

**Impact of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment
Guarantee Scheme on Different Tribes in Telangana**
(A Comparative Study among Gond, Koya, Chenchu and Lambada Tribes in
Selected Villages)

**A Thesis Submitted to the University of Hyderabad for the
Award of the Degree of**

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
ECONOMICS**

By

YEDUKONDALU NARENDRA



**SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS
UNIVERSITY OF HYDERABAD
HYDERABAD – 500 046
JUNE - 2017**



CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled “**Impact of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme on Different Tribes in Telangana: (A Comparative Study among Gond, Koya, Chenchu and Lambada Tribes in Selected Villages)**” Submitted by **YEDUKONDALU NARENDRA** bearing registration number 09SEPH01 in partial fulfilment of the requirements for award of **Doctor of Philosophy** in the School of **Economics** is a bonafide work carried out by him/her under my supervision and guidance.

This thesis is free from plagiarism and has not been submitted previously in part or in full to this or any other university or institution for award of any degree or diploma.

Part or in this thesis have been:

A. Published in the following publication

1. “**Empowerment of Indian Women-Role of MGNREGS: A Study in Mahbubnagar district of Telangana**”, **International Journal of Academic Research, Vol.4, Issue-5(1), May, 2017 pp.108-120 ISBN/ISSN Number (2348-7666), Chapter 6 (Six)**

And

B. Presented in the following conferences:

1. **Dr. B. R. Ambedkar’s Views on Economic Development- Upliftment of Indian Women-Role of MGNREGA - A Study in Mahabubnagar district of Telangana in National conference on Dr. B. R Ambedkar’s Perspective on State, Society and Economy: Revisiting his vision and mission at Dept. of Sociology, University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad, during 22-23 February 2017 (National/International)**

Further, the student has passed the following coursework requirement for Ph.D. / was exempted from doing coursework (recommended by Doctoral Committee) on the basis of the following course passed during his M.Phil. Program and the M.Phil. Degree was awarded:

Supervisor

Dean of School

DECLARATION

I **YEDUKONDALU NARENDRA** hereby declare that the research work carried out by me, the present dissertation entitled, “**Impact of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme on different tribes in Telangana A Comparative study among Gond, Koya, Chenchu and Lambada tribes in selected villages**” is an original research work carried out by me under the supervision of **Prof. K. Laxminarayana**, School of Economics for the award of Doctor of Philosophy, from the University of Hyderabad.

A report on plagiarism statistics from the University of Hyderabad Librarian is enclosed.

Place: Hyderabad

Date: 17-06-2017

(YEDUKONDALU NARENDRA)

Regd. No: 09SEPH01

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This is one of the greatest achievements in my life, a longtime dream. I am indeed beholden to all those who have it possible for me.

First and foremost I am deeply indebted to my supervisor, Prof. K. Laxminarayana for his diligent guidance, immense patience and cooperation throughout the course of research work. I learnt so much on academics, field work, and economics and about life from him, which left an enduring impression on my world view. Without his help and encouragement, I never could have finished this thesis. I am grateful to him for all the care. I give him all the credit and all the errors are mine.

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. B. Kamaiah, Dean, School of Economics, for his great support and encouragement. I also sincerely thank my Doctoral Committee members Prof. J. Manohar Rao School of Economics and Prof. G. Nagaraju, Department of Sociology, School of Social Sciences, for their valuable suggestions and feedback on the course and thesis. I also thank and acknowledge all other faculty members of the School of Economics, for their kind cooperation and contributions to my learning.

I am thankful to my colleague guru Kameswar Rao for his immense support. I am sincerely thankful to all the Programme Officers of MGNREGS of Adilabad, Khammam, Mahbubnagar, and Warangal districts for their cooperation and guidance in selection of sample villages. A special thanks to the Technical Assistants Field Assistants, Mates, of the selected villages and mandals for the assistance in selection of villages and collection data from the respondents in time. I also acknowledge the indispensable contributions made by the villagers for their hospitality at the time of the study.

I am grateful to the office staff of the School of Economics for their constant support. I am also grateful to the all the staff of IGM Library, Computer Network

Facility, and Administration for providing academic, administrative and technical help for my research work.

I acknowledge my friend Dr. G. Suneel for his priceless support throughout the course. I express my gratitude to my friend A. Samba Siva Rao for his immense support in completing the course.

