**CHAPTER - I**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**INTRODUCTION**

The women in India had enjoyed considerable respect and wisdom to participate as per to their choice in different social, cultural, political, religious functions and economic activities and had enjoyed a very respectable position and honour in the prevailing socio-cultural system during Vedic period. In fact the presence of women along with their better offs was regarded compulsory for the success of performing various social and religious functions. However, it was after 500 BC the social status of women started deteriorating due to the sudden development of various social evils. The changing socio-cultural system during the post Vedic period had disturbed and increasingly reduced the participation of women in carrying out certain activities and were largely deprived the opportunities of education, participating in outdoor socioeconomic and cultural activities.

Since last decade, in our country has been implemented several programme by government for rural development. MGNREGS is well known programme for rural development, it is known as a large flagship programme of UPA government. The Act‘s success or failure will have an impact on the entire in rural community in India. An attempt to removing the hindrance in improving the socio-economic condition of them through produce employment for this unique programme is developed which Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee scheme is focused on the regeneration of village economy in the long term and mostly focuses on welfare of rural areas with produces an opportunities for rural development which improving qualities of people worker under MGNREGS an opportunity in rural areas.

Since the introduction of first five-year plan in India, several development programmes and welfare schemes have also been initiated especially to improve the socio-economic status of women. At policy level, different legal provisions and resolutions in the forms of acts have been introduced to achieve the favourable changes in the status and to strengthen the empowerment of women. Provisions have also been made to maximise the participation of girls in the availment of different level of educational systems with the notion that educating women would be an instrumental measure for awaking them about their rights, social standings and responsibilities as prime elements for maximising their participation in different developmental programmes, welfare schemes, socio-cultural activities and in different categories of remunerative occupations of employment. In this regard, initiatives have been taken to provide educational facilities for girls on a priority basis according to the needs and requirements of girls, recruitment of women teachers and developing different social infrastructural facilities for the girls' schools

In India unemployment is a crucial problem .Due to unemployment a lot of problems are arising in our country. Poverty, illiteracy, underdeveloped agriculture sector etc. are the results of unemployment. In order to eradicate poverty, illiteracy and to develop agriculture sector Government has undertaken different schemes. This lead to the emergence of MahathmaGandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA)

The MGNREGA is an Indian law that aims to guarantee the right to work and ensure livelihood security in rural areas by providing at least 100 days of guaranteed wage employment in a financial year to every household. It was notified on SEPTEMBER 7, 2005. According to 11th 5 year plan(2007-2012),the plan targeted poverty through MGNREGA which promised employment as an entitlement. Previous Employment Guarantee Scheme (EGS) were“SampoornaGrameenRozgarYogana” (SGRY) or Rural Employment Program and National Food for Work Programme (NFFWP). Both SGRY and NFFWP merged with MGNREGA for providing short term unskilled employment to poor, assured food and job security. The unemployment allowances must be paid if the work is not provided with in the statutory limit of 15 days. It is a recent employment scheme in India for providing 100 days guaranteed wage employment for all employment seekers above 18 years of age and willing to do work.

While MGNREGA is a landmark legislation that promotes decentralization, transparency, accountability and participation of marginalized sections. It also faces challenges due to its large scale focus and spread across the country, and other institutional constraints depending on the state/district of implementation.

This bottom up people centered, demand driven architecture also means that a great share of the responsibility for the success of the MGNREGA lies with wage seekers, Grama Sabhas and Grama Panchayaths (GSs and GPs). The MGNREGA is implemented as a centrally sponsored scheme on a cost sharing basis between the center and the state as determined by the Act. Implementation of MGNREGA involves role and responsibilities of a large number of stake holders from the village to the national level.

This is a rural wage employment program in India. It provides for a legal guarantee of at least 100 days of unskilled wage employment in a financial year to rural households whose adult members are willing to engage in unskilled manual work at a pre-determined minimum wage rate.

The objectives of the Act are: To enhance the livelihood security of the rural poor by generating wage employment opportunities; andto create a rural asset base which would enhance productive ways of employment, augment and sustain rural household income.

The NREGS is mostly emphasis on labour intensive creating asset works which could tackle the problem of unemployment as well as agricultural growth. The NREGA-2005 is being considered as one of the important components of the inclusive growth strategy of 11th Five year plan. Through this present study made to attempt taking aims at to know the extent to which the intended programme has reached at tribal people in terms of employment generation, poverty alleviation and reduce migration in rural areas.

**CHAPTER – II**

**PROBLEM STATEMENT**

**RESEARCH PROBLEM**

Unemployment is one of the basic problems faced by most of the developing countries. Due to unemployment number of people living in a poor condition, most of them face poverty too, for avoiding all these problems the Government of India implemented an effective programme namely MGNREGA. This programme provide a lots of job opportunities to the people in agriculture and such other sectors.This present research on impact evaluation of the MGNREGS is intended to assess the impact of this scheme on the overall quality of life of people by gauging different parameters associated with the improvement of overall quality of life Of BPL people such as impact on income, earning levels of each household, expenditure on food and non-food items, household and cultivable assets creation by the beneficiaries. This study also captured the impact of the scheme to arrest out-migration, views and feed-back of the beneficiaries on various faucets of implementation of the scheme at grass root level right from the stage of issue of job cards etc.

**SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

Having well designed grand rural employment generation to manual labour, MGNREGA launched new portals for women employment across the country. Women population and labour share are given due weightage in the act to enhance the opportunities for employment and income levels. It is the sustained effort of the academics and activists for the introduction act to reduce poverty among marginalised sections of the society. No restriction for number of women participation from a household and equal wage for both men and women is the innovation of MGNREGA . It arranges child care facilities at work sites for children of female workers. But the women workers have a low awareness about the provisions of MGNREGA. The accessibility is major challenge for women workers. Some field level studies have observed that there is delay in payment of wages in some parts of Anantapuramu district. Women workers have been more proned to harassment at the worksites. There is an absolute poverty of worksite facilities at major number work sites. All these drawbacks preventing women to participate in the programme. Hence, the study looks in to all these problems faced by women workers employed in MGNREGP in Pinarayi Panchayath of Kannur Dstrict

**OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

* To understand the response of ordinary people towards the MGNREGA.
* To understand the benefits enjoyed by the employees through MGNREGA.
* To analyses the success of MGNREGA in women empowerment
* To find the working of MGNREGA in Pinarayi Panchayath.
* To find the draw backs of the programme

**HYPOTHESIS OF THE STUDY**

* The socio economic profile of the women has changed positive direction through MGNREGA
* The living standard of the MGNREGA beneficiaries has improved
* The day to day living of the women has not improved considering the components of financial soundness.
* MGNREGA has been successful in giving more employment in reaching out to the rural poor
* Problems faced by the implementing agencies as well as beneficiaries and to identify the administrative drawbacks.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This study is based on 100 individuals and hence survey method is adopted. Since the population consists of large number of people, sample study is followed. This study used both kinds of data, namely primary and secondary. For collecting primary data questionnaire method was used.

