

PARTICIPATION IN RURAL LABOUR WORK UNDER MGNREGA: CASE OF KARNATAKA

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/361973917_Participation_in_Rural_Labour_Work_Under_Mgnrega_Case_of_Karnataka

Pesala Peter *and I. Maruthi**

ABSTRACT

The Government of India introduced the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) to provide employment to unskilled labourers, especially those in dire circumstances. MGNREGA is one of the best among the successful social welfare programmes in India. For the study, a total of 30 beneficiaries belonging to one Gram Panchayat, who actively participated in the labour work under MGNREGA during a three-year period from 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17, were identified. In addition, 10 MGNREGA job card holders, who either participated for less than 10 days or never participated during the study period, were identified to assess the impact of their non-participation. The study selected a total of 21 GPs. Hence, the total sample size was 840. Majority of the actively participating households owned less than three acres of land, and the remaining were landless. In the case of inactive participation households, a majority possessed more than three acres. Among the activities, the MGNREGA wage income occupied third place whereas the agriculture sector contributed enormously for the inactive households. The average MGNREGA wage income was higher in SC households than other social groups.

Keywords: Rural Labour, MGNREGA, Karnataka.

*Consultant and **Professor in ADRTC, Institute for Social and Economic Change, Nagarabhavi, Bengaluru-560 072; Email: drpesalapeter@gmail.com

Introduction

The Government of India introduced the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) to provide employment to unskilled labourers, especially those in dire circumstances. Among the many social welfare programmes in India, MGNREGA is one of the best, which is functioning in a very successful manner. According to Benni (2017), MGNREGA is one of the biggest poverty alleviation programmes in the world. Mahesh (2017) emphasised that through MGNREGA, the Government of India provided employment to the rural unskilled labour in Karnataka, among other States. Under this programme, rural people could improve their purchasing power parity (PPP). The Government of India had given 100 person-days' security for each rural MGNREGA job card holder. Reddy et al. (2016) investigated the performance of the scheme in Karnataka. According to the author, MGNREGA is the biggest poverty alleviation programme in the world. In Karnataka, MGNREGA was introduced on 2nd February 2006 in Bidar, Gulbarga, Raichur, Davanagere and Chitradurga districts. It provided 67.83 crore person-days of employment between 2006-07 and 2014-15. In the process, it enhanced the workers' livelihoods in rural areas, particularly in drought-prone States like Karnataka. Mostly women, SC, ST and OBC people have participated and benefited (Peter and Maruthi, 2018a) from this programme. In the current paper, MGNREGA component-wise expenditure

details are presented and based on the secondary information (data), we are able to say that the Government of Karnataka appropriately implemented MGNREGA.

Expenditure under MGNREGA

The study looks at three kinds of expenditure: labour, material, and administrative. Among the expenditures, labour expenditures have been gradually increased from 2006-07 to 2017-2018, followed by material expenditures. The material expenditures, which declined in 2013-14 and again risen slowly in 2014-15, have gradually declined thereafter. The administrative expenditures have not been more than 5 per cent during the entire study period. In the initial year, it was 1.4 per cent, and was 2.2 per cent by its fag end. It means that material expenditures were constant (Table1).

Participation in MGNREGA Work by Different Social Groups

The non-SC/ST participation in MGNREGA work has slightly declined from 2011-12 to 2017-18. In the same years, the participation of SC and ST has increased by one per cent (Table1). Women's participation in MGNREGA has significantly increased by one per cent in the same period. However, women's participation reached only 47 per cent during the overall study period (Table 2) and it never crossed 50 per cent. This indicates that female participation is low in Karnataka.

Households' 100-day Limit among SC and ST

In Karnataka, some households completed 100 man-days under the scheme. Out of the total households that participated, only 2.5 per cent of SC households completed 100 man-days in 2011-12, and it increased to nine per cent in 2016-17. In the case of ST households, 10 per cent of households completed 100 man-days in 2015-16, and it increased to 11 per cent in 2016-17. Similarly, total households' participation was 10 per cent in 2015-16 and 2016-17. The participation of all social group households that completed 100 man-days declined in 2014-15 and 2017-18 (Table 2). The completion of 100 man-days was higher in some years due to varied allocation of funds. In addition, for some years, drought affected many districts in Karnataka. These may be the reasons that affected the completion of 100 man-days.

