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7.1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act or MGNREGS is an Indian job guarantee scheme, enacted by legislation on August 25, 2005. The scheme provides a legal guarantee for 100 days of employment in every financial year to adult members of any rural household willing to do public work, related to unskilled manual work at the statutory minimum wage of Rs.100 per day.

A majority of the poor in rural areas of India depends mainly on the wages they earn through unskilled, casual and manual labour. The sinking labour demand and unpredictable natural disasters adversely affect their employment opportunity. They are vulnerable to the possibility of chronic poverty.

The National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme is a social and economic security for the rural poor. The MGNREGS is the first tangible commitment to the poor that they can expect to earn a living wage, without loss of dignity and demand this as a right. The MGNREGS is the United Progressive Alliance (UPA) Government’s flagship programme and they hope to gain political mileage in every election. MGNREGS has placed a judicially enforceable obligation on the state. Under the provisions of the Act, State Governments are to provide unskilled, manual work within 15 days of a person making an application, within a radius of 5 kms from the applicant’s residence. Failing this, the state government is to provide an unemployment allowance.
This Act has been extended to cover not just Below Poverty Line (BPL) households but is entitled to the statutory minimum wage applicable to agricultural workers in the state unless the central government overrides this by notifying a different wage rate. If the central government notifies a wage rate, it is subject to a minimum of Rs.100 per day.

The government has renamed its flagship 'Rural Job Guarantee Programme', the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme, after Mahatma Gandhi on his birth anniversary. The Centre has also decided to appoint 100 prominent people from across the country to carry out independent evaluations and monitoring of the scheme. The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGS), the United Progressive Alliance (UPA) government's flagship job scheme that provides 100 days of work in a financial year to every rural household, will now be called the Mahatma National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGMGNREGS).

The new name was unveiled on the birth anniversary of Mahatma Gandhi, on October 2, 2009, with Prime Minister Manmohan Singh announcing it to a gathering of heads of villages in New Delhi to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the launch of Panchayati Raj. This is a small effort to pay homage to the Mahatma who always believed in gram swaraj. Flooded with complaints about corruption in MGNREGS works, the Centre has also decided to appoint 100 prominent people from across the country to carry out independent evaluations and monitoring of the scheme.
Adult members of rural households submit their name, age and address with a photo to the Gram Panchayat. The Panchayat registers households after verification and issues a job card. The job card contains the details of the adult member enrolled and his/her photo. A registered person can submit an application for work in writing (for at least fourteen days of continuous work) either to the panchayat or to the Programme Officer.

If employment under the scheme is not provided within fifteen days of receipt of the application, the unemployment allowance will be paid to the applicant. No discrimination between men and women is allowed under the act. Therefore, men and women must be paid the same wage. All adults can apply for employment, not just those below the poverty line.

The MGNREGS achieves twin objectives of rural development and employment. The MGNREGS stipulates that works must be targeted towards a set of specific rural development activities such as water conservation and harvesting, afforestation, rural connectivity, flood control and protection such as construction and repair of embankments, etc. Digging of new tanks/ponds, percolation tanks and construction of small check dams are also carried out under this scheme.

Micro irrigation works such as construction of small canals is also carried out. The scheme provides irrigation facilities to land owned by people coming under SC/STs, beneficiaries of land reforms, Indira Awas Yojana, etc. Renovation of traditional water bodies is also
carried out. This involves desilting of tanks/ponds, old canals, open wells, etc. Land development is also given importance. The unemployed are given work such as land leveling, tree plantation, etc.


The scheme is extended to all other districts in a phased manner. It is expected to enhance people's livelihood on sustained basis by developing economic and social infrastructure in rural areas. It is a direct attack on the causes of chronic poverty such as drought, deforestation and soil erosion. The scheme is different from the earlier wage employment programmes in different ways:

- It provides legal guarantee of 100 days work to every rural house hold whose adult member volunteer to do un-skilled manual work
- If an applicant is not provided employment within 15 days he / she shall be entitled to unemployment allowance
Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme is demand-driven instead of being supply-driven.

The focus of the scheme shall be on the following works in their order of priority:

- Water conservation and water harvesting
- Drought proofing including afforestation and tree plantation
- Irrigation canals including micro and minor irrigation works
- Provision of irrigation facility to land owned by households belonging to the scheduled Castes/Schedule Tribes or to land of beneficiaries of land reforms or that of the beneficiaries under the IAH of Govt. of India
- Renovation of traditional water bodies including desilting of tanks
- Land Development
- Flood control and protection works including drainage in waterlogged areas
- Rural connectivity to provide all weather access and
- Any other work which may be notified by the Central Government in consultation with the State government
- Creation of durable assets and strengthening the livelihood resource base of the rural poor shall be an important object of the scheme
- The works taken up under the scheme shall be in rural areas
- The scheme shall not permit engaging any contractor for implementation of the projects under it.
Programmes for reduction of poverty in India have to be viewed in the wider perspective of the socio-economic transformation in the country. The experiences of the working of poverty alleviation programmes are not uniform in the country as a whole. Against this background of non-uniform implementation and performance of Special Employment Guarantee Scheme and anti-poverty programmes, the present study tries to assess the working and impact of MGNREGS in Anantapur district of Rayalaseema region in Andhra Pradesh.

Anantapur district is one of the chronically drought prone districts of India and has been identified by the World Bank for special assistance. So, it is hoped that the study of the impact of MGNREGS on income and employment generation in Anantapur district would be of considerable interest both to the planners and to the administrators. The MGNREGS is a demand driven scheme and has its focus on works relating to water conservation, drought proofing, land development, flood control and rural connectivity in terms of all weather roads. If it is implemented effectively, MGNREGS is going to be biggest social security programme for the unorganized workers.

The results of MGNREGS implementation are that the programme is supplementing the meager incomes of rural poor and reducing their dependence on moneylenders. The empowerment of rural poor by placing the right to demand for work is in the hands of poor is the biggest gain of the MGNREGS. The scheme is in the process of implementation and has also yielded productive assets in
villages, especially in the form of village tanks, new school buildings, roads and repairs of old ones in those areas.

The special feature of the MGNREGS has been as one third of the scheme's beneficiaries must be women. This type of programme becomes employment oriented, village oriented, poor oriented and basic needs oriented probably has more effective 'trickle down effect.' In these circumstances, the MGNREGS has become very vital for providing employment to poor people in rural India. The study is based both on primary and secondary data, official reports concerning the working of MGNREGS have been widely used. Along with these, a sample study has also been undertaken.

7.2. POVERTY ALLEVIATION PROGRAMMES IN RURAL INDIA

Poverty and unemployment have been the bane of India since long. Their reduction has been one of the major goals of India's development planning since the beginning of the planning era in 1951–52 and the planning process has been sensitive to the needs of the poor. Poverty in India is not merely an economic phenomenon but a social one as well. While poverty is an outcome of multiple deprivations, its measurement has largely dealt with economic deprivation.