**SOURCRS OF DATA**

**Source of Data**

The sources of the data collected for the purpose of the study are broadly bifurcated into two:

* **Primary Data**

The data that has been collected from first-hand-experience is known as primary data. Primary data not been published yet and is more reliable, authentic and objective. Here primary data is collected from 100 respondents in Pinarayi area by a pre-standard questionnaire**.**

* **Secondary Data**

The data collected from a source that has already been published in any form is called secondary data. These secondary data is collected from various books, magazines, journals, internet etc.

**SAMPLING DESIGN**

A sample design is a finite plan for obtaining a sample from a given population. Non-Probability sampling design is used for this study. It is a sampling procedure which does not afford any estimating the probability that each item in the population has of being included in the sample.

**SAMPLE AREA**

The area is conducted among respondents from Pinarayi panchayath

**SAMPLE SIZE**

We intend to conduct a sample survey, by taking a sample of 100 respondents from different locations of Pinarayi Panchayath.

**SAMPLING TECHNIQUE**

By convenience sampling method, a sample of 100 respondents was selected. A convenience sample is obtained by selecting convenient sampling units. The method of convenience sampling is also called chunk. A chunk refers to that fraction of the population being investigated which is selected neither by probability nor by judgment but by convenience.

* **Tool for Data Analysis**

Tool being used for analyzing and interpretation are percentage analysis.

* **Tabular representation**

It is the statistical tool used to present data in rows and columns.

* **Charts**

Charts are another statistical tool used to present data in graphs and diagrams.

**LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

The major limitations of the study are;

* The study is confined to 100 individuals, thus finding may have limited applications.
* A detailed study could not be carried out owing to the time limit.
* The study depends entirely on the response of rural people.
* Prejudicial attitude of certain people to supply correct information.

**REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

The empowerment of rural women is crucial for the development of the rural Bharat. Women have to empower themselves from below in order to make the government to empower them from above. In the words “empowering women is a precondition for creating a good nation, when women are empowered, society with stability is assured”. The MGNREGA has positive impact on empowerment and employment pattern of women in recent years. It aims at enhancing livelihood security by providing at least 100 days of guaranteed wage employment in a financial year to every rural household especially for women. Women participation has increased significantly and perceived it giving them a sense of independence and security. Country should be alerted with proper education and also they should be entrusted with all sorts of works as per their physical capability”. Women are needed part of the world. They play important role in the growth of the society as well as the country. The definition of women is actually different for different persons but there is an essential base that cannot change regardless of nationality, caste, color, profession etc., when women support to empower themselves the whole society benefits and families are healthier. Therefore, it is very important to empower women. Empowerment of women refers to the influence of decision making of their own. The word “empower has become equal with the word women”. “The present review takes a critical look at the selected studies such as: women empowerment, issues, challenges and unraveling various impacts of MGNREGA both at micro and macro level; beginning from its inception in 2005 to till 2015. The study focuses on performance of MGNREGA by relevant performance indicators, in various states in together micro and macro settings, underlining the common and unique issues emerged across these study sites related to the implementation of the MGNREGA and its functioning”.

For almost a decade of application, MGNREGS in India has been positive in ensuring livelihood for the deprived people in rural areas. During the year 2013-14, 3.8 crores household were given employment and a total of 135 crores person-days of employment have been produced. Out the 135 crore, 73.33 crore were for women, 21.09 crore for STs, and 31.53 crore for SCs. A total of 111 lakhs job were taken up of which 11.17 lakhs have been completed so far and remaining jobs are in progress. In the 1st phase of execution of NREGA 2006-07, 2.10 crore publics got 100 days employment during the period. This comprises water harvesting and conservation 3.40 lakh, face-lift of traditional water bodies 96 thousand, provision of irrigation amenity 1.58 lakh, and small irrigation works 53 thousands, land growth 1.17 lakh, rural connectivity 2.03 lakh. Drought proofing nearly 1.13 lakh, flood control and safety 20 thousand. A budget delivery of Rs.12,000 crores has been made during financial year 2007-08, Rs.30,000 cores in 2008-09, Rs. 39,100 crores in 2009-10 and 40,100 crores in 2010-11 respectively for execution of the scheme (MoRD,2012). The apportionment of funds for 2011-12 financial years has been the government has allocated Rs.38,500 and 39,699 crores correspondingly for 2015-16 and 2016-17. The following Table 1 indicates progress of MGNREGA at a glance during the year 2013-14 in India.

The purpose of a literature review is “to determine the extent to which the topic under study is covered in the existing body of knowledge” (Babbie & Mouton, 2001).Perusal of the previous literature is essential to identify research problems & provide valuable suggestions in any research. Thus review of literature helps not only in gaining knowledge about a topic but also arouses the interest in information seeking & critical appraisal of an issue. As such, an attempt has been made in this chapter to review the work already done in respect of MGNREGA.While emphasizing the need for employment generation programmers in the realm of poverty alleviation, Verma (2006) brought out a publication on “Rural Poverty Alleviation and Employment.” He pointed out that unemployment is still on the increase and that the benefit of growth has failed to percolate down to the poor people especially in rural areas. He further stressed that for poverty alleviation rapid economic growth focusing mainly employment intensive sector is required. In addition to this access to basic minimum services and direct state intervention in the form of targeted anti-poverty programmers, including provision of subsidized food-grains too is important. Dreze (2007) stated that corruption in rural employment programs in Orissa even continues in NREGS as well. He further added that there is tremendous potential of NREGA in the survey areas. He was of the opinion that NREGA offers opportunity for the rural poor‟s, and that it is appreciated by casual labourers and other disadvantaged sections of the population also. There is the hope among workers that NREGA would enable them to avoid long-distance seasonal migration and its hardships. Dreeze and Lal (2007) based on his studies on NREGS in Rajasthan concluded that this state stands first in terms of employment generation per rural household under this scheme. They stated that in 2006-07 the average rural households in six “NREGA Districts” of Rajasthan got work for 77 days under this programmer earning nearly Rs.4,000 in the process. This was held by them to be an unprecedented achievement in the history of social security in India. Disadvantaged sections of the population, they further added, are the main gainers of the programme benefits. They also found that the share of women in NREGA employment to be about two thirds in Rajasthan, and that of scheduled caste and scheduled tribe households to be as high as 80 percent. In this way this Act contributes to social equality and economic redistribution inflicts deep-rooted wounds on the psyche of individuals. If they cease to be oppressed, their first task would be to psychologically empower themselves.