Data and Methodology

In Karnataka, out of 30 districts, the study selected 10 each high-performance and low-performance districts. In addition, a high

population district was chosen. Based on the number of man-days generated by the district, high and low-performance districts were divided. In each district, one GP was selected based on the above-mentioned criteria. A total of 30 beneficiaries, who actively participated in the programme during the three-year period, i.e. 2016-17, 2015-16 and 2014-15, were identified as the primary sample. In addition, 10 MGNREGA job card holders, who either participated for less than 10 days or never participated during the three-year period, were identified to assess the impact of their non-participation. The respondent's households were selected through transit walk with the help of Gram Panchayat Secretary (GP). The total sample size was 840 (Table3). The main objectives of the research study were to investigate the employment generation through MGNREGA on wage employment opportunities in rural Karnataka, and find the socio-economic status of those who participated or did not participate in MGNREGA work.

Table1: Particulars of Expenditure and Participation of Different Social Groups in Karnataka

Years	Expenditure over labour, materials, skilled wages and administration (Rs. in lakhs)				Participation in MGNREGA work by different social groups			
	Labour	Material	Adminis- trative	Total	Total persons	Total SC persons	Total ST persons	Total persons
2006-07	14774.2	9439.9	DNA	DNA	DNA	1318100	867300	DNA
2007-08	14306.8	7129.9	DNA	DNA	DNA	597900	379400	DNA
2008-09	23295.9	10675.4	DNA	DNA	DNA	798900	399100	DNA
2009-10	172303.7 (63.0)	97639.7 (35.7)	3720 (1.4)	273663.4 (100)	DNA	3346500	1717900	DNA
2010-11	157560 (62.1)	90030 (35.5)	6120 (2.4)	253710 (100)	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA
2011-12	95653.3 (60.2)	56036.1 (35.3)	7190 (4.5)	158879.4 (100)	53217076 (75.9)	11074331 (15.8)	5811334 (8.3)	70102741
2012-13	86610.8 (60.9)	48886.1 (34.4)	6653 (4.7)	142149.9 (100)	45802490 (74.1)	10436298 (16.9)	5542124 (9.0)	61780912
2013-14	142392.4 (69.7)	55034.8 (26.9)	6789 (3.3)	204216.2 (100)	54757197 (76.2)	11423765 (15.9)	5705012 (7.9)	71885974
2014-15	98673.5 (60.9)	56313.3 (34.8)	6943.7 (4.3)	161930.5 (100)	32916855 (76.0)	6865799 (15.8)	3545435 (8.2)	43328089
2015-16	112046.3 (62.8)	57097.7 (32.0)	9216.4 (5.2)	178360.4 (100)	44683670 (74.7)	9775966 (16.3)	5378648 (9.00)	59838284
2016-17	215467.1 (66.1)	101110.2 (31.0)	9493.5 (2.9)	326070.7 (100)	68285713 (74.7)	14680071 (16.1)	8440568 (9.2)	91406352
2017-18	201681.4 (68.0)	88213 (29.8)	6551.7 (2.2)	296446.1 (100)	63515366 (74.1)	14206467 (16.6)	7979005 (9.3)	85700838

Note: DNA means data not available. Figures in brackets represent percentage in columns.

Source: MGNREGA website <http://www.nrega.nic.in>.

Table2: Particulars of Women Who Participated among Those Who Completed 100 Man-days

Years	Women who participated in MGNREGA		HHs who participated for over 100 days		
	Total persons worked	Total person-days worked by women	Total SC hhs.	Total ST hhs.	Total hhs.
2011-12	70102741	32340909(46.1)	6869(2.5)	3277(2.4)	45144(2.7)
2012-13	61780912	28574416(46.3)	17684(7.8)	8809(7.7)	104364(7.8)
2013-14	71885974	33491714(46.6)	18424(7.8)	9774(8.9)	117725(8.1)
2014-15	43328089	20303691(46.9)	6407(3.7)	3198(3.8)	41315(3.8)
2015-16	59838284	28197619(47.1)	19873(9.4)	11212(10.4)	132977(10.8)
2016-17	91406352	43153965(47.2)	27710(9.0)	18354 (11.2)	196442(10.8)
2017-18	85700838	40392416(47.1)	4541(1.4)	2367 (1.4)	29986(1.6)

Note: DNA means data not available. Figures in brackets represent percentage in columns.