I also acknowledge my junior brothers Kishore Kumar Aleti, B. Prasad, Dr. G. Jagadeesh, and Dr. G. Venkateswarlu, Siva Narayana, M. Pitchaiah, my colleagues Dr.B.Bondyalu, Ch. Ramachandram, and G. Rama murthy, J. Sunil, M. Anita, Srinivas, all those who directly and indirectly helped me to make this thesis possible.

Last but not least, I express my reverence to my parents, my beloved wife Renuka, and sweet children Sree Vennela, Ram Charan for their love and encouragement for being a great source of family support.

(YEDUKONDALU NARENDRA)

CONTENTS

Certificate	ii
Declaration	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Contents	vi
List of Tables	ix
Acronyms	xv
Dedication	xvi

CHAPTER – 01

Introduction

1.1. Introduction	01
1.2. Background	03
1.3. Need for Employment Guarantee	06
1.4. Statement of the Problem	11
1.5. Objectives of the Study	12
1.6. Methodology and Data Sources	12
1.7. Limitations of the Study	15
1.8. Organization of the Study	15

CHAPTER – 02

MGNREGS: Review of Literature

2.1. Macro view of the Employment Programmes in India	18
2.2. Review of Literature on MGNREGS Implementation in India	26
2.3. Conclusion	48

CHAPTER – 03

Understanding the MGNREGA 2005

3.1. Features of the MGNREGA	51
3.2. Registration and Employment	54
3.3. Works	54
3.4. Payment of Wages	55
3.5. Funding	55
3.6. Monitoring and Evaluation	58
3.7. Social Audit	59
3.8. Role of Information Technology	61
3.9. Role of Gram Panchayat	61

CHAPTER – 04

Implementation of MGNREGS- A Macro over View

4.1. MGNREGS at all India Level-Provision of Employment by Households	66
4.2. Comparison between Top and Bottom level States in Provision of Employment during the financial year 2015-16.	68
4.3. MGNREGS in Telangana	70
4.4. MGNREGS in Dandepally Mandal of Adilabad district	73
4.5. MGNREGS in Wazeedu Mandal of Khammam district	76
4.6. MGNREGS in Lingal Mandal of MahabubNagar district	78
4.7. MGNREGS in Kothaguda Mandal of Warangal district	81
4.8. Conclusion	83

CHAPTER – 05

A Micro Study on Selected Tribes in Selected Villages

5.1. About Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages of Gond Tribe	86
5.1.1. Village Profile	86
5.1.2. Occupational distribution of Gond respondents	87
5.2. About Gummadidoddi Village of Koya Tribe	92
5.2.1. Village Profile	92
5.3. 5.3 About Yerrapenta Village of Chenchu Tribe	98
5.3.1. Village Profile	98
5.4. About Ootai Thanda Village of Lambada Tribes	104
5.4.1. Village Profile	104
5.5. Conclusion	111

CHAPTER – 06

Implementation of MGNREGS - A Comparative Study among four Selected Tribes in Selected Villages

6.1. Introduction	112
6.2. MGNREGS Implementation in Four Selected Tribal Village A Comparative analysis	112
6.3. Impacts of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme on Selected Tribes in Selected Villages	143
6.3.1. Person days	144
6.3.2. Durable Assets Created	146
6.3.3. Agricultural Wages	149
6.3.4. Migration	150
6.4. Conclusion	152

CHAPTER – 07
Summary and Conclusions

7.1. Summary and Conclusions	153
7.2. Findings from the Study	158
7.3. Policy Suggestions	161
Appendix Table's	164
Bibliography	166
Questioner	171
Plagiarism Report	181

LIST OF TABLES

Sl. No.	Table No.	Name of the Table	Page No.
1	4. 1	MGNREGS at all India Level -Provision of Employment per Household during the Financial Year 2015-16	66
2	4. 2	Comparison between Top and Bottom level States in Provision of Employment	69
3	4. 3	MGNREGS in Telangana in Provision of Employment in Rural Areas during Financial year 2015-16.	71
4	4. 4	Comparison between Top and Bottom level Performing Districts in Telangana in Provision of Employment during 2015-16.	72
5	4. 5	MGNREGS in Dandepally Mandal of Adilabad district in Provision of Employment during the year 2015-16	74
6	4. 6	Comparison between Top and Bottom level Performing Gram Panchayats in Dandepally Mandal in Provision of Employment during 2015-16.	75
7	4. 7	MGNREGS in Wazeedu Mandal of Khammam district in Provision of Employment during the year 2015-16	76
8	4. 8	Comparison between Top and Bottom level Performing Gram Panchayats in Wazeedu Mandal in Provision of Employment during 2015-16.	77
9	4. 9	MGNREGS in Lingal Mandal of Mahabubnagar district in Provision of Employment during the financial year 2015-16	79
10	4. 10	Comparison between Top and Bottom level Performing Gram Panchayats in Lingal Mandal in Provision of Employment during 2015-16.	79
11	4. 11	MGNREGS in Kothaguda Mandal of Warangal district in Provision of Employment during the year 2015-16	81