Rekha Rani (2016) in her study on “Women Participation In MGNREGA With Special Reference To Tehri Garhwal District Of Uttarakhand” found that more than seventy five percent women beneficiary out of the total beneficiary in a particular area take their own decision to participate in programme. High participation rate of women in programme indicated great contribution towards achieving women empowerment objective of MGNREGS and contributed to very much extent in their socio-economic upliftment.

Farooqi and Saleem (2015)conducted a survey of rural areas of district Aligarh (Uttar Pradesh) and by the in-depth interview of women beneficiaries and tried to find out that up to what extent MGNREGA is helpful for women empowerment by raising their standard of living through the provision of 100 days guaranteed employment. The field survey reveals that the Gram Panchayats have been able to generate only very moderate degree of awareness about the scheme among the villagers, especially to women. They could make aware them about some special factors like minimum wage rate, wages payable by 15 days etc. most of the women workers from the minority dominated villages have little knowledge about the procedures protecting their rights. Among all the respondents from surveyed blocks none was aware about unemployment allowance. The level of awareness about worksite facilities and provision of guaranteed 100 days employment was very poor with 20 percent respondents in favour of positive response. Small percentage (2%) of among all surveyed women respondent was aware about their right for work in MGNREGA. Survey data revealed that participation of women in MGNREGA activities was very low.

Ahangar (2014) in his research analyzed the women participation on MGNREGA in Shahabad block of Anantnag Districts, Jammu and Kashmir. Under the surveyed sample 21 per cent of the respondents are males (table 1), 79 per cent of the sample are females, which shows the greater participation of women in this job. Due to low wages (₹ 150 per day) male workers are not attracted towards this job. Females prefer this job due to more security in the wage and lower risks etc. Majority of the surveyed persons are married and they prefer this job only for earning an extra income to maintain their family. The security provided by this job and the intention of getting a better status in the society compared to earlier period. Findings of study reveals that the reason for preferring job under NREGP even with a lower wage rate was because of the possibility of doing less risky work. The work provide under this scheme require less hard work and do not involve any risk (30 percent). Sixty percent of the surveyed respondent likes this job, because it suit women of different age groups.

Dey (2014) studied the implementation of MGNREGA in two gram panchayats in Jhalawar, Rajasthan. Finding from both the gram panchayats revealed that the work force was mostly women from that the marginalized sections of the society. In accordance with this, men consider the work of MGNREGA to be meant for women only. This is one of the reasons behind the large percentage of female workers working under the scheme ; the limited days of work and low wage rate under the act being the other reason .It has helped women in rural areas to come out of their closed shell. Further in both the panchayats, people were aware of MGNREGA but not of the provision of the act. Gram sabha are the main decision making and implementing agencies in MGNREGA. However only 30% of the respondents in Durgapur and 66% in Sunelpanchayat were aware of the gram sabha held in the village. Majority of population got informed about the act from panchayat members. It was found that no hordings, padyatras, street plays etc. were held to spread the awareness regarding the act.

Keerthan and Manoj (2015) studied impact of MGNREGS on economic empowerment of women labourers of three top most performing Districts in Kerala. They analyzed the economic status of women prior to and after getting MGNREGS employment, based on various parameters. There was significant level of improvement found in their economic status as a result of employment under MGNREGS. The overall difference in the mean scores of perceptions of MGNREGS beneficiaries between pre and post MGNREGS is 7.130. The p–value of 0.000 shows significant difference. Women beneficiaries perceived significant level of improvement in saving habits, level of financial security and extent of paying back debt.

Borah and Bordoloi (2014) in their study on the female worker in Sonitpur District of Assam highlighted the impact of the program on the lives of women. Female workers significant benefit reported by the study includes – income gains, social empowerment, more say in intra household decision making and creation of community assets etc. The survey data conclude that women workers are more confident about their roles as contributors to family expenditure and their work decisions, and that they are also becoming more assertive about their space in the public sphere. They found that in Sonitpur district the total number of women employment increases from 4.68 lakh in 2010-11 to 5.22 lakh in 2011-12. This indicates that the purchasing power capacities of the women workers have increased. A large majority (72%) of the respondents said that they spent wages earned at MGNREGA works on regular food and consumer goods. The increased income locally available through MGNREGA work, they felt, was helping ensure at least two regular meals a day. It could reduce infant malnutrition through positive effects on household’s food security and infant feeding. Nearly 30 per cent of the respondents said that they had spent their wages on repaying small debts. It also helps them to keep themselves away from the clutches of local moneylenders. But the amount earned through MGNREGA is not sufficient to repay debt. Through the employment guarantee act, in the study areas, the health condition of the poor people in both rural and urban areas are improved. A large expenditure regularly met through MGNREGA wages is health care, with around 40 per cent of the respondents having spent earnings on this. Therefore the health condition of the selected areas are seen a lot of improvement after implementation of MGNREGA act. Though MGNREGA has positive impact on employment pattern of women but in Assam their presence is also less in average. The gained benefits of women as community can be understood by increased presence in the gram-sabha, increasing number of women in speaking out in the meetings, increasing capacity of interaction etc.

**CHAPTER III**

**THE STUDY**

**EMPOWERMENT OF WOMEN**

Empowerment is a term widely used in the context of women who are equal partners in development of the society and the nation. Women as a significant human resource can play their role effectively if they are provided equal opportunities and status on par with the men. They need to be enabled to use improved technology in their daily activities for which relevant education and training are to be imparted to them in the same measures, as they are available to men. However, equal opportunities and status are only two dimensions of empowerment which is a way of defining, challenging and overcoming barriers in one’s life through which an individual increases one’s ability to shape up her life and environment. Women are the vital human infrastructure and their empowerment economic, educational, social and political would hasten the pace of social development. Investing in women’s “capabilities” and empowering them to achieve their “choices” and “opportunities” is the surest way to contribute to economic growth and overall development. Empowerment goes beyond socio-economic or political attribution and essentially refers to a process of becoming psychologically empowered. Poverty In this context, empowerment would mean increasing one’s capacity to define, analyse and act upon one’s own problem

Empowerment is a multi-dimensional social process that helps people gain control over their own lives communities and in their society by acting on issues that they define as important. Empowerment occurs within sociological, psychological, economic spheres and at various levels, such as individual, group, and community and challenges our assumptions about the status quo, asymmetrical power relationships and social dynamics.

Empowerment of women involves many things - economic opportunity, property rights, political representation, social equality, personal rights and so on. The Indian society is a patriarchal system in which women’s’ position within the structure and duties towards the family precede their rights as individuals. Many people who argue for empowerment of women do so either with or without a full understanding of the conflicts between the historical and contemporary status of women in the patriarchy and the goals of empowerment. Certainly we may track a great many changes that have occurred in the direction of change in the status of women in India but women have yet to achieve or realize many of the ideal stages of social, psychological, economic and political empowerment.