Source: MGNREGA website (<http://www.nrega.nic.in>)

Table 3: Selected Sample Households in Karnataka

S. No.	Highest/low/ category-C districts		Beneficiary/ Active HHs	Non-beneficiary/ Inactive HHs	Total
	Highest performing districts		Total sample	Total sample	Total
I	Districts	GP			
1	Kalaburagi	Koodi	30	10	40
2	Raichur	Toran Dinny	30	10	40
3	Belagavi	Handigund	30	10	40
4	Davangere	Harakanalu	30	10	40
5	Ramanagar	Herindyapanahalli	30	10	40
6	Mysuru	Kethupura	30	10	40
7	Davangere	Hosakote	30	10	40
8	Haveri	Karur	30	10	40
9	Hassan	Akkanahalli	30	10	40
10	D.Kannada*	Munduru	30	10	40
	Total	10	300	100	400
II	Lowest performing districts		Total sample	Total sample	Total
1	Bidar	Maniknagar	30	10	40
2	Yadgir	Chapetla	30	10	40
3	Dharwad	Devaragudinihal	30	10	40
4	Chikkamagaluru	Markal	30	10	40
5	Kolar	Ammanallur	30	10	40
6	Mandya	Shettahalli	30	10	40
7	Shivamogga	Antharagange	30	10	40
8	Gadag	Antur	30	10	40
9	Kodagu	Sampaje	30	10	40
10	Udupi	Yellur	30	10	40
	Total	10	300	100	400
III	Based on population (Category- C)		Total sample	Total sample	Total
	Belagavi	Bannur	30	10	40
	Grand Total	21	630	210	840

*Dakshina Kannada.

Source: Primary data collected 2018.

Socio-economic Status of Sample Households

Participation under MGNREGA work is determined by many factors. The economic conditions of whoever participated in MGNREGA work have improved (Bahuguna et al., 2016). In general literature, Maruthi and Peter (2018) mentioned that participation under MGNREGA work determines the head of the household's social status, landholdings, income, education, and type of house, which are the main factors. This study brings out the importance of socio-

economic status and income levels of active and inactive participation households. Out of 630 active/beneficiary households, 54 per cent belongs to the OBC category, 18 per cent to SC category, 16 per cent to Other Caste (OC), and 12 per cent to ST. Besides, the study selected 210 non-beneficiary (inactive) households. Among them, 54 per cent belongs to OBC, 24 per cent to SC, 16 per cent to OC, and 6 per cent to STs. In this study, a total of 630 beneficiary households and 210 non-beneficiary households were selected (Table 4).

Table 4: Distribution Of Sample Households According to Caste Group

Caste group	Active households	Inactive households	Total households
SC	112(17.78)	50(23.81)	162(19.29)
ST	77(12.22)	12(5.71)	89(10.60)
OBC	343(54.44)	114(54.29)	457(54.40)
OC	98(15.56)	34(16.19)	132(15.71)
Total	630(100)	210(100)	840 (100)

Source: Primary data, 2018.

Note: Figures in brackets are percentage to column total.

Operational Landholdings

Among 630 active participation households, 86 per cent had lands at the time of our study, and the remaining 14 per cent households were landless. Reddy et al. (2016) mentioned that most of SC households were landless. But the MGNREGA scheme provided livelihood to the poor people, women, small and marginal farmers and SC/ST households. According to the study, the average land size is higher in the OBC (3.02 acres) category, followed

by OC (2.89 acres), ST (2.56 acres) and SC (1.79 acres). Here, the average land indicates that the average land size of the SCs is low as compared to other social groups. In the case of 210 inactive households, 89 per cent had land, and the remaining 12 per cent were landless and might be engaged in other activities. The average landholdings are higher in SC (5 acres) category followed by OBC (4.9 acres), OC (4.1 acres) and ST (3.4 acres) (Table 5).

Table 5: Operational Landholding of Sample Households - Caste Group-Wise

Active/ Inactive	Operation land	Social group				Total
		SC	ST	OBC	OC	
Active HHs	No. of households reported	91 (16.88)	68 (12.66)	291 (53.99)	89 (16.51)	539 (100)
	Total land	163.34 (1.79)	174.3 (2.56)	877.84 (3.02)	256.99 (2.89)	1472.47 (2.73)
Inactive HHs	No. of households reported	44 (23.66)	11 (5.91)	103 (55.38)	28 (15.05)	186 (100)
	Total	231.88 (5.27)	38 (3.45)	504.55 (4.90)	116.61 (4.16)	891.04 (4.79)

Source: Primary data collected, 2018.

Note: Figures in brackets are percentage to column total.