Poverty alleviation schemes and programmes have been in pace for a long time now. The programmes and schemes have been modified, consolidated, expanded and improved over time. There are numerous centrally sponsored schemes (CSS) belonging to all the four categories. Incidence of poverty shows no discernible trend. In 1951,
47 percent of India's rural population was below the poverty line. The proportion went up to 64 percent in 1954-55 and it came down to 45 percent in 1960-61 but in 1977-78, it went up again to 51 percent. Poverty declined significantly between the mid-1970s and the end of the 1980s.

The decline was more pronounced between 1977-78 and 1986-87, with rural poverty declining from 51 percent to 39 percent. It went down further to 34 percent by 1989-90. Urban poverty went down from 41 percent in 1971-78 to 34 percent in 1986-87 and further to 33 percent in 1989-90. The post-economic reform period evidenced both progress and setbacks. Rural poverty increased from 34 percent in 1989-90 to 43 percent in 1992, and then fell to 37 percent in 1993-94. Undoubtedly, India has made some progress in the reduction of poverty. Yet, in 2004-05, as many as 302 million persons (27.5 percent) were living below the poverty line in India.

A large number of the hardcore poor are located in remote and inaccessible areas. The problem of poverty alleviation is going to be far more difficult than in the past, since those who were near the poverty line might have crossed it temporarily for some time but may have slipped again below the poverty line and now living as the hardcore poor. The poverty estimates in 2004-05 based on the URP consumption distribution (27.5 percent) is comparable with the poverty estimates of 1993-94, which was 36 percent. The poverty estimates in 2004-05 based on the MRP consumption (21.8 percent) is
roughly (but not strictly) comparable with the poverty estimates of 1999–2000, which was 26.1 percent.

The inter-state variations in the rural poverty reduction have been attributed to the variations in their agricultural productivity improvement. In addition, initial endowments of physical infrastructure and human resources did contribute to the inter-state variations in the performance. Andhra Pradesh which had benefited from Green Revolution, and Kerala and West Bengal which had implemented land reforms, experienced significant decline in the rural poverty ratio. Despite this, the rural poverty level was higher in West Bengal in 1999–2000 than that of all India because of the extremely high poverty level in the first phase.

Most of these programmes were conceived and funded by the central government which determined the criteria for allocation between states. The major programmes which have been adopted during the reform period are: Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS), Prime Minister's Rozgar Yojana (PMRY), National Social Assistance Programme (NSAP), Swarnajayanti Shahri Rozgar Yojana (SJSRY), Swarnajanti Gram Swarojgar Yojana (SGSY), Pradhan Mantri Gramodaya Yojana (PMGY), Antyodaya Anna Yojana (AAAY), Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY), Valmiki Ambedkar Awas Yojana (VAMBAY), Sampoorna Gramin Rozgar Yojana (SGRY), National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS).

Micro credit-linked programmes provide a package of services including credit and subsidy to set up micro enterprises. Wage employment programmes address the issue of transient poverty. Besides, schemes for infrastructure development and provision of basic services contribute to the well-being of the rural people. A careful examination of the poverty alleviation programmes reveals that the planners have made the assumption that the poor constitute a homogeneous category. The planners made no attempt to segment the group in terms of common characteristics and their requirements. A distinction has to be made between two categories of poor, namely, those who have some skills and thus can take up self-employment and others who are to be provided with wage-employment.

Each category should be treated separately by appropriate policy measures. Self-employment is a major form of employment in
the rural areas and this fact must not be ignored in the strategy of poverty alleviation. Further, dependence on wage employment alone to tackle the problem of poverty will lead to total dependence of the poor on employers. A major limitation of the existing poverty alleviation strategy is that it has no programmes for these households who neither have assets nor skills, and in addition, do not have any able-bodied adult member and thus cannot benefit from wage employment programmes. For such a category separate policy measures would be required. Moreover, poor targeting is reflected in the high proportion of non-poor and other non-eligible persons among the beneficiaries under these programmes.

It is also true that outlays on targeted poverty alleviation programmes have increased rapidly both in absolute terms and relative to total public sector plan outlays. The poverty alleviation programmes were revamped and refocused during the Ninth Plan to increase their effectiveness. During the Tenth Plan, those programmes that provide self-employment and wage employment to the poor would be implemented with greater vigour. The growth-oriented approach for poverty alleviation has been reinforced in the Tenth Plan by focusing on specific sectors, which provide greater opportunities for the poor to participate in the growth process.

Anti-poverty programmes have been strengthened and restructured through special programmes for the weaker sections of the society. Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP) was designed in such a way that it would promote self-employment
ventures in a variety of activities in the rural sector. Evaluation studies indicate its strong bias towards animal husbandry schemes, in particular milch cattle and goat rearing. In the newly launched SGSY also implementation of skill development programmes for the assisted individuals and self-help groups remains a weak area.

The primary objective of the JRY programme was to generate additional gainful employment for the unemployed and underemployed persons in the rural areas. JRY was also suffered from all ills of the poverty alleviation programmes. For example it was never possible to achieve full utilization of available fund during its implementation. The Midterm Appraisal of the Ninth Five Year Plan mentioned lower employment generation per person than the Task Force - on an average it was 18 days in 1994-95 and 16 days in 1995-96.

The ranking of states shows that employment generation is very low in the states like West Bengal, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Assam and Madhya Pradesh where number of families languishing under below poverty line is huge. At the instance of the Planning Commission, Programme Evaluation Organisation (PEO) undertook an evaluation study on EAS (Report published in April, 2000). It needs to be mentioned that in EAS also on an average expenditure in relation to available funds remained at a low level. This certainly goes against the objective of generating employment for the poor.
In this programme also in most of the years stipulated target of 30 per cent women coverage could not be achieved. With the launching of SGRY, food and nutrition security to the poor was brought in within the framework of the programme along with generation of wage employment and creation of durable economic infrastructure in the rural areas. The programme is being implemented as a centrally sponsored scheme on cost sharing basis between the Centre and the States in the ratio of 75:25 of the cash component where food grains would be provided free of cost to the states. The employment generation in SGRY (taking both the streams together) in 2002-03 and 2003-04 are respectively around 75 crores and 63 crores.

This employment generation is much less than EAS and JRY taken together. The employment generation in SGRY (taking both the streams together) in 2002-03 and 2003-04 are respectively around 75 crores and 63 crores. This employment generation is much less than EAS and JRY taken together. Low employment generation only affects the interests of the poor whose dependence on government sponsored programme is quite high in comparison to better off families.