12	4. 12	Comparison between Top and Bottom level Performing Gram Panchayats in Kothaguda Mandal in Provision of Employment during 2015-16.	83
13	5. 1	Population Details of Beharanguda and Kundelpahad Villages	86
14	5. 2	Labour profile by age group in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad Villages	86
15	5. 3	Land Details in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad Villages	87
16	5. 4	Occupational distribution Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages.	88
17	5. 5	Educational Standards in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages.	88
18	5. 6	House Structure Details in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages.	89
19	5. 7	Source of Toilets in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad Villages	89
20	5. 8	Source of Cooking Fuel in Beharanguda And Kundelpahad Villages	90
21	5. 9	Provision of Employment in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages during the Financial Year 2015-16.	90
22	5. 10	Durable Assets created in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad Villages for Gond Tribe.	91
23	5. 11	Private Agricultural and Non- Agricultural Works under taken in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages during 2015-16.	92
24	5. 12	Population Details of Gummadidoddi Village	92
25	5. 13	Labour Profile by Age Group in Gummadidoddi village	93
26	5. 14	Land Details in Gummadidoddi village	93
27	5. 15	Occupational Distribution In Gummadidoddi Village.	94
28	5. 16	Educational Standards Gummadidoddi village	94

29	5. 17	House Structure Details in Gummadidoddi Village	95
30	5. 18	Source of Toilets in Gummadidoddi Village	95
31	5. 19	Source of Cooking Fuel of Households in Gummadidoddi Village	96
32	5. 20	Provision of Employment In Gummadidoddi Village During The Financial Year 2015-16.	96
33	5. 21	Durable Assets (Public) Created in Gummadidoddi Village	97
34	5. 22	Private Agricultural and Non- Agricultural Works under taken in Gummadidoddi village during the financial year 2015-16.	97
35	5. 23	Population Details Of Yerrapenta Village	99
36	5. 24	Labour Profile By Age Group In Yerrapenta Village	99
37	5. 25	Land Details of Yerrapenta Village	100
38	5. 26	Occupational Distribution in Yerrapenta Village.	100
39	5. 27	Educational Standards in Yerrapenta Village.	101
40	5. 28	House Structure Details in Yerrapenta Village.	101
41	5. 29	Source of Toilets in Yerrapenta Village	102
42	5. 30	Source of Cooking Fuel of Chenchu Respondent Households in Yerrapenta Village	102
43	5. 31	Provision of Employment in Yerrapenta village during the financial year 2015-16.	103
44	5. 32	Durable Assets (Public) Created In Yerrapenta Village.	103
45	5. 33	Private Agricultural And Non- Agricultural Works Under Taken In Yerrapenta Village During 2015-16.	104
46	5. 34	Population Details in Ootai Thanda	105
47	5. 35	Labour Profile by Age Group In Ootai Thanda	105

48	5. 36	Land Details of Ootai Thanda	106
49	5. 37	Occupational Distribution in Ootai Thanda.	106
50	5. 38	Educational Standards in Ootai thanda.	107
51	5. 39	House Structure Details in Ootai thanda.	107
52	5. 40	Source of Toilets in Ootai thanda	108
53	5. 41	Source of Cooking Fuel in Ootai thanda Village	108
54	5. 42	Provision of Employment in Ootai thanda during the financial year 2015-16.	109
55	5. 43	Durable Assets (public) created in Ootai thanda Village for Lambada Tribe.	109
56	5. 44	Private Agricultural and Non- Agricultural Works under taken in Ootai thanda during the financial year 2015-16.	110
57	6. 1	Distribution of Selected Sample Households from Selected Villages	112
58	6. 2	Gender wise Distribution of Respondents	113
59	6. 3	Age wise Distribution of Respondents	113
60	6. 4	Educational standards of the Respondents	114
61	6. 5	Occupation wise Distribution of Respondents in Selected Tribes in Selected Villages.	115
62	6. 6	Reasons for Not Having Job Cards in the Selected Four Tribes in Selected Four Villages	116
63	6. 7	MGREGS Programme Evaluation in the Selected Four Tribes in Selected Four Villages.	117
64	6. 8	Savings and Borrowing Agencies among Selected Tribes in Selected Villages	118
65	6. 9	Possessing Electrical and Consumer Durable Items by Respondents among selected Tribes in Selected Villages	119