Source of Income

Out of the 630 actively participating households, 82 per cent reported that their total annual income from agriculture was Rs. 2,33,65,000 during 2016-17. The share of agricultural income in total income was 49 per cent and it was higher as compared to other activities, followed by income from animal husbandry (14%), MGNREGA wages (13%), and trade/self-employment (7%). The MGNREGA wage income share occupied third place among the activities (Table 6). The agriculture (Rs.

1,08,68,000) sector contributed enormous income for inactive households, followed by trade/self-employment/business (Rs. 16,78,000), non-agricultural wages excluding MGNREGA wages (.10,40,908), animal husbandry (.10,06,489) and traditional services-repair, maintenance, caste-based occupations-carpentry, and blacksmithery (Rs. 5,70,720). It indicates that the agriculture sector's share is still (68%) higher than beneficiary households. But the trade/self-employment/business share also increased when compared to actively participating households (Table 6).

Table 6: Annual Income of the Households from Various Sources (for 2016-17)

S. No.	Source	Active households		Inactive households	
		Annual income (Rs.)		Annual income (Rs.)	
		Number of households	Total income	Number of households	Total income
1	Income from agriculture	519	23865000 (49.3)	175	10868000 (67.6)
2	Income from land rent	3	80000(0.2)	1	12000(0.1)
3	Income from animal husbandry	229	6849445(14.2)	31	1006480(6.2)
4	Artisan work (handicrafts)	4	133000(0.3)	0	0(0.0)
5	Trade/self-employment /business (own shop, etc.)	38	3325800(6.8)	31	1678000(10.4)
6	Manufacturing (other than artisan, carpenter, etc.)	3	149000(0.3)	1	60000(0.3)
7	Agricultural wage income	478	3040582(6.3)	56	643383(4.0)
8	Non-agricultural wages, excluding MGNREGA wages	129	2524820(5.2)	18	1040908(6.5)
9	MGNREGA wages	601	6412458(13.2)	0	0(0.0)
10	Traditional services*	11	878000(1.8)	14	570720(3.5)
11	Income from forest/CPR/ other products	9	115500(0.2)	0	0(0.0)
12	Remittances	9	423000(0.8)	1	120000(0.7)
13	Pension	84	614400(1.2)	9	66000(0.4)
14	Others	4	30000(0.1)	2	12000(0.1)
Total			48411005(100)		16065491 (100)

Note*: Traditional services- repair, maintenance, caste-based occupations-carpentry, blacksmithery.

Figures in brackets represent percentage in columns.

Source: Primary data collected, 2018

Income from MGNREGA and Non-MGNREGA

Rao (2014), in his study, explained how poverty was reduced through MGNREGA. According to him, the beneficiary farmers confidently overcame poverty through multiple sources under the MGNREGA project. Similarly, in his study, Haque (2011) used secondary and primary data. The total sample size was 2,200 and the study finds that the MGNREGA helped, especially SC, ST and small and marginal farmers, in the legal space, which was a positive development. In general, the income varied from person to person and place to place; the nature of work determined the annual income. The active households' total MGNREGA work income was higher in OBC (Rs. 34,37,824) category, followed by SC (Rs. 12,12,670), OCs (Rs. 9,34,680) and ST (Rs. 8,27,284). But the average MGNREGA income was higher in SC (Rs. 11,228) households followed by ST (Rs. 11,045), OBC (Rs. 10,449) and OC (Rs. 10,385) (Table 7). The average income was higher in SC households as their man-days were

higher. Kundu and Sanjib (2016) emphasised that MGNREGA generated income for the poor and improved agricultural productivity and profitability in the long run to create assets. In our study, the active households' non-MGNREGA work average income was higher in OC (Rs. 75,251) category, followed by SC (Rs. 68,627) and OBC (Rs. 66,935). The inactive households' average income was higher in OC (Rs. 94,427) households, followed by OBC (Rs. 78,155), ST (Rs. 73,342) and SC (Rs. 71,340). The average income indicated that the OC households were economically better off than the other social groups. Here, we observed that average income is different among the social groups. But ILO (2016) mentioned that the MGNREGA scheme had helped women and economically backward communities by creating productive assets. In addition, poverty is also most acute among households headed by females and among SCs and STs in India. Through MGNREGA, these households were able to overcome acute poverty.

Table 7: Total Income from MGNREGA and Remaining Sources - Social Group-wise (Rs.)