In most developing countries, including India and most in South-East Asia, only few people voluntarily opt out of the labour market—it, they do so; it is most likely because they have given up hope. But the fact remains that even a rise in the employment to population ratio does not indicate whether the work being done falls
under the category of decent and productive jobs. The crisis of employment is a visible one.

Its manifestation may range from an anxiety to hold on to a low paid job to the concern that grips highly paid analysts and programmers who face the threat of outsourcing. But evidence shows that even in the United States, the largest outsourcer among the industrialized economies, estimates of job losses on account of outsourcing represent only a small fraction of the jobs lost.

The ILO report contends that the indications of deficit of decent work in the global labour market are many, the absence of social protection and basic rights at work, and so on. A key economic indicator of that deficit is that men and women do not earn enough to lift themselves out of poverty.

7.3. UNEMPLOYMENT SCENARIO AND EMPLOYMENT GENERATION PROGRAMMES IN INDIA

Poverty and unemployment have been the bane of India since long. Their reduction has been one of the major goals of India's development planning since the beginning of the planning era. Accordingly, the Government of India (GoI) has launched various programmes from time to time aimed at alleviation of poverty and unemployment. Poverty alleviation schemes and programmes have been in place for a long time now. The programmes and schemes have been modified, consolidated, expanded and improved over time. The targeted programmes fall into four broad categories:

- self-employment programmes;
wage-employment programmes; public distribution system (PDS); and other social welfare oriented programmes (SWOP), such as National Social Assistance Programme (NSAP) and the Aam Admi Bima Yojana (AABY).

Undoubtedly, India has made some progress in the reduction of poverty over time. Yet, according to the Uniform Recall Period (URP) consumption distribution data of the sixty-first round of the National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO) survey, in 2004-05, the poverty ratio in the rural areas of India was 28.3 percent for the country as a whole. According to Human Development Report (HDR) 2003 of the UNDP (2003), India has the largest number of poor among the countries of the world and is home to one-fourth of the world’s poor. The regional differences in poverty reduction are substantial. The decline in incidence of poverty in the state ranged between 12 and 50 percentage points in rural areas during 1973–2000 and 20–40 percentage points in urban areas.

The inter-state variations in the rural poverty reduction can be attributed to the variations in their initial endowments of natural resources, physical infrastructure, human resources and agricultural productivity. The poverty alleviation programmes were aimed at tackling the problems of poverty and backwardness directly by helping the weaker sections to increase their incomes through self-employment and wage-employment. According to the sixty-first round estimates of the NSSO, during 1999–2000 to 2004–05, the labour
force grew even faster at an annual 2.54 percent compared to annual employment growth of 2.48 percent.

As a result, despite the faster growth of employment, unemployment (on Usual Principle Status [UPS] basis) was higher at 3.06 percent of the labour force in 2004–05 as compared to 2.78 percent in 1999–2000. Incidence of unemployment had come down from 2.88 percent in 1983 to 2.62 percent in 1993–94. The public distribution system (PDS) is perhaps the oldest of all programmes that were designed to ensure food security in India, particularly of the poor. It is perhaps the world’s largest food distribution network.

The basic objective of the PDS is to ensure that essential commodities are made available to the people at reasonable price, so as to provide them a safety net against inflation. The Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP) is the most important programme that falls in the category of self-employment programmes. It is the single largest anti-poverty programme currently underway in all the community development blocks in the country. Wage-employment programmes have become important instruments for alleviating poverty and smoothing consumption during critical periods, including drought and flood situations.

The Rural Works Programme (RWP) was the first major public programme introduced in 1971 with the main aim of providing employment to the unemployed, particularly in the lean season. A series of wage-employment programmes followed the RWP. The National Rural Employment Guarantee (NREG) scheme was launched
on 2nd February 2006 in 200 backward districts with a view to extend it to all the districts within five years. It aims at enhancing the livelihood security of the people in rural areas by guaranteeing 100 days of wage employment in a financial year to every rural household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work. For the first time in India, it recognizes the right to work as a fundamental legal right.

Besides the self-employment and wage-employment schemes, there are few other social welfare programmes including the National Social Assistance Programme (NSAP), the Aam Admi Bima Yojana (AABY) and the Rashtriya Swasthya Bima Yojana (RSBY). The effectiveness of the poverty alleviation programmes in targeting the poor and alleviating poverty have been a mixed bag of success in some of the states and failure in other states. Variations in effectiveness are largely due to efficiency or otherwise of the implementing machinery, that is, the delivery system, strengths of the panchayati raj institutions existence or non-existence of community based organizations of people and initiative and innovativeness of the states in evolving approaches and institutional arrangements in harmony with the ground conditions. Poverty and unemployment are interrelated problems and have a two-way relation, that is, one is both the cause and effect of the other.

Poverty in India is not merely an economic phenomenon but a social one as well. While poverty is an outcome of multiple deprivations, its measurement has largely dealt with economic
deprivation (income/consumption expenditure). Poverty alleviation schemes and programmes have been in pace for a long time now. The programmes and schemes have been modified, consolidated, expanded and improved over time. Incidence of poverty shows no discernible trend. In 1951, 47 percent of India’s rural population was below the poverty line. In development economics, the link between employment and poverty is one of the most debatable issues, particularly in the light of their relationship with the general growth rate of the economy. Out of the 377.88 million labour force in 1999–2000, 337 million were employed (251 million in rural areas and 86 million in urban areas) and 26.6 million (7.32 percent) were unemployed.

The primary sector—agriculture, animal husbandry, fisheries and forestry—employed 191 million (57 percent) of the workforce, unorganized non-agricultural sector employed 118 million (35 percent) and the organized sector employed just 28 million (8 percent). Employment in the organized sector had increased slowly from 24 million in 1983 to 28 million in 1999–2000. The poverty alleviation programmes were aimed at tackling the problems of poverty and backwardness directly by helping the weaker sections to increase their incomes through self-employment and wage-paid employment. The major premise of the group-specific programmes was that their benefits would flow to the weaker sections because of the specificity of the target groups and target areas.
The national Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005 was introduced in India in 2005 with an objective of providing 100 days of employment for the job seekers who are willing to do unskilled work in a financial year. The Act empowers ordinary people to play an active role in the implementation of employment guarantee schemes through gram sabhas, social audits, participatory planning and other means. The Act is an important step towards the realization. Each State Government shall formulate an Employment Guarantee Scheme. The Act envisages a collaborative partnership between the Central Government, the State Governments, the Panchayats and the local community.

The gram sabha is the statutorily mandated institutional mechanism for community participation. For the implementation of REGA, the gram panchayats at the bottom level, Mandal Parishads at the block level, Zilla Parishads at the district level along with concerned state government at the state level and also the Central Government at the top. The work entitlement of '100 days per household per year' may be shared between different adult members of the same household.