66	6. 10	Land Irrigation- Farmers Classification among Respondents in Selected tribes in Selected Villages	121
67	6. 11	Details of Family Income Source of Respondents from Cooli (monthly) among Selected Tribes in Selected Villages during the Financial Year 2015-16	122
68	6. 12	Details of Family Income Source of Respondents from Farming (Yearly) among Selected Tribes in Selected Villages	123
69	6. 13	Details of Family Income Source of Respondents from MGNREGS (Yearly) Among Selected Tribes in Selected Villages	124
70	6. 14	Family Total Expenditure per Month among Selected Tribes in Selected Villages Before and After MGNREGS	126
71	6. 15	Artisans Wage among Selected Tribes in Selected Villages before and after MGNREGS	129
72	6. 16	Agricultural Wage Rates among Selected Tribes in Selected Villages Before and After MGNRES	131
73	6. 17	MGNREGS Wage Rate among Selected Tribes in Selected Villages between 2006-2011 and 2011-16	132
74	6. 18	Number of Person Involved in MGNREGS among Respondents Family among Selected Tribes in Selected Villages	133
75	6. 19	Number of Person days (Working days) of Employment Created under MGNREGS during 2015-16 among the Respondents Families among Selected Tribes in selected Villages	134
76	6. 20	Durable Assets Created Under MGNREGS in Selected Tribal Villages from 2006-07 to 2015-16.	135
77	6. 21	Private Agricultural and Non-Agricultural Works (1) Taken up in the Selected Tribal Villages	137
78	6. 22	Private Agricultural and Non-Agricultural Works (2) Taken up in the Selected Tribal Villages	138

79	6.23	Details of Migration among Selected Tribes in Selected Villages	139
80	6.24	Direct Impacts of MGNREGS on Selected tribal Respondents in Selected Villages	140
81	6.25	Negative Effects of MGNREGS among Respondents of Selected tribes In Selected Villages.	142

ACRONYMS

AP	:	Andhra Pradesh
AWPB	:	Annual Work Plan and Budget
CBCS	:	Community Based Convergent Services
CCA	:	Child Care Activities
CSRE	:	Crass Scheme for Rural Employment
DDP	:	Desert Development Programme
DPAP	:	Drought Prone Area Programme
DWACRA	:	Development of Women and Children in Rural Areas
EAS	:	Employment Assurance Scheme
FCI	:	Food Corporation of India
FWP	:	Food for Work Programme
GDP	:	Gross Domestic Product
IRDP	:	Integrated Rural Development Programme
ITDA	:	Integrated Tribal Development Agency
JRY	:	Jawahar Rozgar Yojana
MIS	:	Monitoring and Information System
NFFWP	:	National Food For Work Programme
NGOs	:	Non-Government Organizations
NSSO	:	National Sample Survey Organization Rural Landless
RLEGP	:	Employment Guarantee Programme Sampoorna Grameena
SGRY	:	Rozgar Yojana
SGSY	:	Swarna Jayanthi Gram Swarozgar Yojana
SHGs	:	Self Help Groups
SJSRY	:	Swarna Jayanthi Sahariyar Rozgar Yojana
SMR	:	Suicide Mortality Rate
SORs	:	Schedule of Rates
TRYSEM	:	Training of Rural Youth for Self-Employment
UNDP	:	United Nations Development Programme
UPA	:	United Progressive Alliance



WITH
DEDICATION
TO MY BELOVED
Parents, Wife and Children

CHAPTER – 01

Introduction

1.1. Introduction:

Even after 70 years of independence, Indian economy could not become as a developed economy, due to the chronic problems like poverty, unemployment, illiteracy, malnutrition, and rural distress. As a welfare government, the government of India continuously introduced various welfare programmes suitable to the people as and when needed to bring out the people from their chronic macro-economic problems. Without solving these problems, India cannot become developed economy, and which in turn leads various social unrests in the country. The Governments changing for every 5 years promising the citizens to find the solutions to all these problems, but failed. The reasons are, mixed economy, lack of political will, bureaucratic apathy, corruption, illiteracy among majority of the people, agrarian economy and most recently new economic reforms, widened the gaps between rich and poor. As a result rich becoming richer and poor becoming poorest, which in turn become as a political manifest of political parties to attract the poor in the elections.