Active/ Inactive	Social group	Source			
		MGNREGA		Non-MGNREGA (all other sources)	
		No. of household reported	Total	No. of household reported	Total
Active	SC	108 (17.97)	1212670 (11228)*	110 (17.66)	7548962 (68627)*
	ST	74 (12.31)	827284 (11180)	76 (12.20)	4422305 (58188)
	OBC	329 (54.74)	3437824 (10449)	340 (54.57)	22757899 (66935)
	OC	90 (14.97)	934680 (10385)	97 (15.57)	7299382 (75251)
	Total	601(100)	6412458 (10670)	623 (100)	42028547 (67462)
Inactive	SC	0	0	49 (24.02)	3495660 (71340)
	ST	0	0	11 (5.39)	806760 (73342)
	OBC	0	0	112 (54.9)	8753401 (78155)
	OC	0	0	32 (15.69)	3021670 (94427)
	Total	0	0	204 (100)	16077491 (78811)

Source: Primary data collected, 2018; * average income.

Note: Figures in brackets are percentage to column total.

Awareness of MGNREGA

Awareness is essential for human beings; however, most people are not aware of many issues nowadays. Even the educated people are unaware of many programmes. In order to gain awareness, people have to be educated. Here, education means formal education and informal education. The study found that for a majority (77%) of the active participation households, the MGNREGA awareness information source was GP head/ward members (77 per cent), Gram Sabha

(69 per cent), Panchayati Secretary/ Rojgar Sevak (61 per cent) and the lowest information source was others (0.79 per cent). Similarly, the inactive households' awareness sources were Gram Sabha (16 per cent), GP head/ward members (14 per cent), block-level officials (11 per cent), and the least used information source was poster/wall paintings/public announcement (0.95 per cent). Analysis of the active and inactive data revealed that GP head/ward members were the source of information for 61 per cent of households (Table 8).

Table 8: Source of Awareness about MGNREGA (Provision for Multiple Responses)

S. No.	Source	Active HHs(A)	Inactive HHs (B)
		Number of hhs reported	Number of hhs reported
1	Radio	134 (21.27)	15 (7.14)
2	Television	117 (18.57)	15 (7.14)
3	Newspaper	140 (22.22)	14 (6.67)
4	Gram Sabha	436 (69.21)	34 (16.19)
5	GP head/WM	487 (77.3)	29 (13.81)
6	PS/RS	385 (61.11)	22 (10.48)
7	Block level officials	186(29.52)	24 (11.43)
8	Special camp	25 (3.97)	0 (0.0)
9	Poster/wall paintings/*	51 (8.10)	2 (0.95)
10	Co-villagers	18 (2.86)	0 (0.0)
11	Co-workers	123 (19.52)	8 (3.81)
12	Others	5 (0.79)	0 (0)

Source: Primary data collected, 2018;* public announcement.

Note: Figures in brackets are percentage to column total.

Dheeraja et al. (2013), in their study, found that the awareness on minimum wages and the right to work was higher. More than 55 per cent of workers were aware of these two components. The awareness level was low regarding

unemployment allowance and the time limit to provide employment after submitting application. Twenty-seven per cent of the workers were aware of unemployment allowance. A majority (92%) of active

participation households were more aware of the minimum wages under the MGNREGA scheme, followed by awareness about its provisions like a minimum of 100 days of employment (88 per cent), work to be given within 15 days (61 per cent), work to be given within five-kilometre radius, otherwise additional payment (49 per cent), unemployment allowance (16 per cent), compensation for injury (15 per cent), four facilities at the worksite (10 per cent) and one-third of workers needing to be women (7 per cent). Our results were in line with Dheeraja et al. (2013). But the level of awareness differed among the social groups. In the case of SC households, a

majority (95 per cent) were aware of minimum wages. But ST (95 per cent) households reported that they were more aware more of the 100 days of employment criterion.

Similarly, 94 per cent of OBC households reported that they were aware of minimum wages, and the same thing was reported by OC (86 per cent) households. In the case of inactive households, 17 per cent were aware of the provision of employment for at least 100 days. The same information was reported by 19 per cent of OBC households and 21 per cent of OC households. But 14 per cent of SC households were aware more of minimum wages (Table 9).