**AN OVERVIEW OF MAHATHMA GANDHI NREGA**

**HISTORY**

Prior to the enactment of Mahatma Gandhi NREGA, India had no programme in rural areas that promised employment as a legal right, although employment generation through rural works had a long history in India dating back to the 1960s. Since 1960, the government had been merging old schemes to introduce new ones while retaining the basic objective of providing additional wage employment involving unskilled manual work, creating ‘durable’ assets, and improving food security in rural areas through public works with special safeguards for the [weaker sections](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scheduled_Castes_and_Scheduled_Tribes) and women of the community. The problem areas had also been almost similar like mismanagement, lack of planning and implementation. The remuneration had been a combination of wages and food grains across all schemes. It took 30 years of government experimentation to launch major schemes like JawaharRozgarYojana (JRY), Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS), [Food for Work Programme (FWP)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Food_For_Work_Programme), JawaharGrama Samridhi Yojana (JGSY) and [Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sampoorna_Grameen_Rozgar_Yojana" \o "Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana) (SGRY) that were forerunners to Mahatma Gandhi NREGA. In the process, the government decentralized implementation by providing financial and functional autonomy to the local self-government institutions or [Panchayathi Raj Institutions](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Panchayati_raj" \o "Panchayati raj) (PRIs) in order to fight corruption.

The government experimented with various schemes from 1960-90. The most significant ones were Food for Work Program (FWP) of 1977 and National Rural Employment Program (NREP) of 1980. The popular FWP provided food grains to complement wages. It was then revamped and renamed to NREP with almost similar objective

On 1stApril 1989, to converge employment generation, infrastructure development and food security in rural areas, the government integrated NREP and RLEGP into a new scheme JRY. The most significant change was the decentralization of implementation by involving local people through PRIs and hence a decreasing role of bureaucracy. Due to implementation issues, JRY was restructured and renamed to JGSY in 1999.

On 2ndOctober 1993, the EAS was initiated to provide employment during the lean agricultural season. The role of PRIs was reinforced with the local self-government at the district level called the ‘[ZillaParishad](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/District_Councils_of_India" \o "District Councils of India)’ as the main implementing authority. Again due to implementation issues, EAS was merged with SGRY in 2001.

In January 2001, the government again introduced FWP similar to the one initiated in 1977. Once again due to implementation issues, it merged with Mahatma Gandhi NREGA in 2006.

On 1stApril 1999, the JRY was revamped and renamed as JGSY with a similar objective. The role of PRIs was further reinforced with the local self-government at the village level called the ‘Village Panchayaths’ as the sole implementing authority. But again due to implementation issues, it was merged with SGRY in 2001.

Once again on 25thSeptember 2001 to converge employment generation, infrastructure development and food security in rural areas, the government integrated EAS and JGSY into a new scheme SGRY. The role of PRIs was retained with the ‘Village Panchayaths’ as the sole implementing authority. Yet again due to implementation issues, it was merged with Mahatma Gandhi NREGA in 2006.

Finally on 2ndFebruary2006, to converge employment generation, infrastructure development and food security in rural areas, the government integrated SGRY and FWP into a new scheme called Mahatma Gandhi NREGA. The total government allocation to these precursors of Mahatma Gandhi NREGA had been about three-quarters of INR1 trillion (equivalent to over $18 billion).

The **Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act** (MGNREGA) is an Indian law that aims to guarantee the '’right to work’ and ensure livelihood security in rural areas by providing at least 100 days of guaranteed wage employment in a financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work. The statute is hailed by the government as "the largest and most ambitious social security and public works program in the world". The more comprehensive survey of Comptroller and Auditor General of India (CAG), a ‘Supreme Audit Institution’ defined in Article 148 of the constitution of India, reports serious lapses in implementation of the act.

**FUNDING**

The central Government of India has recognized a finance known as the Nationwide Career Assurance Fund, from which allows are launched straight to Zones. Turning resources are to be set up under REGS at the Region, Prevent and local Grama Panchayath levels, with individual records being started out for such resources at each level.

**AIM OF MGNREGA PROGRAMME**

The popular NREGA or Nationwide Non-urban Career Assurance Act  is designed at improving the income protection of the people in rural areas by ensuring hundred days of salary occupation in a financial year, to a rural family whose associates offer to do inexperienced guide work. The purpose of the Act is to make resilient resources and enhance the income source platform of the rural inadequate. A clear political decision was conveyed to the projects that the scheme has to be implemented strictly as the laws in force .Implementation of MGNREGA has contributed to very high levels of women empowerment. Because as the work is organized by women’s groups, the gender perspective gets built in automatically, and for the first time equal wages are really paid and this has boosted the earnings of women. The choice of works recommended in the Act deal with causes of serious hardship such as famine. The high deforestation, complete land problem, in order to  course of action of occupation creation is on a maintainable basis works recommended in the Act details causes of serious hardship like famine, deforestation and land break down completely, in order to  the modus operandi of occupation creation is managed on a maintainable base. Another aim of MGNREGA is to create durable assets such as roads ,canals, ponds ,well employment is to be provided with 5km of an applicant’s residence, minimum wages are to be paid . Therefore, by observing the main aims and objectives of this government scheme, people can easily understand the benefits of the program.

**STRENGTHENING PANCHAYATHS**

An important goal of MGNREGA is to deepen democracy at the grassroots and bring about greater transparency, responsiveness and accountability in local governance. MGNREGA provides a powerful legal entitlement and opportunity to realize the objectives of the 73rd Amendment of the Constitution. The Act formally declares Panchayaths at the three levels as “principal authorities for planning and implementation of the schemes made under this Act” and this provision is backed up by substantial guaranteed resources.

It may be noted that Panchayaths are more than instruments for implementation of the Act. They have an intrinsic value in realizing the expected outcome of enhanced livelihood security for the poor. State may issue detailed instructions to enable Panchayath at different levels to perform the roles and responsibilities assigned to them under the Act and in these guidelines. This can be done in the form of a Hand Book which can easily be understood and used by the elected representative and officials.

The Labour Groups formed under MGNREGA should work in association with the village panchayaths and intermediate panchayaths. The process of decentralized planning should be integrated with the preparation of the labour budget to ensure that local priorities are taken into account even while generating employment for the workers. Progress of MGNREGA should be reviewed once in a month by each level of Panchayat. Monthly meetings of Village Panchayaths may be organized at the level of the Program officer and of the intermediate and District Panchayaths at the level of the DPC to review progress and sort out problems.