The political parties and governments ruled India, during the last 70 years treated the unemployment and poverty problems in the country as a last resort of attracting the people in the elections. The political parties which came into government, just took these problems as a short run problems and announced several anti-poverty and unemployment reduction programmes. As a welfare and directive principle of state policy, which ensures every citizen of India, entitles right to life at meager facilities. As a directive state principles, state cannot provide or citizens cannot ask the government to provide all the basic amenities of right to life provided in article 21 of the Constitution of India.

There is a flow of rights of this kind mentioned in the Constitution of India, and such rights i.e. right to education, right to information, right to equality. These rights are introduced in the constitution with free and compulsory basis for achieving the universal primary education for all. Right to equality is introduced in constitution of India with a view to achieving equality among all the citizens of India irrespective of caste, creed, sex,

religion and region. The right to information is introduced in India in the year 2005 with a view to open access of public information for the people. It is necessary to understand why they are introduced now, and in what way these rights are realized, and how they will be achieved, the right to employment introduced in India in 2005, will show some solutions to the above mentioned rights achievement. This dissertations aims to study one such right, namely Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act 2005.

During the last four decades, the Indian government implemented several programmes as part of 'trickle down' effect of economic growth process, but came to know this process in too slow. Since the fifth five-year plan, Indian government has started direct attacks on poverty. As a part of these the government introduced several welfare programmes like Food for Work Programme (FWP), Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP), Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP), Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (RLEGP), Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY), Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS), Swarna Jayanthi Sahariyar Rozgar Yojana (SJSRY), Swarna Jayanthi Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY), Samporna Grameena Rozgar Yojana (SGRY)

Earlier programmes are essentially supply side programmes, providing employment or creating assets to targeted sections of the people. However, the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act 2005 (MGNREGA) makes a difference of the earlier programmes, in providing employment to the needy people. It is a unique sense that the MGNREGA, being an act is a right. It has a "right-based" frame work with legal guarantee of work, as against and different to a typical government programme that could be withdrawn by the government at will, it is a time bound action programme to fulfill guarantee of work within 15 days of demand for work. As it is a demand driven programme, the programme has to be implemented as long as and when and where people demand the resource flows needs to be ensured according to the demand.

In the MGNREGA Act 2005, there is a mechanism to address complex issues such as minimum wages, setting up to crèches, building people's assets, and gender differences in wages, which can drastically change the economic and social conditions of the poor people, the biggest promise ever made by the government to the poor of the country.

There is a large expectations that MGNREGA can change the lives of the rural poor in general and vulnerable sections of the society in particular. When such an ambitious programmes are undertaken, an intellectual responsibilities of academia is to make a comprehensive study of it and contribute to a positive and realistic criticism to help a better and effective execution of the programmes. The present study is a modest attempt in this direction.

1.2. Background :

Anti-poverty and unemployment reduction programmes have been important elements of public policy in India to provide employment to unskilled workers with short-term employment on public works. All the employment programmes have come into existence after the realizing the fact that anti-poverty programmes like IRDP, TRYSEM, RLEGP, JRY have been ineffective in reducing poverty to look at an all sides, that there is need for programmes that directly generate employment and wage income to the poor. These programmes must provide employment and transfer of income to the poor during the periods when they suffer and at the time of lack of employment opportunities. From the First Five Year Plan onwards, many schemes have been started in India for the welfare of the poorest of the poor in the society. Earlier experiences reveals that many weaknesses and lapses have reported in the implementation of these programmes, like, lack of programmes awareness to beneficiaries, lack of proper planning, poor quality of assets created, false muster rolls, wage differences among men and women, incapability's of implementing agencies, and lack of accountability etc. The reasons mentioned by several economists for these are (i) lack of man power planning; (ii) priority to non-productive works; (iii) lack of funds for the maintenance of assets; (iv) delay in undertaking the schemes; (v) payment of low wages to the workers; (iv) lack of committed and skilled administrative officers; (vii) corruption, wastage of money and resources; (viii) lack of political will to implement the employment policies etc.