At least 50 percent of the works in terms of costs will be allotted to the gram panchayats for execution. Worksite facilities are to be ensured by the Implementing Agency. Medical aid, drinking water,
shade and crèche if there are more than five children below the age of six years will have to be provided. Equal wages to be paid both men and women workers and the provisions of the equal remuneration Act, 1976 shall be complied with.

It is recommended that wages should be paid on a weekly basis or a pre-specified day of the week in each gram panchayat. The central government will normally release funds equal to the expenditure incurred and admissible under the scheme. The share of the concerned state government will be released by the state government within 15 days of the release of the central funds.

The MNREGS funds at the gram panchayat level can not be used for other purposes under any circumstances. The gram sabha will monitor all the works at the village levels as well as the employment provided to each person who has applied for MNREGS work. The gram panchayats will monitor works executed by other implementing agencies, muster rolls maintained by them at work sites and the payments made. The financial audit is mandatory and this must be carried out at the end of the financial year by each district.

A physical audit of the works undertaken will be conducted to verify the quality of works and to check that the expenditures incurred have led to the creation of durable assets. In the context of MNREGS, the process of social audit should include public vigilance and verification of registration of families, distribution of job cards, selection of sites, receipt of work applications, allotment of work to
individuals, supervision of works, payment of unemployment of allowance, payment of wages and evaluation of MNREGS work.

Andhra Pradesh is regarded as one of the most progressive states of the country today. The population of A.P. as per the 2001 census stands at 76.21 millions. This constitutes about 7.42% of the total population of the country. This makes A.P. is the most populous of the four southern States. It shows that the total number of households working under MNREGS are 56.26 lakhs with a variation of 1.20 lakhs in Rangareddy district to 3.89 lakh households in Nalgonda district. The number of households provided 100 mandays of employment under the scheme in A.P. are 8.37 lakhs with a variation of 1451 in Guntur district to 61843 in Vizianagaram district.

It may also observed that the number of households provided 75-100 days of employment are 4.98 lakhs with a variation of 1497 households in Guntur district to 38617 in Vizianagaram district. The number of households received 50-75 days of employment under MNREGS are 8.04 lakhs in the state with the district variation of 3888 in Guntur district to 56900 in Warangal district.

It reveals that the number of households completed less than 50 days per year from the scheme in the state are 34.87 lakhs and more number of workers received less than 50 days are 2.67 lakhs in Nalgonda district. The average wage rate per day per person is Rs. 89 and the average days of employment provided per household are 51 in A.P.
It shows that the total amount allotted to all the districts, to utilize at mandal level are increased from Rs.145541 lakhs in 2007-08 to Rs.321179 lakhs in 2009-10 with the annual average amount of Rs.228402 per annum. It may be noticed that the total expenditure incurred under MNREGS increased from Rs.145541 lakhs to Rs.295207 lakhs during 2007-2010 with the annual average expenditure of Rs.212653 lakhs.

However, the expenditure incurred for MNREGS works has been increased during 2009-2010 comparatively with its previous years in the state in most of the districts. The expenditure incurred for MNREGS works fluctuated between Rs.1, 896.07 lakhs in Guntur district to Rs.19,936.01 lakhs in Mahaboobnagar district with a state average of Rs.13,856.87 lakhs. It may also observed that the annual average expenditure under MNREGS works in between different districts of A.P during 2007-2008 to 2009-2010 varied form Rs.1,506.71 lakhs in Krishna district to Rs.14,277.36 lakhs in Anantapur district with a state annual average expenditure of Rs.9,284.37 lakhs per annum.

It reveals that in the 10 out of 22 districts, the expenditure incurred on administration of MNREGS varied form Rs.80.51 lakhs in Srikakulam district to Rs.195.87 lakhs in Kurnool district during 2007-2008. In the remaining district the expenditure on administration varied form Rs. 216.07 lakhs in Kadapa district to Rs.290.61 lakhs in Nalgonda district. On an average, Rs.119.61 lakhs
were incurred for administration of MNREGS in various districts (except Krishna and Visakhapatnam) of A.P. during 2007-2008.

Further, it is noticed that the expenditure on administration of MNREGS during 2009-2010 fluctuated between Rs.166.66 lakhs in Krishna district of Andhra region and 709.91 lakhs in Anantapur district of Rayalaseema region with the state average of Rs. 954.88 per district during 2009-2010.

It shows that during 2008-2009, the expenditure on publicity and awareness of MNREGS varied from Rs.0.82 lakhs in Prakasam district of Andhra region to Rs.13.64 lakhs in West Godavari district of the same region in A.P. with state average of Rs.4.86 lakhs. During 2009-2010, the expenditure on publicity and awareness of MNREGS programme in different districts of A.P. varied from Rs.0.50 lakhs in Prakasam district to Rs.20.91 lakhs in Warangal district. It may also observed that the annual average expenditure on publicity and awareness among the various districts of A.P. during 2007-2010 fluctuated between Rs.1.16 lakhs in Prakasam district and Rs.11.76 lakhs in Warangal district with the annual state average of Rs.5.13 lakhs during 2007-2010.

It also reveals that the expenditure incurred on social audit is low in Prakasam district with Rs.2, 000 only during 2007-08 and high in 67.32 lakhs in Kurnool distinct during the same period. However, no amount was incurred on social audit in six out of 22 districts in Andhra Pradesh during 2007-08.
It also indicates that the expenditure on social audit during 2009-2010 was fluctuated between Rs.6.54 lakhs in Ranga Reddy district and Rs.35.69 lakhs in Khammam district with a state average of Rs.18.97 lakhs. Since the inception of MGNREGS in A.P. an amount of Rs.1175.83 lakhs were incurred for social audit of MGNREGS in Andhra Pradesh.

The total expenditure on MGNREGS in A.P. was increased from Rs. 1,20,835.45 lakhs in 2007-2008 to Rs.2,02,151.61 lakhs in 2008-09. It reveals that the total expenditure on MGNREGS in A.P. during 2008-09 was fluctuated between Rs.1,671.34 lakhs in Krishna district and Rs.16,159.28 lakhs in Kurnool district with the state average expenditure of Rs.9,188.71 lakhs. It may also observed that the total expenditure on MGNREGS in A.P. during 2009-2010 was fluctuated from Rs.2,163.75 lakhs in Guntur district and Rs.20,587.48 lakhs in Mahaboobnagar district with a state average expenditure of Rs.13890.17.