Table 9: Awareness of the Following MGNREGA Provisions as per the Act (Provision for Multiple Answers) Caste - Group-wise (No. of HHS)

Type	S. No.	Particulars	SC	ST	OBC	OC	Total
Active	1	Minimum of 100 days of employment	99(88.4)	73(94.8)	314(91.5)	70(71.4)	556(88.3)
	2	Minimum wages	106(94.6)	70(90.9)	322(93.8)	84(85.7)	582(92.4)
	3	Work to be given within 15 days	75(66.9)	46(59.7)	211(61.5)	50(51.1)	382(60.6)
	4	Unemployment allowance	15(13.4)	12(15.5)	55(16.1)	16(16.3)	98(15.6)
	5	Work to be given within 5-km radius, otherwise additional payment	50(44.6)	31(40.3)	180(52.5)	47(47.9)	308(48.9)
	6	One-third of workers to be women	5(4.4)	2(2.6)	27(7.8)	7(7.2)	41(6.5)
	7	Four facilities at work site	8(7.1)	6(7.7)	26(7.6)	20(20.4)	60(9.5)
	8	Compensation for injury	12(10.7)	6(7.7)	47(13.7)	29(29.3)	94(14.9)
Inactive	1	Minimum of 100 days of employment	6(12.0)	1(8.3)	22(19.3)	7(20.6)	36(17.2)
	2	Minimum wages	7(14.0)	1(8.3)	20(17.5)	6(17.6)	34(16.2)
	3	Work to be given within 15 days	1(2.0)	1(8.3)	12(10.5)	3(8.8)	17(8.1)
	4	Unemployment allowance	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(0.8)	0(0.0)	1(0.5)
	5	Work to be given within 5-km radius, otherwise additional payment	5(10.0)	1(8.3)	16(14.1)	7(20.6)	29(13.8)
	6	One-third of workers to be women	0(0.0)	0(0)	0(0.0)	2(5.8)	2(0.9)
	7	Four facilities at work site	1(2.0)	0(0)	0(0.0)	1(2.9)	2(0.95)
	8	Compensation for injury	5(10.0)	0(0)	5(4.4)	2(5.8)	12(5.71)

Source: Primary data collected, 2018.

Note: Figures in brackets represent the percentage of community total.

Particulars of Job Card

All the actively participating households of the study sample had job cards. Nearly 49 per cent of the households had their first job card in 2006-2010, followed by 2011-2015 (44 per cent) and in 2016-2018 (8 per cent). Similarly, at the time of our investigation, 91 per cent of the households were in possession of the job card, followed by cards with someone else (4 per cent), lost (3 per cent) and do not know (2 per cent) categories. Nearly 35 per cent of the households reported that their job card was kept in the Sarpanch's house, followed by field assistant (22 per cent) and other GP functionaries (22 per cent), secretary (9 per cent), mate (4 per cent), mortgaged (4 per cent) and not sure where they kept the job card (4 per cent). In the case of inactive participation households, 98 per cent of the households had the job card.

Among the inactive households, 45 per cent of households received their job cards for the first time in 2011-15, followed by 2006-2010 (42 per cent) and in 2016-18 (12 per cent). Eighty-two per cent of the inactive households were in possession of the job card at the time of primary data collection, followed by do not know where they kept the job card (11 per cent), lost (3 per cent) and with someone else (3 per cent). Among the job card kept with someone else households, 43 per cent of the households kept their job card with another GP functionary, followed by field assistant (29 per cent), secretary (14 per cent) and not sure (14 per cent) (Table 10).

Employment Generation through MGNREGA

According to our study, the overall employment days for males increased by 2,984 man-days, 4,451 man-days and 15,395 man-days in 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17, respectively. The man-days doubled from 2014-15 to 2015-16, and it increased nearly fourfold from 2015-16 to 2016-17. In the same way, the total wage income increased from Rs. 5,30,989 to Rs. 10,33,902 and Rs. 37,54,110 in 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17, respectively. The man-days of all social groups increased during the mentioned years. Among the social groups, OBC households' employment days were higher (but their households also were many), followed by SC, OC and ST during the study period (Table 11).

Women also participated in MGNREGA work during the study period and generated 1,816 workdays in 2014-15, 3,439 in 2015-16, and 11,250 in 2016-17. OBC households contributed significant person-days among the social groups and earned a high total wage income during the mentioned years. As for MGNREGA rules and regulations, the payment has to be made within 15 days after completion of work. But, sometimes, the payment is delayed due to technical problems like lack of bank account, wrong account number in MIS or wrong Aadhaar number linked to the MIS, deletion of worker name from job card, etc.