Anti-poverty strategies consists of a wide range of poverty alleviation and employment generation programmes, many of them have been implemented for several years and have been elevated to generate more employment opportunities, to create productive assets, to raise the income level of the poor. In spite of all these programmes implemented in India to remove the socio economic handicaps, it is mostly accepted that,

they had limited success in achieving their objectives. In the last three decades the problems of poverty, unemployment, and rural distress are believed to be increased. The most serious case of hard core poverty is witnessed by the BIMARU States, which carry the cumulative burden of poverty generated over the years by economic stagnation and social backwardness. The BIMARU states which are now estimated over 60 per cent of the poor in the country as a result of failure of delivery systems in implementing the programmes to eliminate poverty situation in India.

Almost fifteen years of reforms in India, the poverty rates are still quite high in rural as well as in urban areas. According to the estimates of head count ratio given by the planning commission, rural poverty is 27.1 percent and urban poverty is 23.6 percent in 1999-2000. For the period of 2011-12 the poverty levels said to have decreased to 25.7 percent in rural areas and 13.7 percent urban areas, and the rate of decline in urban areas is very fast when compared to rural areas. It is said that even though head count ratio of poverty is on decline, the absolute people below poverty line in India, who are around 35 crores is perhaps an unacceptably high level [Radhakrishna (2008)]. The planning commission of India, has recently accepted a new definition of poverty, taking into account the expenditure on clothing, shelter and food, according to which the percentage of the poor in the country is 36 percent for the period of 2004-05, the poverty levels are very high in most economically backward states like BIMARU states, Odisha, Jharkhand, Uttarakhand, Chattisgarh. Poverty levels, among these states, Odisha is 39.9 percent, Jharkhand it is 34.8 percent, Bihar it is 32.5 per cent, Madhya Pradesh is 32.4 percent, Chattisgarh is 32.0 percent and Uttarakhand is 31.8 percent. In case of Andhra Pradesh, the level of poverty is 11.1 percent and India poverty level that is 21.8 percent. [Appendix-A1.2].

Employment Situation in India :

The nature of unemployment in India differs from the one that prevails in industrially advanced countries. It would be worthwhile to emphasize here that unemployed in under developed economics like India is not the result of deficiency of effective demand in the Keynesian sense, but a consequence of shortage of capital equipment or other complementary resources. So Government of India has been introducing productive employment programmes for sustained poverty reduction and

improvement in human development, as labour is the main factor of production for the majority of poor people. In India, in spite of the enhancement in the growth of the economy the absolute number of unemployed and under-employed has increased and quality of employment has not improved, due to the population explosion. The employment situation in India also had undergone changes in response to the accelerated growth of the economy. But since the high growth in non-agricultural sector has lower employment intensity than agriculture, employment diversification lagged behind the diversification of the economy in India (Bhalla, 2007). In addition to slow-paced structural change of employment, the Indian labor market is attacked by many other problems, unemployment, under employment, illiteracy, low-educational levels, unskilled labour, and low wage rate. The recent NSS 68th round (2011-12) survey on employment and unemployment situation estimated that labour force participation rate was high in rural areas 40.6 percent than 36.7 percent in urban areas. [Appendix: A 1:3].

The long term total employment rural and urban combined growth in India is around 1.73 percent per annum from 1977-78 to 2009-10. When this is further divided into pre-reform (1983-1994) and post-reform (1993-2005) periods, the growth of employment in India declined from 2.25 percent in the pre-reform period to 1.84 percent in the post-reform period, both in rural and urban areas. In the post-reform period, growth in employment in urban areas was almost double than in rural areas. More over employment elasticity which indicates the responsiveness of employment growth to increase in GDP was lower during the post-reform period when compared to the pre-reform period was lower than all India average. The growth of elasticity of employment shows that it is negative between two periods (pre and post reform period). In the pre-reform period (up to 1993-94) the employment elasticity is 0.431 and it is increased to 0.481 for the post-reform period (2004-05 to 2011-12) [Appendix: A 1:4].