It is interesting to note that except in Guntur (43.72%) and West Godavari (38.04%) districts, the unspent MGNREGS funds varied from only 0.24% in Nizamabad district to 8.98% in Ranga Reddy districts during 2009-2010. On the average, only 5.47% per district was not utilised the MGNREGS funds during 2009-2010. The annual average balance of MGNREGS funds among the various states in A.P. fluctuated between 3.41% in Nizamabad district and 323.19% in West Godavari district.
7.5. STATUS AND PROGRESS OF MGNREGS IN THE STUDY AREA

Anantapur district was formed in the year 1882 by separating from Bellary district and was later on extended with the addition of Kadiri taluk from Kadapa district in the year 1910 and Rayadurg taluk from Bellary district in the year 1956. Anantapur District is situated in the western part of Deccan plateau and forms the southernmost part of Rayalaseema region of Andhra Pradesh. Anantapur is the biggest districts of Andhra Pradesh accounting 6.7% of the total geographical area of the state.

The district has been divided into three Revenue Divisions viz., Anantapur division (20 revenue mandals), Dharmavaram division (17 revenue mandals) and Penukonda division (26 revenue mandals) consisting of 63 revenue mandals. There are 2415 hamlets indicating an average of three hamlets for each revenue village. All villages are covered under 866 Villages.

It reveals that out of 87 sample respondents in Settur mandal about 78% are Hindus and nearly 22% are Muslims. It may also reveal that in Anumpalli village nearly 58% are Hindus and about 42% are Muslims. It may also noticed that in Makodiki village 86% are Hindus and 14% are Muslims and in Thippanapalli village out of 12 sample respondents, 83% are Hindus and nearly 17% are Muslims.

It reveals that out of 98 sample MGNREGS respondent households of Yadiki mandal under study, nearly 85% are Hindus and about 15% are Muslims. It may also noticed that in Thippareddypalli village nearly 79% of the respondents are Hindus and 21% are
Muslims. It reveals that nearly 78% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Basavanahalli village, 85% in Nidragatta village, 70% in Thammedahalli village, about 88% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Gowdanakunta village and 75% in Veerapuram village are Hindus.

The Scheduled caste respondent households are identified in Makodiki (42.66%) and Thippanapalli villages (2.5%) with a total share of 13.79% in Settur mandal. It may also noticed that the number of sample ST respondent households are nearly 16% each in Anumpalli and Bacheputi villages.

It shows that out of 98 sample MGNREGS respondent households in five selected villages of Thipareddypalli mandal, about 20% belongs to SC category, nearly 47% are STs, 19% are BCs and the rest 13% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households are from other communities under reference. It may also observed that in Thipareddypalli village, nearly 11% of the sample respondents are STs 58% are BCs and another 32% of the respondents belongs to other communities.

It shows that 11% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Nidragatta, Thammedahalli and Gowdanakunta villages are Scheduled Caste. Nearly six percent in Basavanahalli and Gowdanakunta villages and five percent of the sample respondents in Thammedahalli village belongs to Scheduled Tribes.

It shows that out of 87 sample respondents in Settur mandal, about 10% are in the age group of 21 to 25 years, 47% are in the age
group of 26–40 years, 32% are between 41 and 60 years of age and the remaining 9% of the sample respondents are in the age group of above 60 years of age.

Out of 12 sample MGNREGS respondent households in Thippanapalli village, nearly 17% are in the age group of 21–25 years, 25% are in the age group of 26–40 years, 50% are between 41 and 60 years and the rest 8% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households age is above 60 years. It reveals that five percent of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Lakshumpalli village, nearly 32% of the respondents in Gudipadu village and 10% in Puppala village are in the age group of 21 to 25 years.

It reveals that five percent of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Thermedahalli village and nearly six percent of the sample in Gowdanakunta village are in the age group of 21 to 25 years. It may also observed that about 4% of the sample respondents in Basavanahalli village, 90% of the respondents in Nidragatta and Veerapuram villages, 75% in Thammedahalli village and about 82% in Gowdanakunta village are in the age group of 26–40 years.

It reveals that out of 87 sample MGNREGS respondent households in Anumpalli mandal, about 85% are illiterates, ten percent are studied upto primary standards, another two percent each of the respondents have upper primary and secondary standards. It may also noticed that nearly 89% of the MGNREGS respondent households in Anumpalli and Bachepalli villages, about 88% in
Khairevu, 52% in Makodiki village and 83% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Thippanapalli village are illiterate.

It is observed that 84% of the respondents in Thippareddypalli village, 90% of sample respondents each in Lakshumpalli, Puppala and Kotanaka villages, about 74% of the respondents in Gudipadu village are illiterate. It shows that about five percent in Gudipadu village were studied upto intermediate education.

It reveals that nearly 89% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Basavanahalli village, 95% in Nidragatta and Thammedahalli villages, all the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Gowdanakunta village and 85% in Veerapuram village are illiterates. Nearly six percent of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Basavanahalli village and five percent in Veerapuram village are studied upto secondary education.

It shows that nearly 95% of the MGNREGS respondent households in Anumpalli village, about 89% in Bachepalli village, all the respondents in Khairevu and Thippanapalli villages and 90% in Makodiki village are married. It reveals that nearly 95% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Thippareddypalli village, 70% of the respondents in Kottalapalli village, about 89% in Gudipadu village and 95% of the respondents in Puppala village are married.

It reveals that only one sample Sample MGNREGS respondent households in Kottalapalli village is unmarried woman and one respondent in Gudipadu village is divorced. It may also observed that one respondent each in Thippareddypalli, Gudipadu and Puppala
villages, and 25% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Kottalapalli village are widowed. Nearly 89% of the sample households in Basavanahalli village, all the respondents in Nidragatta, Thammedahalli and Gowdanakunta villages and 95% of the sample respondents in Veerapuram village are married.

Out of 87 sample MGNREGS respondent households, nearly 30% of the families are joint families and the rest 70% of the households have nuclear families. It may also observed that 47% of the sample households in Anumpalli village, 37% in Bachepalli village, nearly 19% in Khairevu village, about 19% of sample households in Makodiki village and two percent of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Thippanapalli village have joint families.

It may also reveals that nearly 53% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Anumpalli village, 63% in Bachepalli village, about 81% of the sample households each in Khairevu and Makodiki villages and 75% of the sample households in Thippanapalli village have nuclear families.

It may also observed that nearly 95% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Thipparedypalli and Puppala villages, 75% of the sample households in Kottalapalli village, 90% of the respondents in Lakshumpalli village and all the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Gudipadu village have nuclear families.

Out of 95 sample MGNREGS respondent households in Amarapuram mandal, nearly 14% have joint families and 85% of the sample households are nuclear family. It shows that nearly 39% of
the sample households in Basavanahalli village, five percent in Nidragatta village, 10% of the respondent households in Thammedahalli village and 15% of the sample households in Veerapuram village have joint families.

It reveals that out of 19 sample MGNREGS respondent households households in Anumpalli village, nearly 95% of the households have pukka houses and five percent are residing in pukka under government scheme. It shows that nearly 95% of the sample households in Thipparedypalli village, 90% of the respondent households in Kottalapalli village, 60% in Lakshumpalli village, about 63% of the respondent households in Gudipadu village and 80% of the sample respondent households in Puppala village have pukka houses.