**PAYMENT OF WAGES**

Every person working under the scheme is entitled to wages at the wage rate notified by the central government under section 6(1) of the MGNREGA. State governments and the program authorities shall make all efforts to publicize the notified wage rate in simple language and through means that are easily accessible to the local community. Notified wage rate shall also be displayed prominently at the work sites. Looking at increasing efficiency and strengthening institutional systems relating to wage payments, Government of India and State Governments have been making concerted efforts to minimize gaps in the terms of ensuring timely wages to the beneficiaries as well as transparency in the payments of these wages. The Act also provides that equal wages shall be paid to both men and women workers, and the provisions of the equal remuneration Act, 1976 shall be complied with.

**JOB CARDS, DEMAND FOR WORK AND UNEMPLOYEMENT ALLOWANCE**

The single most important and distinguishing feature of MGNREGA, from employment programs of the past, is the provision of work on demand by wage seekers and work provided as their legal right. MGNREGA is a demand driven public wage employment program where works are opened and jobs offered whenever there is a demand for works. This requires that the implementers pay very close attention to generating awareness among potential wage seekers and set up systems that facilitate and rigorously record registration for work, issuance of job cards and applications on demand for work.

**THE IMPLEMENTATION STRUCTURE OF MGNREGS**

MGNREGA work has already divided into five –tire structure of implementation starting from GP at the bottom to the central government at the top.

1) Gram Panchayat (GP)

This is the first tire from initial step, which is GP, is the nodal agency at the bottom level that has the authority to select work, design it and implement 50% of the works. The Gram Sabha should be conducted for selection of works, monitoring and supervision of work. GP has the responsibility to register households, issue job cards, receive application for employment, provide employment, and monitor the NREGS works.

2) Block Panchayat

Either the block Panchayat or the district Panchayat or both may undertake the rest 50%. Block Panchayat monitors ad coordinates the plans and works at the block level. Computer updating of MGNREGS works, muster roll entries, etc. is done at the block level under the guidance of the MGNREGA programme officer.

3) District Panchayat District Panchayat, in addition to implementing non-mandatory works, coordinates MGNREGA activities at the district level. Besides this, it has the responsibility to prepare both the district annual plan and the five-year perspective plan. These two plan documents are the bases for guide the implementation of MGNREGA at the village level. These documents are prepared at the district level in consultation with the GP and block Panchayat.

4) State Government

Next in hierarchy is the state government, which acts as a facilitator in the flow of MGNREGA funds and helping in preparation of workers. It has the responsibility to set up the state Employment Guarantee Council. The latter has the role to advice the government from time to time on MGNREGA implementation in the state. Besides, the council is also entrusted with the responsibility of monitoring and evaluation of the MGNREGA in the state.

5) Central Government

At the top of the hierarchy comes the central government. The Ministry of Rural Development, New Delhi is the nodal agency for MGNREGA implementation. It has the responsibility to set up Central Employment Guarantee Council for receiving advice on MGNREGA implementation. It may also undertake independent evaluation and monitoring of the scheme. It has the responsibility to prepare the budget and disburse funds.

**Permissible Work under the MGNREGS ¬**

* The carried out such work which has given permission for agricultural allied work such Water Conservation and water harvesting including contour trenches, contour bunds, boulder checks, gabion structures, underground dykes earthen dams,stop dams and spring shed development.
* This is the drought Proofing consist of plantation and a forestation; Irrigation canals including micro and minor irrigation works;
* Provision of irrigation facility through take up work such as dug out farm pond, horticulture, plantation, farm banding and land development through to make bunds side of land.
* Renovation of traditional water bodies including desalting of tanks; Land Development; through to make bunds side of land.
* Renovation of traditional water bodies including desalting of tanks; Land Development;
* Flood control and protection works including drainage in water logged areas including deepening and repairing of flood channels, chaur renovation, construction of storm water drains for coastal protection;
* Rural connectivity to provide all weather access, including culverts and roads within a village, wherever necessary in villages
* Construction of Bharat Nirman Rajiv Gandhi Sewa Kendra as Knowledge. Resource Centre at the Block level and as Gram Panchayat
* Bhawan at the Gram Panchayat level;
* Agriculture related works, such as, NADEP composting, vermicomposting and liquid bio-manures;
* Livestock related works, such as, poultry shelter, goat shelter, Construction of pucca floor, urine tank and fodder trough for cattle, a zolla As cattle-feed supplement; Fisheries related works, such as, fisheries in seasonal water bodies on public land.
* Works in coastal areas, such as, fish drying yards, belt vegetation;
* Rural drinking water related works, such as, soak pits, recharge pits;
* Rural sanitation related works, such as, individual household latrines, school toilet units, Anganwadi toilets, solid and liquid waste management;
* Construction of Anganwadi Centres, Construction of play fields.
* Any other work which may be notified by the Central Government in consultation with State Government.

**THE PROCESS OF ISSUE OF JOB CARDS**

The job card is a key document that records workers entitlements under MGNREGA. It legally empowers the registered households to apply for work, ensures transparency and protects workers against fraud.

1. The Act has been in operation for the last six years in many parts of the country and since 2008-09, in all the districts of the country. Most of the eligible households would have already been registered under the Act. However, there may be some households who did not seek registration earlier as they were not aware of their entitlements or were denied and therefore have not been registered. There would be another category of households who would like additional names to be entered on account of one or more member have become adults. There would be yet another category whose details were entered wrong in MIS database.
2. To ensure that the above mentioned three categories are registered, a door-to-door survey should be undertaken by each GP every year to identify eligible households who have been missed out and wish to be registered under the Act. It needs to be ensured that this survey is held at that time of the year when people have not migrated to other areas in search of employment or for other reasons. The PO will lay down a schedule for this survey and ensure that all GP’s in his/her charge have done this survey.
3. Apart from door to door survey for identification of eligible household for registration under MGNREGA, details of individual in the registered households should also be verified by the Panchayath Secretary with assistance of GRS and data entry operators and compared with the details in the database in MIS. Corrections in the database should be made after due verification. In respect of adding new names on account of one or member of the household having become adult in registered households, birth certificate / proof of age should be verified and accordingly, name of the eligible individual should be entered in the database of MIS.

**MGNREGS and Women Empowerment**

Women empowerment is a global thrust issue in recent decades. In India there are provisions in the constitution and several legislative Acts have been passed to ensure women empowerment. The term “Empowerment” is the course of action in any individual which bring a desirable change in the efficiency and more control over environment. Being economically independent , better access on education or control over reproduction doesn’t define it but a combination of including various sphere strength from internal as well external environment collectively indicates its right path of empowerment. To achieve the empowerment of women the government of India introduced different programmes. One such programme focusing on unskilled based wage- employment is MGNREGS. Besides meeting out the goal of social protection and livelihood security, MGNREGS promises so much from perspective of women empowerment.

**The gender sensitive features like –**

While providing employment “Priority” will 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 the scheme.

Equal wages shall be paid no discrimination solely on the ground of gender and provision of Equal Remuneration Act 1976, shall be compiled with.