Table 10: Some Particulars about the Job Card

S. No.	Particulars	Active household	Inactive household
		Number of households	Number of households
		630 (100)	205 (98%)
1	Whether having a job card::Yes	Number of households	Number of households
2	When was the job card first issued?	306 (48.6)	87 (42.4)
a	2006-2010	276 (43.8)	93 (45.4)
b	2011-2015	48 (7.6)	25 (12.2)
c	2016-2018	630 (100)	205 (100)
	Total		
3	Whether in possession of job card at the moment		
a	In possession	576 (91.4)	168 (82.0)
b	Lost	19 (3.0)	7 (3.4)
c	With someone else	23 (3.7)	7 (3.4)
d	Not sure/do not know	12 (1.9)	23 (11.2)
	Total	630 (100)	205 (100)
4	If with someone else, where is it?		
a	Pradhan /Sarpanch	8 (34.78)	0 (0.0)
b	Secretary (Sachiv)	2 (8.70)	1 (14.29)
c	Field Assistant (GRY)	5 (21.74)	2 (28.57)
d	Other GP functionary	5 (21.74)	3 (42.86)
e	Mate	1 (4.35)	0 (0.0)
f	Mortgaged	1 (4.35)	0 (0.0)
g	Not sure	1 (4.35)	1 (14.29)
	Total	23 (100)	7 (100)

Source: Primary data collected.

Average Man-days and Wage Income per Household (2014-15 to 2016-17)

The average total man-days per household were 47 in Karnataka. Among the social groups in Karnataka, the average man-days of STs are the highest (56), followed by SCs (49), OCs (46) and OBCs (44). Similarly, the total average wage income is Rs. 10,903. This amount is helpful to the rural sample households. Among the social groups, the average wage income is higher in ST (Rs. 13,184), followed by SC (Rs. 11,390), OC (10,767) and OBC (Rs. 10,325) (Table 11).

As for our observation, wherever resources are more, the households are not interested in participating in MGNREGA labour work. In addition, whoever has resources like land and other economic assets is not interested in participating in MGNREGA work. Wherever the resources are meagre, the households are willingly and voluntarily interested in participating. In the same way, during drought/famine/flood situations, more man-days are required. As far as the social group is concerned, SCs, STs, OBCs and women require more man-days.

Table 11: Employment and Wages - Caste, Gender and Year-wise

Years/Days/wage	SC	ST	OBC	OC	Total
Male- 2014-15					
Total employment days	750 (16)	172 (7)	1242 (11)	220 (16)	2384 (12)
Wage per day	211.96	223.38	216.63	223.5	216.86
Total earnings	166248 (3464)	38116 (1466)	277176 (2349)	49449 (3532)	530989 (2578)
Male- 2015-16					
Total employment days	908(12)	597(14)	2021(10)	925(17)	4451(12)
Wage per day	230.95	232.56	231.22	231	231.29
Total earnings	209615 (2795)	138991 (3232)	471732 (2324)	213564 (4030)	1033902 (2764)
Male-2016-17					
Total employment days	2886(28)	2047(28)	8719(27)	2283(26)	15935(27)
Wage per day	235.78	235.92	235.93	235.91	235.9
Total earnings	680376 (6670)	482834 (6706)	2052284 (6315)	538616 (6121)	3754110 (6395)
Female- 2014-15					
Total employment days	405(8)	310(11)	917(9)	184(15)	1816(9)
Wage per day	211.02	220.43	217.1	225	216.54
Total earnings	87216 (1780)	66314 (2368)	200855 (1895)	41536 (3461)	395921 (2030)
Female- 2015-16					
Total employment days	743(10)	441(10)	1462(8)	793(17)	3439(10)
Wage per day	229.28	233.16	230.84	231.76	230.91
Total earnings	169352 (2258)	102706 (2389)	340263 (1829)	181970 (3956)	794291 (2269)
Female-2016-17					
Total employment days	2258(22)	1460(21)	5853(21)	1679(21)	11250(21)
Wage per day	235.78	235.91	235.92	235.9	235.89
Total earnings	532294 (5270)	344450 (5065)	1376100 (4863)	396064 (4951)	2648908 (4979)
Total Male and Female (2014-17)					
Total Employment Days	7950(49)	5027(56)	20214(44)	6084(46)	39275(47)
Wage per day	230	233	232	233	232
Total Earnings	1845101 (11390)	1173411 (13184)	4718410 (10325)	1421199 (10767)	9158121 (10903)

Source: Primary data collected, 2018.

Figures in brackets represent average man-days and average wage income.