It shows that about 89% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Anumpalli village and all the respondent households in the remaining four sample villages under study are residing in their own houses. Out of 87 sample MGNREGS respondent households in Anumpalli mandal nearly 98% are residing in their own houses and the rest of the respondents are residing in rented and the relative's houses.

It reveals that out of 98 sample MGNREGS respondent households in Yadiki mandal, nearly 97% of them have own houses and the rest are residing in the rental houses. It reveals that nearly 89% of the sample respondent households in Basavanahalli village, 88% in Gowdanakunta village, 90% of the sample households in
Thammedahalli village and all the respondent households in Nidragatta and Veerapuram villages are residing in their own houses.

7.6. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

About 21 sample MGNREGS respondent households in Anumpalli village, 84% in Bachepalli, nearly 63% in Khairevu village, 71% in Makodiki village, and 83% of the sample MGNREGS respondents in Thippanapalli village have less than two adult male workers in their families. It shows that in 63% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Anumpalli village, nearly 19% of the respondent households in Khairevu village, nearly 17% in Thippanapalli village have two adult male workers in their families are getting.

Only five respondent households each in Anumpalli and Bachepalli villages more than four adult male workers in their families under reference. Only one adult female worker is there in 42% of the sample households in Anumpalli village, in 84% of sample households in Bachepalli village, in 75% of the families in Khairevu village, 71% of the sample houses in Makodiki and in all the respondent households in Thippanapalli village.

It reveals that nearly in 11% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Anumpalli village, around five percent each in Bachepalli and Makodiki villages and six percent in Khairevu village have three adult female workers in their families are getting job under NREGS. It is also observed that nearly in 16% of the sample households in Thippareddy palli village, in 40% in Kottalapalli village,
in 30% of Lakshumpalli, nearly 37% of the respondent households in Gudipadu village and in 15% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Puppala village, two male adults are getting employment under the programme.

It shows that nearly 11% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Thippareddypalli village, in five percent of the households in Kottalapalli village, and in 11% of the sample households in Gudipadu village, three adult male in their families are getting employment under NREGS. About in 89% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Thippareddypalli village, 65% of the households in Kottalapalli, 75% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Lakshumpalli village, about 89% of the respondent households in Gudipadu village and in 85% of the sample households in Puppala village, only one adult female worker is getting wage employment. It may also observed that in about 44% of the sample respondent households in Basavanahalli village, in 35% of Thammedahalli village, in nearly 18% of the sample households in Gowdanakunta village and in 15% of the sample households in Veerapuram village, two adult male in their families are getting job under NREGS. It shows that about 11% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Basavanahalli village, five percent of the respondent households in Nidragatta and Thammedahalli villages, in about six percent in Gowdanakunta and in 10% of the sample households in Veerapuram village, three adult male are getting employment from EGS under study.
It reveals that about seven percent of the sample households in Basavanahalli village, in 95% in Nidragatta village, in 80% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Thammedahalli, in 88% of Gowdanakunta village and in 75% of Veerapuram village, only one female adult is involved in NREGS. It shows that nearly 17% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Basavanahalli village, three female adult workers are getting wage employment. It may also observed that in five percent of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Thammedahalli and Veerapuram villages, four adult female are getting job from NREGS under study.

It shows that nearly 32% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Anumpalli village, 53% in Bachepalli, 25% of the Sample MGNREGS respondents families in Khairevu village, 48% of the sample households in Makodiki and 4% of the respondent households in Thippanapalli village have only one dependent in their families.

It reveals that nearly 11% of the respondent households each in Anumpalli and Bachepalli villages, nearly 13% in Khairevu village, 14% of the respondent households in Makodiki village and 17% in Thippanapalli village have three dependents in their families. It reveals that about 47% of the sample respondent households in Thippareddypalli village, 75% in Kottalapalli village, 55% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Lakshumpalli village, about 68% in Gudipadu and 40% in Puppala village have one dependent member in their houses.
There are three dependent family members in 11% of the sample household families in Thippareddypalli village, in one respondent house in Kottalapalli and Puppala village, in 10% of the sample household families in Lakshumpalli village and in 11% of the sample families in Gudipadu village. Nearly 39% of the sample respondent households in Basavanahalli Village, 40% in Nidragatta, 55% in Thammedahalli, about 41% of the sample households in Gowdanakunta village and 35% of the sample households in Veerapuram village have only one dependent in their families.

It shows that about 44% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Basavanahalli village, 40% in Nidragatta village, 35% in Thammedahalli, about 41% in Gowdanakunta village and 55% in Veerapuram village have two dependents in their families. Out of 87 sample MGNREGS respondent households in Anumpalli village, 23% of the respondents’ main occupation is agriculture, 56% of the respondents are agricultural labour, nearly 15% are non-agricultural labour and nearly six percent are depending on other activities.

It reveals that MGNREGS wage employment activity is the main occupation for 26% of the sample MGNREGS respondents in Anumpalli village, for 89% in Bachepalli village, for 31% in Khairevu, for 62% in Makodiki and for 75% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Thippanapalli village. Other activities are the main occupation for 11% of the MGNREGS respondents in Anumpalli village, for six percent in Khairevu, for five percent in Makodiki and for about eight percent of the sample MGNREGS respondents in
Thippanapalli village. It is observed that agriculture is the main occupation for 37% of the sample respondent households in Thippareddypalli village, for 10% in Kottalapalli, for 15% in Lakshumpalli village, for 26% in Gudipadu village and for 15% of the sample MGNREGS Respondent Households in Puppala village.

It may also noticed that about 47% of the sample households in Thippareddypalli village, 90% in Kottalapalli village, about 74% in Gudipadu are depending on MGNREGS activity. It shows that agriculture is the main occupation for about 61% of the sample MGNREGS respondents in Basavanahalli village, for 20% in Nidragatta village, for 25% of the sample respondents in Thammedahalli village, for about 41% of the respondents in Gowdanakunta village and for about 30% of the sample respondents in Veerapuram village.

It reveals that nearly 3% of the respondent households in Anumpalli village, 68% in Bachepalli village, nearly 19% in Khairevu village, 33% in Makodiki village and 53% of the sample MGNREGS respondents in Thippanapalli village have less than 2.5 acres of agricultural land. It reveals that 21% of the respondent households in Anumpalli village, nearly 11% of the households in Bachepalli village, 25% in Khairevu village and nearly 24% of the MGNREGS respondents in Makodiki village have 5.00 to 10.00 acres of agricultural lands.