In case of children below the age of six years accompanying the women working at any site shall be made to depute one such women working to look after the children.

The gram sabha will elect the members of committee and ensure that SC/STs and women are represented on it.

Participation in social audit: The timing of the forum must be such that it is convenient for people to attend – that it is convenient for REGS (Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme) workers, women and marginalized communities.

By recognizing a single person as a ‘household’, the act make t possible for widows and other single women to access work.

Therefore, MGNREGS can play a substantial role in improving status of women economically and lying basis for greater independence, self-esteem and paved the way for empowerment of women. MGNREGA is one out of such developmental cum democratic empowerment generating growth engine which playing a significant role to meet the practical as well as strategic needs of women’s participation evident from MGNREGS women’s person days’ data at national level increasing from 40 to 51% from its inception to year 2012-13. It is above the expectation and the stipulated 33% share. Rajasthan is among the poorest states of India and ranked among highest percentage of women’s participation in MGNREGS states

MGNREGS boost up the economy with its innovative approach of growth and development. Women were given special attention and their participation in scheme was entertained on priority for leading them on the track of empowerment. Right based law of work entertained their working needs, region specific migration problems. Gender inequalities prevailing in labour market were down the moral of women workers earlier but after implementation of scheme women found more sound status socially and economically and changing the mindset of society for women workers.

**CHAPTER IV**

**DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

**TABLE 4.1**

**AGE WISE CLASSIFICATION**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **No of Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Below 25 | 0 | 0 |
| 25-35 | 43 | 43 |
| 35-45 | 40 | 40 |
| Above 45 | 17 | 17 |
| **Total** | **100** | **100** |

**Source : primary data**

**INTERPRETATION**

The table 4.1 shows that the age status of workers under MGNREGA Program. It is found that no workers under the age group of 25 are involved. Out of the total, majority of the workers are in the age group of 25-35.

**TABLE 4.2**

**EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **No of Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Below SSLC | 37 | 37 |
| SSLC | 40 | 40 |
| Plus two | 20 | 20 |
| Degree | 3 | 3 |
| Above degree | 0 | 0 |
| **Total** | **100** | **100** |

**Source : primary data**

**INTERPRETATION**

The table 4.3 shows that majority of the workers have the basic qualification of SSLC and the percentage is 40percentage. The percentage of workers under MGNREGA Program without the qualification of SSLC is 37percentage. Out of the total, the workers with the qualification of Plus Two are 20percentage. Only 3percentage of workers in Pinarayi Grama Panchayath have the qualification of Degree.

**TABLE 4.3**

**MARITAL STATUS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **No of Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Married | 80 | 80 |
| Unmarried | 13 | 13 |
| Widow/Widower | 7 | 7 |
| **Total** | **100** | **100** |

**Source : primary data**

**INTERPRETATION**

The table 4.4 shows that, 80percentages of the total workers under MGNREGA Program in Pinarayi Panchayath are married. The percentage of unmarried workers is 13percentages. Out of the total, 7percentages of the workers under MGNREGA Program are single parents.

**TABLE 4.4**

**INCOME LEVEL**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **No of Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| APL | 40 | 40 |
| BPL | 60 | 60 |
| **Total** | **100** | **100** |

**Source : primary data**

**INTERPRETATION**

The table 4.5 shows that majority of workers under MGNREGA Program in Pinarayi Grama Panchayath belong to BPL category. The percentage is 60. The percentage of workers from APL category is 40 percentage.

**TABLE 4.5**

**THE WAY OF GETTING INFORMATION**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **No of Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Gramasabha | 33 | 33 |
| Kudumbasree | 47 | 47 |
| others | 7 | 7 |
| **Total** | **100** | **100** |

**Source : primary data**

**CHART 4.1**

**THE WAY OF GETTING INFORMATION**

**INTERPRETATION**

The table 4.6 shows that 47percentage of the workers under MGNREGA are getting knowledge about this program by way of working in kudumbasree units. And other major source of information are from Gramasabha -33percentage ,13percentage of people get information from workers already registered and 7percentage from other sources.

**TABLE 4.6**

**THE REASON TOINTERSTED IN MGNREGA PROGRAMME**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **No of Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Due to low income | 57 | 57 |
| For self-empowerment | 30 | 30 |
| Unemployment | 13 | 13 |
| **Total** | **100** | **100** |

**Source : primary data**

**CHART 4.2**

**THE REASON TO INTERSTED IN MGNREGA PROGRAMME**

**INTERPRETATION**

The table 4.8 shows the reason for interested in MGNREGA. The major 57percentage are due to low income, 30percentages for self-employment and the remaining 13percentage due to unemployment

**TABLE 4.7**

**SUPPORT FROM FAMILY**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **No of Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Yes | 67 | 67 |
| No | 33 | 33 |
| **Total** | **100** | **100** |

**Source : primary data**

**CHART 4.3**

**SUPPORT FROM FAMILY**

**INTERPRETATION**

The table 4.9 shows support from their family. The major 67percentage having positive response and a 33percentage respondents’ having negative opinion.

**TABLE 4.8**

**OVERLOAD OF JOB**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **No of Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Per day | 63 | 63 |
| Per week | 37 | 37 |
| **Total** | **100** | **100** |

**Source : primary data**

**CHART 4.4**

**OVERLOAD OF JOB**

**INTERPRETATION**

The table 4.10 shows employees having job over load. The major 63percentage of employees facing job over load, and the remaining 37percentage of respondents commented as no over work load.

**TABLE 4.5**

**SUPERVISE BY ANY OFFICIAL**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **No of Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Representative of ward member | 27 | 27 |
| Group leader | 57 | 57 |
| Often | 16 | 16 |
| **Total** | **100** | **100** |

**Source : primary data**

**CHART 4.5**

**SUPERVISE BY ANY OFFICIAL**

**INTERPRETATION**

The table 4.11 shows employees supervision by any official. Here the major 57percentage workers positively responded, 27percentage have negative response,16percentagesays ‘often’.

**TABLE 4.10**

**SUFICIENT LEISURE TIME**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **No of Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Satisfied | 60 | 60 |
| Dissatisfied | 40 | 40 |
| **Total** | **100** | **100** |

**Source : primary data**

**CHART 4.6**

**SUFICIENT LEISURE TIME**

**INTERPRETATION**

The table 4.12 shows getting sufficient leisure time. The major 60percentageworkers are positively responded and 40percentageshave negative response.

**TABLE 4.11**

**GETTING PAYMENT AS PER WORK**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **No of Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Monthly | 70 | 70 |
| Weekly | 13 | 13 |
| Per day | 17 | 17 |
| **Total** | **100** | **100** |

**Source: primary data**

**CHART 4.7**

**GETTING PAYMENT AS PER WORK**

**INTERPRETATION**

The table 4.13 shows workers getting payment as per work for workers. The major 60percentageworkers are positively responded and 87percentagewere positively responded and remaining 13percentage were says ‘no’.

