tea or coffee taken/month/head	120	100.00
6.	Quantity of milk consumed/day/head	59	49.17
	Mean percentage		66.39
B.	**Dressing pattern**		
1.	Types of dress used	10	8.33
2.	No. of sets of dresses possessed	15	12.50
3.	Amount spent on dressing is increased	15	12.50
	Mean percentage		11.11
C.	**Housing**		
1.	Own house	105	87.50
2.	Renovated the house	61	50.83
3.	Electrified house	120	100.00
4.	Family with household latrine	120	100.00
	Mean percentage		84.58
D.	**Education to children**		
1.	Children sent to local school	100	83.33
2.	Children sent to school outside the village	20	16.67
3.	Children sent to college	76	63.33
	Mean percentage		54.44
E.	**Income and savings**		
1.	Income/month increased	40	33.33
2.	Debts cleared	15	12.50
3.	savings increased	80	66.67
	Mean percentage		37.50
F.	**Personal changes**		
1.	Outside contact increased	106	88.33
2.	Gained respect from village	20	16.67
3.	Gained respect from family members	81	67.5
4.	Expenditure on ceremonies increased	106	88.33
5.	Expenditure on festivals increased	120	100.00
6.	Expenditure on children's education	100	83.33
7.	Expenditure on recreation increased	30	25.00
8.	Frequency of going to temple and tourist places increased	40	33.33
9.	Vehicles purchased	25	20.83
10.	Opened account in bank/office	120	100.00
11.	Household appliances purchased	35	29.17
	Mean percentage		59.31
G.	**Contact with development personnel**		
1.	Block Development Officer	5	4.17
2.	Bank officer	76	63.33
3.	Village president	120	100.00
4.	A.A.O	25	20.83
5.	L.I.C officer	10	8.33
	Mean percentage		39.33
H.	**Media participation**		
1.	No subscription	106	88.33
2.	Subscription to newspaper	-	-
3.	Owning of radio	106	88.33

4.	Owning of TV	120	100.00
5.	Cable TV subscription	120	100.00
	Mean percentage		75.33
I.	**Migration**		
1.	Establishment of MGNREGA help in preventing you or your family members to migrate to other villages/ town for work	120	100.00
	Mean percentage		100.00

Socio-Economic Impact:

Based on the mean percentage, the socio-economic impact was found to be cent per cent for migration (100.00 per cent). This was followed by other socio-economic impact components viz., housing (84.58 per cent), media participation (75.33 per cent), food habits (66.39 per cent), personal changes (59.31 per cent), education to children (54.44 per cent), contact with development personnel (39.33 per cent), income and savings (37.50 per cent) and dressing pattern (11.11 per cent).The beneficiaries were engaged for 100 days under MGNREGA in the lean season. Further, they are engaged in agricultural operation for the rest of the period. Hence, none of the beneficiaries might have migrated to other places.

Food Habits:

It could be inferred from Table-1, that 87.50 per cent of the beneficiaries increased expenditure on food items and increased quantity of vegetables taken /month and 100.00 per cent of the beneficiaries had increased the number of times tea/ coffee taken/ month/ head. From this it could be concluded that MGNREGA beneficiaries gradually improved their food habits. This is in line with the findings of Kunjithapatham and Anand (2015).

Dressing Pattern:

It is evident from Table-1, that 12.50 per cent of the beneficiaries had increased the amount spend on dresses after participating in MGNREGA resulting with more sets of dresses. It could be understood that participation MGNREGA has increased their buying capacity.

Housing:

Cent percent of the beneficiaries (100.00 per cent) had electrified house with household latrine facilities and 87.50 per cent of the beneficiaries were residing in their own houses. This is in line with the findings of Shobha (2015).

Education to Children:

83.33 per cent of the beneficiaries' children were sent to local school and 63.33 per cent of the beneficiaries children were studying in colleges.

Income and Savings:

It could be observed that the income level two-third of the beneficiaries (66.67 per cent) had significantly increased which thereafter resulted with 33.33 per cent of the beneficiaries to increase their savings which helped them to clear their debts. This is in line with the findings of Sivamurugan and Sankari (2009).

Personal Changes:

It could be further inferred that all the beneficiaries (100.00 per cent) have increased the expenditure on festival and opened account in banks, followed by 88.33 per cent of the beneficiaries outside contact increased and expenditure on ceremonies increased, 83.33 per cent of the beneficiaries had increased their expenditure on children's education and 67.50 per cent of the beneficiaries gained respect from family members,

Contact with Development Personnel:

All the beneficiaries (100.00 per cent) had contact with village president and 63.33 per cent of the beneficiaries had contact with bank officer.

Media Participation:

It could be concluded that cent per cent of the beneficiaries (100.00 per cent under each) had owned TV and also they subscribed cable connection and 88.33 per cent of the beneficiaries had owned radio.

Migration:

In general, MGNREGA is preventing people from migrating to other places for want of job as it gives job guarantee for 100 days. In this study also, all the beneficiaries (100.00 per cent) felt that it helped in preventing them to migrate to other villages or towns for work. This is in line with the findings of Anupamhazra (2009).

Conclusion:

This study revealed that marginal farmers were highly depending on the MGNREGA during the lean season for subsistence living. Hence, it is necessary for the government to implement the scheme effectively only in the lean season. It will help to reduce labour scarcity for agricultural operations during crop season and in addition ensures stable income to the beneficiaries throughout the year. It was also found that the overall livelihood status of MGNREGA beneficiaries had improved. Hence, the government should encourage more people to participate in the scheme through effective targeting of the rural people.

References:

1. Anupamhazra. 2009. Transforming Rural India, Kurukshetra: 7-10.
2. Kunjithapatham, K. A. and D. Anand. 2015, Role of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme and its Impact on the Upliftment of Rural Population in Thiruvannamalai District, Scholars Journal of Economics, Business and Management, 2(12): 1172-1176.
3. Shobha, K. 2015. Inclusion of Female Labour Force in MGNREGA: A Micro Level Study, Journal of Socialomics, (4): 1-5.
4. Sivamurugan, C. and V. Sankari. 2009. Impact in Udangudi Panchayat Union, Tamil Nadu- Case Study, Kurukshetra: 39-41.