Conclusions

Based on the above facts, the study found that the generation of income is based on the number of man-days. The major findings of the

study are:

- As much as 84 per cent of the beneficiary households belong to backward and downtrodden sections of society.

indicates that most of the weaker sections of the people benefited more through the MGNREGA programme, and it helped them improve their purchasing power parity (PPP), as found during the study period.

- Apart from a small percentage, majority of the actively participating households owned land. The land size was the lowest among the socially/economically weaker sections of the households as compared to other social groups. In the case of inactive households, nearly 90 per cent had land, and the remaining, having no land, were engaged in other activities.

- The study found that the MGNREGA wage income occupied the third place among the activities in actively participating households, and it indicated that the households in study area actively participated and earned more income. The MGNREGA was the third main income source for actively participating households. The study observed that MGNREGA income was significant for the actively participating households. In addition, the MGNREGA average wage income was higher among the lower sections of the people, which implies that

most of the social and economically weaker sections were further benefited. In the case of inactive households, the average income was higher in other caste (OC) people. It indicates that most of the other caste people had more land and other activities in general, than the study area people in particular. The study observed that the average income varied from household to household and among the social groups. The GP head/ward members played a vital role in creating awareness about MGNREGA programme. Those attended the works under MGNREGA were able to receive the wage fixed by the government.

Based on the above findings, the study suggests that the government has to provide more employment opportunities during the slack season in all GPs in general, and study GPs in particular.

Acknowledgements

This paper is a part of the completed research project "A Decade of MGNREGA: Participatory Assessments and the Way Forward", funded by NIRDPR, Hyderabad, which is gratefully acknowledged. However, the usual disclaimers apply.

References

- Bahuguna Rahul, Akhilesh Chandra Pandey & Vishal Soodan. (2016). A Study on Socio-Economic Impact of MGNREGA on Beneficiaries in Rudraprayag District of Uttarakhand, India, *International Journal of Management and Applied Science*, 2(10), 44-47.
- Benni Basavaraj, S. (2017). Inclusive Growth through Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee in Karnataka, *International Journal of Academic Research*, 4 (61), 53-61.
- Dheeraja, C., Madhuri N. V. & Antaripa Daimari. (2013). *Research Study on Factors Facilitating Participation of Women in Mahatma Gandhi NREGS*, Research Reports Series-98, by NIRDPR.
- Haque, T. (2011). Socio-economic Impact of Implementation of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act in India, *Social Change*, 41(3), 445-471.
- Kundu Amit & Sanjib Talukdar. (2016). Asset Creation through National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS) and its Impact on West Bengal Agriculture: A District Level Analysis, *Journal of Global Economy*, 12 (3), 151-166.
- Mahesh S. (2017). *Performance Analysis of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act in Karnataka: A Comparative Study of Chikkamagalur and Tumakuru Districts [Proceedings of the Sixth Middle East Conference on Global Business, Economics, Finance and Banking (ME17Dubai Conference)]*, Dubai-UAE. 6-8, Paper ID: D749.
- Maruthi, I. & Peter Pesala. (2018). Factors Influence to Participate MGNREGA Work: A Case Study in Shettihalli GP in Karnataka, *Journal of Economic Policy and Research (JEPR)*, 13(2), 47-56.
- Maruthi I. & Peter Pesala. (2019). *A Decade Of MGNREGA: Participatory Assessments and Way Forward in Karnataka*, Report Submitted to Centre For Wage Employment, National Institute of Rural Development & Panchayati Raj, Hyderabad-500 030.
- Peter Pesala & Maruthi, I. (2019). *Impact of MGNREGS on Rural Households: Selected GPs in (North) Karnataka* [Paper Presentation]. 19th Annual Conference on Development and Growth, NIRDPR.
- Peter Pesala & Maruthi, I. (2018a). *Employment and Income Generation through MGNREGA: A Case Study in Ammanallur GP in Kolar District in Karnataka* [Paper Presentation]. Social Security in India: Issues, Challenges and Prospects, Rani Channamma University, Belagavi.
- Peter Pesala & Maruthi, I. (2018b). *Employment and Income Generation through MGNREGA: An Empirical Analysis in Two GPs in Karnataka* [Paper Presentation] Social Security in India: Issues, Challenges and Prospects, Rani Channamma University, Belagavi.
- Rao K., Hanumantha, "Can the Rights-Based NREGA Reduce Poverty?", *Debating Poverty, eSocialSciences*, 2014, 26-31.
- Reddy, Y. Gangadhara & Aswath G. R. (2016). Performance of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act in Karnataka, India, *International Research Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(1), 15-19.