**TABLE 4.12**

**DELAY OF PAYMENTS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **No of Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| No | 17 | 17 |
| Often | 50 | 50 |
| Very often | 33 | 33 |
| **Total** | **100** | **100** |

**Source : primary data**

**CHART 4.8**

**DELAY OF PAYMENTS**

**INTERPRETATION**

The table 4.14 shows any delay in getting payment.17percentage of workers are positively responded, most of the 50percentage of workers commented as ‘often’, and the remaining 33percentageof workers says ‘very often’.

**TABLE 4.13**

**MENTIONED BENEFITS OF THE PROGRAMMES**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **No of Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Highly aware | 43 | 43 |
| Aware | 17 | 17 |
| Not aware | 40 | 40 |
| **Total** | **100** | **100** |

**Source : primary data**

**CHART 4.9**

**MENTIONED BENEFITS OF THE PROGRAMMES**

**INTERPRETATION**

The table 4.15 shows knowledge about benefits of the programme for workers. The major 43percentage says ‘yes’, 17percentage of workers say they are not aware about this, and 40percentageof workers have a little knowledge about this programme.

**TABLE 4.14**

**ALLOWANCES AS IT QUOTED**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **No of Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Yes | 27 | 27 |
| No | 23 | 23 |
| Sometimes | 10 | 10 |
| Most of the times | 40 | 40 |
| **Total** | **100** | **100** |

**Source : primary data**

**CHART 4.10**

**ALLOWANCES AS IT QUOTED**

**INTERPRETATION**

The table 4.16 shows allowance as is quoted.27percentage of workers commented positively and 23percentagewere positively responded, were 10percentage of workers have opinion as sometimes, and40 percentage workers says ‘most of the times’

**TABLE 4.15**

**FREQUENTLY GET THE WORK**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **No of Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Daily for a period | 27 | 27 |
| Days in weeks | 13 | 13 |
| A couple of days in month | 20 | 20 |
| Randomly | 40 | 40 |
| **Total** | **100** | **100** |

**Source: primary data**

**CHART 4.11**

**FREQUENTLY GET THE WORK**

**INTERPRETATION**

The table 4.17 shows workers frequently getting work 27percentage of workers getting daily for a period,13percentage of workers getting days in a weak,20percentage getting a couple of days in a month. And the remaining major 40percentage getting work randomly.

**TABLE 4.16**

**BENIFICIAL FOR FAMILY**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **No of Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Benefitted | 63 | 63 |
| Not benefitted | 37 | 37 |
| **Total** | **100** | **100** |

**Source : primary data**

**CHART 4.12**

**BENIFICIAL FOR FAMILY**

**INTERPRETATION**

The table 4.18 shows the programme how beneficial for the workers family. 63percentage were having positive response and the remaining 37percentage of workers having negative opinion

**TABLE 4.17**

**BENIFICIAL AS WORKERS EXPECTED**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **No of Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Yes | 37 | 37 |
| No | 23 | 23 |
| Far better | 27 | 27 |
| Not to the expectation | 13 | 13 |
| **Total** | **100** | **100** |

**Source : primary data**

**CHART 4.13**

**BENIFICIAL AS WORKERS EXPECTED**

**INTERPRETATION**

The table 4.19 shows it is beneficial for the workers as they expected. The major 37percentage were positively, 23percentageworkers responded negatively, 27percentagessays: far better, and a minor 13percentage says ‘not to the expectation.

**TABLE 4.18**

**WORK PRESSURE**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **No of Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Yes | 37 | 37 |
| Some supervisors | 30 | 30 |
| No | 33 | 33 |
| **Total** | **100** | **100** |

**Source: primary data**

**CHART 4.14**

**WORK PRESSURE**

**INTERPRETATION**

The table 4.20 shows work pressure for the employees. The major 37percentageof workers were says ‘yes’ and 30percentage were commented as ‘some supervisors and the remaining 33percentage of workers says ‘no’.

**TABLE 4.19**

**UNSATISFIED WITH THE PROGRAMME DUE TO PAYMENT**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **No of Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Yes | 40 | 40 |
| No | 27 | 27 |
| Little | 20 | 20 |
| More people | 13 | 13 |
| **Total** | **100** | **100** |

**Source: primary data**

**CHART 4.15**

**UNSATISFIED WITH THE PROGRAMME DUE TO PAYMENT**

**INTERPRETATION**

The table 4.21 shows unsatisfied with program due to the payment. The major 40percentage responds positively and the 27percentagehave negative response, 20percentage of workers says ‘little’ and a 13percentage of workers says ‘more people;

**TABLE 4.20**

**STILL CONTINUING THE PROGRAMME**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **No of Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Yes | 30 | 30 |
| Payment problems | 23 | 23 |
| Insecurity | 20 | 20 |
| Got another job | 17 | 17 |
| Other | 10 | 10 |
| **Total** | **100** | **100** |

**Source: primary data**

**CHART 4.16**

**STILL COUNTINUING THE PROGRAMME**

**INTERPRETATION**

The table 4.22 shows workers are still continuing the programme or not. The major 30percentage were having positive response, 23percentage have payment problems, 20percentage were due to insecurity, 17percentagegot another job, and the remaining10percentage facing other issues.

**TABLE 4.21**

**MALPRACTICES FROM SUPERVISORS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **No of Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Agree | 73 | 73 |
| Disagree | 27 | 27 |
| **Total** | **100** | **100** |

**Source: primary data**

**CHART 4.17**

**MALPRACTICES FROM SUPERVISORS**

**INTERPRETATION**

The table 4.23 shows malpractices from the supervisors. Here the major 73percentage of workers says ‘yes’ and a 27percentageof workers say ‘no’.

**TABLE 4.22**

**THE DIFFERENT PROBLEMS OBSERVED WITHIN WORKERS UNDER MGNREGA PROGRAMME**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **No of Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Payment delay | 30 | 30 |
| Insecure work places | 7 | 7 |
| Work overload | 13 | 13 |
| Unauthorized schedule | 17 | 17 |
| Others | 7 | 7 |
| None | 26 | 26 |
| **Total** | **100** | **100** |

**Source: primary data**

**CHART 4.18**

**THE DIFFERENT PROBLEMS OBSERVED WITHIN WORKERS UNDER MGNREGA PROGRAMME**

**INTERPRETATION**

The table 4.24 shows that the 30percentage of workers who participated have no problems to mention. But 26percentage of the total workers complained about payment delay. Unauthorized work schedule and work overload are on second and third places with percentage of 17 and 13 respectively. Only 7percentage of workers have some complaints apart from the above mentioned complaints.