About 42% of the sample households in Thippareddypalli village, about 68% of the sample respondents in Lakshumpalli village,
65% of the respondent households each in Gudipadu and Puppala village have less than 2.5 acres of agricultural land. It reveals that one sample respondent household in and Lakshumpalli villages, and two sample MGNREGS respondent households each in Gudipadu and Puppala village have 5.00 to 10.00 acres of agricultural land. It may also reveals that only one sample respondent household in Gudipadu village have 10 to 15 acres of agricultural land.

It may also noticed that nearly 56% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Basavanahalli village, 45% in Nidragatta, 24% of the sample Sample respondent households in Gowdanakunta village and 55% of the sample respondent households in Veerapuram village have 2.5 to 5.00 acres of land.

It shows that about 22% of the sample MGNREGS respondents in Basavanahalli village, 10% in Nidragatta and Veerapuram villages, five percent in Thammedahalli villages and nearly 12% of the sample MGNREGS respondents in Gowdanakunta village have 5.00 to 10.00 acres of agricultural land.

It shows that out of 87 sample MGNREGS respondents in all the five selected villages of Settur Mandal, nearly 23% of the respondent's major source of income is agriculture, 47% are depending on the wage income from NREGS, 25% depends on allied activities and the rest five percent of the respondents are mainly depends on other sources of income.

About 21% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Thipparredypalli village, five percent in Kottalapalli village, 10% in
Lakshumpalli village, nearly 11% in Gudipadu and 15% of the sample Sample MGNREGS respondent households in Puppala village are mainly depending for their annual income on their own cultivation.

The earnings from NREGS wage employment is the major source of income for nearly 16% of the sample MGNREGS Respondent Households in Thippareddypalli village and for only five percent in Gudipadu village. It reveals that nearly 39% of the sample respondents in Basavanahalli village, 15% in Nidragatta village, 10% in Thammedahalli village, about 2% in Gowdanakunta village and 25% of the respondents’ major source of income is the own cultivation.

It shows that agricultural labour wages are the major source of income to 33% of the sample households in Basavanahalli village, 71% in Gowdanakunta village and for 60% of the sample households in Thammedahalli and Veerapuram villages. It reveals that nearly 79% in Anumpalli, 95% of the respondent households in Bachepalli village and all the respondent households in the remaining three sample villages under reference were received the loans through micro finance institutions.

It may also observed that out of 87 sample MGNREGS respondents in Anumpalli manda,l about 94% have awareness on NREGS policies. It is noticed that about 89% of the sample respondents in Thippareddypalli village, 42% of the MGNREGS respondents in Gudipadu village, 95% of the respondent households in Lakshumpalli and Puppala villages and all the sample MGNREGS
respondents in Kottalapalli village have awareness on the implementation process of MGNREGS under study.

It may also noticed that nearly 11% of the sample respondents in Thippareddypalli village, five percent of the respondents each in Lakshumpalli and Puppala villages and nearly 58% of the sample MGNREGS respondents in Gudipadu village have no awareness on this wage employment programme.

It reveals that about 94% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Basavanahalli and Gowdanakunta villages, 90% in Nidragatta and Thammedahalli villages and 85% of the sample respondents in Veerapuram village have awareness on the implementation process of MGNREGS programme. It may also noticed that nearly six percent in Basavanahalli and Gowdanakunta villages, 10% of the respondents in Nidragatta and Thammedahalli villages and 15% in Veerapuram village have no awareness on MGNREGS.

About 21% of the respondent households in Anumpalli village, 47% in Bachepalli village, about six percent in Khairevu village and 33% of the sample MGNREGS respondents in Makodiki village received wae employment for less than 60 days per annum under study.

It may also noticed that nearly 79% of the respondents in Anumpalli village, 53% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Bachepalli village, nearly 94% in Khairevu, around 67% of the sample MGNREGS respondents in Makodiki village and all the
sample MGNREGS respondents in Thippanapalli village are getting 60 to 80 days of wage employment per annum.

It reveals that 11% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Thippareddypalli village, 20% in Kottalapalli, 10% of the respondents in Lakshumpalli village, nearly 53% in Gudipadu village and 45% of the respondents in Puppala village are getting less than 60 days employment from NREGS. It may also noticed that nearly 53% of the sample MGNREGS respondents in Thippareddypalli village, 15% in Kottalapalli village, 45% in Lakshumpalli village and nearly 11% of the sample respondents in Gudipadu village received more than 80 days of wage employment from NREGS programme under reference.

It reveals that 10% of the sample respondent households in Nidragatta village and 20% of the sample respondents in Thammedahalli village received less than 60 days of wage employment per annum from NREGS under reference. It shows that 50% of the sample respondents in Nidragatta village, about 94% in Gowdanakunta village and 35% of the sample respondents in Veerapuram village received 60 – 80 days of wage employment from the programme.

It reveals that all the respondents in Basavanahalli village, 40% in Nidragatta village, 80% in Thammedahalli, nearly six percent of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Gowdanakunta village and 65% in Veerapuram village received above 80 days of wage employment per year.
It shows that nearly 16% of the respondents in Bachepalli village and about six percent in Khairevu village received an income of Rs. 10,000 from the NREGS wages during 2010-2011. It may also noticed that about 21% in Anumpalli village, nearly 37% in Bachepalli village, 24% of the respondents in Makodiki and 58% of the sample respondents in Thippanapalli village received an income of Rs. 10001 to Rs. 15000 from the MGNREGS wages during the same year.

It may also revealed that about 68% of the respondent households in Anumpalli village, 42% in Bachepalli village, 75% in Khairevu and nearly 24% in Makodiki village and 42% of the sample MGNREGS respondents in Thippanapalli village received an income of Rs. 15001 to Rs. 20,000 during 2010-11.

An amount of above Rs. 20,000 received from NREGS wages during 2010-2011 by nearly 11% of the MGNREGS respondents in Anumpalli village, about five percent in Bachepalli village, nearly 19% of the respondents in Khairevu and about 52% of the MGNREGS respondents in Makodiki village. It is observed that nearly 16% of the sample MGNREGS respondents in Thippareddypalli village, 40% of the respondents in Kottalapalli village, 42% of the sample households in Gudipadu village and 15% of the sample MGNREGS respondents each in Lakshumpalli and Puppala village received an income of less than Rs. 10,000 from the MGNREGS wages during 2010-2011.

It reveals that nearly 11% of the sample MGNREGS respondents in Thippareddypalli village, five percent in Gudipadu village and 10% in Kottalapalli, Lakshumpalli and Puppala villages received the income
of above Rs. 20000/- from the MGNREGS wages during 2010-2011. It
reveals that 20% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in
Nidragatta village, 10% in Thammedahalli village, nearly 71% in
Gowdanakunta village, and 30% in Veerapuram village received less
than Rs. 10,000 income from the MGNREGS wages during 2010-11.