**TABLE 4.23**

**THE SATISFACTORY LEVELS OF THE WORKERS UNDER MGNREGA PROGRAMME**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **No of Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Satisfied | 90 | 90 |
| Unsatisfied | 10 | 10 |
| **Total** | **100** | **100** |

**Source : primary data**

**CHART 4.19**

**THE SATISFACTORY LEVEL OF WORKERS UNDER MGNREGA PROGRAMME**

**INTERPRETATION**

The table 4.25 shows that the majority of the workers under MGNREGA Program in Pinarayi Grama Panchayath are satisfied with this program, the percentage is 90percentage and the unsatisfied percentage is only 10percentage.

**TABLE 4.24**

**THE REASON TO REGISTRATION IN MGNREGA PROGRAMME**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **No of Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Unemployment | 27 | 27 |
| Low income level | 50 | 50 |
| Self-empowerment | 23 | 23 |
| **Total** | **100** | **100** |

**Source : primary data**

**CHART 4.20**

**THE REASON TO REGISTRATION IN MGNREGA PROGRAMME**

**INTERPRETATION**

The table 4.7 shows that in Pinarayi Grama Panchayath about half of the workers under MGNREGA Program are registered due to the low socio-economic status. Out of the next half,27percentage of workers due to unemployment. Another reason for registration is self-empowerment.

**CHAPTER V**

**FINDINGS, SUGGESTIONS AND CONCLUSION**

**FINDINGS**

In Pinarayi Grama Panchayath, the people belonging to different categories of income level are involved in MGNREGA program. Irrespective of age, gender, marital status and education of the people, they are registered in MGNREGA program.

* The study reveals that the workers in the age group of 25-35
* Majority of the workers have basic qualification of SSLC.
* The marital status of MGNREGA Programme in Pinarayi Grama Panchayath are married.
* The majority of workers under MGNREGA Programme in Pinarayi Grama Panchayath belong to BPL category.
* The way of getting knowledge about this programme by way of working in Kudumbasree units.
* The reason to interested in MGNREGA Programme is due to low income.
* The study reveals that most of the workers have family support.
* Most of the workers in MGNREGA Programme facing work overload.
* The Representative of ward member supervised by the workers.
* The majority of workers are satisfied with sufficient leisure time.
* Most of the workers have getting payment monthly as per for there work.
* The majority of workers in MGNREGA have often delay of payments.
* Most of the workers have kwoledge abou t the benefits of the MGNREGA programme..
* The study reveals that workers getting allowances as it quoted in most of the times.
* The study found that the workers getting work randomly.
* The study reveals that the MGNREGA Programme is beneficial for the workers family.
* The MGNREGA Programme is beneficial for Most of the workers for they expected.
* The study reveals that work pressure of employees is very high.
* .The study reveals that most of workers unsatisfied with MGNREGA programme due to payment.
* The majority of workers are still continuing the programme.
* Most of the workers face malpractices from supervisors..
* The different problems observed within workers under MGNREGA Progeamme is payment delay.
* The study reveals that the majority of workers are satisfied with MGNREGA programme .
* The majority of workers in PinarayiGrama Panchayath are under MGNREGA Programme are registered due to the low socio-econo,ic status.

**SUGGESTIONS**

The following measures may be taken to solve the problems faced by the MGNREGA workers;

* Government should insist upon framing strong rules and regulations to prohibit the negative attitude of authorities towards MGNREGA.
* Conduct awareness programs for public for increasing the number of registered people in MGNREGA.
* Rearrange the schedule of working hours and work sites which can give security to women workers too.
* Develop a control panel in managing payment of wages and ensure that there will not be any payment delays.
* In panchayath special cells may be opened for solving the problems of MGNREGA workers with regard to the payment delays and any unsatisfactory matters.
* Increase the supervision at the work site for avoiding the lazy attitude of workers and also for avoiding the problems occurring at the work site.

**CONCLUSION**

Around 70percentage of the Indian population is living in rural areas .The cascading effects of poverty, unemployment, poor and inadequate infrastructure in rural areas or urban centers is leading to socio economic tension manifesting in economic deprivation and urban poverty. The rural development generally refers to the process of improving the quality of life and economic welfare of people living in relatively isolated populated areas. MGNREGA is considered as a “Silver Bullet” for eradicating rural poverty and unemployment ,by way of generating demand for productive labor force in villages. It provides an alternative source of livelihood which will have an impact on reducing migration ,restricting child labour alleviating poverty and making villages self-sustaining through productive assets creation such as road construction ,cleaning up of water tanks ,soil and water conservation work etc. .for which it has been considered as the largest anti-poverty program in India.

It has been established that there are more people attached to the program because of unemployment as well as thirst for self-empowerment. A proper fund development and effective supervision throughout the program can rise the lower socio-economic level of the nation and to remove poverty to an extent. It was an experiment to ruleout the actual response of the people in the village toward this program as well as to find out the main drawback which are need to be reviewed for the ultimate success of the program in Pinarayi Grama Panchayath

It can be concluded that the success of this Act depends up on its proper implementation and effective supervision.
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**QUESTIONNAIRE**

**“A STUDY ON EMPOWERMENT OF WOMEN THROUGH MGNREGA WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO PINARAYI GRAMA PANCHAYATH”**

1. Name
2. age
3. Qualification
4. Marital status

Married Unmarried Widow/Widower

1. Income level

APL BPL

1. How did you know about MGNREGA?

Kudumbasree gramsabha

Workers already registered Others

1. Why are you interested in this programme?

due to low income for self-empowerment unemployment

1. Do you get support from family?

yes no

1. Do you have overload of job?

per day per week

1. Are you supervised by any official?

representative of ward member group leader often

1. Are you getting sufficient leisure time while on duty?

Satisfied dissatisfied

1. Are you getting payments as per your work?

Monthly weekly per day

1. Is there any delay in payment?

no often very often

1. Do you know about the mentioned benefits of the programme?

highly aware aware notaware

1. Are you getting allowances as is quoted?

yes no sometimes most of the times

1. How frequently do you get the work?

Daily for a period days in weeks

a couple of days in month randomly

1. Is it beneficial for you and your family?

Yes No

1. Is it beneficial for you as you expected?

far better not to the expectation yes

No

1. Is there any pressure to complete one work as early as possible?

no Some supervisors yes

1. Did you notice anybody unsatisfied with the programme due to payment problem?

yes no little more people

1. Are you still continuing with this programme? If not mention the reason?

yes payment problems insecurity

got another job other

1. Did you notice any malpractices from supervisors?

yes no

1. What are the problems you face frequently?

payment problems insecurity

unauthorized work schedule none

over load of work others

1. Are you satisfied with this programme?

satisfied unsatisfied

1. The reason to registration in MGNREGA ?

unemployment low income level self-empowerment