It shows that in the same year an amount of Rs. 15001 to Rs.
20,000 was yielded from the NREGS wages for 72% of the sample
MGNREGS respondent households in Basavanahalli village, for 10%
in Nidragatta, for 45% of the sample respondents in Thammedahalli
village and for 20% of the sample respondents in Veerapuram village.
It reveals that about 11% of the sample respondents in Basavanahalli
village, 15% in Thammedahalli and five percent of the MGNREGS
respondents in Veerapuram village received above Rs. 20,000/- of
income from the employment guarantee scheme under reference.

Nearly 11% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in
Anumpalli village, about five percent in Bachepalli village and nearly
five percent in Makodiki village got less than 7 days of employment
per month from NREGS. It may also observed that about 63% in
Anumpalli village, 84% in Bachepalli village, nearly 69% in Khairevu
village, nearly 86% in Makodiki village and 83% of the sample
MGNREGS respondents in Thippanapalli village received more than
13 days of wage employment per month.

It reveals that about five percent of the respondents in
Thipparreddypalli, Kottalapalli and Gudipadu villages and 10% in
Lakshumpalli village got less than 7 days of wage employment per
month from NREGS. It shows that above 10 days of employment was
generated to 84% in Thippareddypalli village, for 85% of the sample
respondents in Kottalapalli, for 50% of the respondents in
Lakshumpalli village, for 32% in Gudipadu and for 80% of the sample
respondents in Puppala village.

It shows that less than 7 days of employment was generated for
about 11% of the sample respondents in Basavanahalli village, for
10% in Nidragatta and for 20% of the sample MGNREGS respondents
in Thammedahalli village. It may also observed that 7 – 10 days of
employment was generated per month through the NREGS sector for
nearly 89% of the sample MGNREGS respondents in Basavanahalli
village, for 90% in Nidragatta village, for 80% in Thammedahalli and
for all the sample respondents in Gowdanakunta and Veerapuram
villages.

It shows that Rs. 7501 to 10000 worth of assets acquired by
nearly 32% of the respondents in Thippareddypalli village, 50% in
Kottalapalli and Puppala villages, 25% of the respondent households
in Lakshumpalli village and nearly 74% of the respondents in
Gudipadu village under reference. It may also noticed that about 26%
of the sample MGNREGS respondents in Thippareddypalli village, 10%
in Kottalapalli, 40% of the respondents in Lakshumpalli village and
20% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Puppala
village acquired the assets worth of above Rs. 10000 from the income
of the NREGS wages under reference.
It shows that 20% of the sample MGNREGS respondents in Nidragatta village, 15% in Thammedahalli, about 18% in Gowdanakunta village and 10% of the sample MGNREGS Respondent Households in Veerapuram village acquired the assets worth of Rs. 5000 from the wage income. It shows that Rs. 7501 to Rs. 10000 worth of assets were acquired by 44% of the sample respondents in Basavanahalli village, by 35% in Nidragatta village, by 40% in Thammedahalli, by 41% in Gowdanakunta and by 20% in Veerapuram village. It may also observed that nearly 39% of the sample MGNREGS respondents in Basavanahalli village, 15% in Nidragatta and Veerapuram villages, 25% of the respondents in Thammedahalli village and about 29% of the sample respondents in Gowdanakunta village acquired the assets worth of above Rs. 10000 from the NREGS wage income under study. About five percent of the sample MGNREGS respondents in Thippareddypalli and Puppala villages, 15% in Lakshumpalli and nearly 16% in Gudipadu village were utilized the loan waiver scheme from the government for their agricultural loans.

It may also observed that 42% of the sample respondents in Thippareddypalli village, 35% in Lakshumpalli, nearly 32% in Gudipadu village and 10% of the sample respondents in Puppala village utilized the mid-day meals scheme for their school going children. It shows that 10% of the sample respondents in Thammedahalli village, about 12% in Gowdanakunta and 25% in Veerapuram village utilized the loan waiver scheme for agricultural
loans. It may also noticed that about 22% of the sample MGNREGS respondent households in Basavanahalli village, 30% in Nidragatta, 15% in Thammedahalli, nearly 24% in Gowdanakunta village and 20% in Veerapuram village utilized the mid-day meals scheme for their children. The fees reimbursement scheme for higher education of the children was utilized by 15% of the sample respondent households in Thammedahalli village and six percent of the respondent households in Gowdanakunta village.

It shows that 33% of the sample respondents in Basavanahalli village, 50% in Nidragatta village, 30% in Thammedahalli village, about 12% in Gowdanakunta village and 45% in Veerapuram village utilized the agricultural subsidies. It reveals that 10% of the sample MGNREGS Respondent Households in Thammedahalli village and nearly six percent in Gowdanakunta utilized the other government schemes.

It shows that 84% of the sample respondents in Anumpalli village, all the sample respondents in Bachepalli and Khairrevu villages, about 95% of the sample MGNREGS respondents in Makodiki village and nearly 92% of in Thippanapalli village saved an amount of less than Rs. 2500 per annum from MGNREGS Wage income.

7.7. SUGGESTIONS

It is better to pay the wages through the regional rural banks or the other banks located within five kilometers from their villages to avoid malpractices in the distribution of wages and to avoid the binomee names in the job list.
The social audit is useful when the rural people have awareness on MGNREGS programme. For this mass publicity to be followed to know the importance of MGNREGS. The district collector should take responsibility to create awareness on MGNREGS guidelines and its implementation process.

The provision of facilities at work site is only book keeping. All the facilities like drinking water, child care, first aid facility, extra wage for five kilometers of distance to be implemented strictly. The MGNREGS wages to be paid within one week without any delay for any reasons.

All the works under MGNREGS are to be for public but not for individual benefit of any section in the society. The Act main objective is to provide 100 days of employment guarantee. So that the other sections will get some indirect benefit through the creation of asset from MGNREGS programme. This in future is useful to the development of rural India.

The households registered for job cards to be scrutinized in the Gram Sabha to avoid malpractice.

The job cards to be provided within 15 days without local political involvement.

All the job card holders are to be agricultural labour or Small, Marginal or Medium farmers.

The role of gram panchayat to be improved in identification of works, issue of job cards, payment of wages.

The execution of works to be under the control of gram panchayat or a separate local committee to be formed.

All the job seeking households to be provided 100 man days of wage employment.
All the works are to be useful to improve the rural economy and not for providing food for work in the name of Guarantee of employment.

The NREGS works to be extended to all the sections of cultivators for the land development programme.

The participation of depressed sections to be improved.

Work site facilities are only book adjustments and this to be checked by proper supervision.

E-Muster rolls to be implemented at work site and day to day progress of work at each work site to be informed to the mandal level officers by mobile message from the field.

The sanctioned works in each gram panchayat to be displayed at panchayat Bhavan.

The funds for NREGS at gram panchayat to be based on population size of the gram panchayat to avoid partiality in administrative sanction of the works under MGNREGS.