Unemployment has also increased as the proportion of labour force. In 1983 unemployment rate is 2.88 percent; it fell to 2.62 percent in 1993-94, over the ten years period the unemployment rate has decreased only by 0.2 percent. In 2004-05 it has increased to 3.06 percent and it has come down to 2.7 percent in 2011-12.

Employment in rural areas is mostly in agriculture and allied activities. So rural unemployment increased at the annual rate of 0.58 percent between 1993-94 and 1999-

2000, while the rate of growth of rural labour force was much higher. The actual unemployment rate for rural areas per the period of 2013-14 was 4.9 percent as against lower than urban unemployment rate for the same period was 5.5 percent. The decline in employment adds to declining incomes of the small and marginal farm households, who derive their incomes from farming as well as labour. This partly explains the spate of farmers' suicides in several states like Andhra Pradesh, Punjab, Karnataka, etc. It is said that a total of 2, 96,438 farmers committed suicides in India for the period of 1995-2014 [NSRB Report 2014-15]. The rural crisis is opined to be one of the reasons why BJP government lost its power in 2004 elections. Taking into the consideration these humanitarian crisis seriously, the government under United Progressive Alliance (UPA) at the centre made a commitment in its common minimum programme, that it would immediately exact an Employment Guarantee Act during 2004 General Elections. The draft prepared by the National Advisory Council provided legal guarantee to every household in rural areas for 100 days of wage employment in a year and is passed as NREGA in parliament on September 7th, 2005.

1.3. Need For Employment Guarantee :

Over the period of last 60 years of independence, government of India have introduced many programmes to change rural living conditions, but all of them by and large failed to achieve their objectives and reach the rural people. Today the rural areas in India are addressed for agricultural failures, unemployment and migration. The present conditions of the rural areas are,

Agricultural Crisis:

Agriculture forms the backbone of the Indian economy and despite concerted industrialization in the last seven decades, agriculture occupies a place of pride. Being the largest sector in the country, agriculture provides employment to around 56 per cent of the total work force. In the post liberalization period, the agricultural sector recorded a roll back in its growth momentum compared to its previous period. As a part of rolling back the state and fiscal adjustment, the macro economic measures such as reduction of fertilizer and food subsidies have adversely affected the sector (Patnaik Utsa, 2005). A study on reduction of public expenditure on agriculture was not considered fully with the

rise in the private capital formation in agriculture. As a result the agricultural sector scroll down and its share in the national income came down drastically. The unavailability of formal GDP it compounded the crisis. The macro changes apparent adversely at micro level expressed in terms of rising indebtedness, farmers suicides, distress migration and increased unemployment. One has to remember that as a counter measure and to make process inclusive, the NREGA is contemplated. We discuss some of these problems forming the context in the following.

Agriculture's contribution to the gross domestic product in India has reduced from 56 percent in 1950-51 to 23 percent in 2005-06, where, as per the 2001 census 58 percent of total work force and 73 percent of the rural workers are still dependent on agriculture¹. This also indicates that rural non-farm employment opportunities are limited. At a time one would require greater inputs from the state, it seems to be withdrawing. Gross fixed capital formation in agriculture as a proportion of gross domestic product (GDP) declined from 3.1 percent during 1980-85 to 1.6 per cent during 1997-2007 at 1993-94 prices. The situation Assessment Survey of Farmers of 2003 (NSSO 59th round) indicates that nearly 49 percent of farmer households are indebted with the average outstanding amount per indebted farmer household is Rs.25, 902/-. The states with a higher average outstanding amount of indebtedness are Andhra Pradesh, Chandigarh, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Pondicherry, Punjab, Rajasthan and Tamilnadu.

Farmers Suicide s:

The longer agrarian crisis has an adverse effect on farm households. As a result of this crisis, farmers suicides increasing every year. In India, there are 2, 96,438/- farmer suicides during the period of 1995-2014. The suicide mortality rate (SMR, suicide death per 1, 00,000 persons) for male farmers nearly doubled from 9.7 percent in 1995 to 15.3 percent in 2012 [Srijit Mishra (2014)]. In case of suicides, 87 percent deaths are reasoned by indebtedness and crop failure. At this critical juncture when there is need for greater support, the state seems to be a roll backing in terms of public investment formal credit and research and extension. Agriculture based income is inadequate for the small or even

¹ Srijit Misra (2007), "Agrarian Scenario in post-reform India", A story of Distress, Despair and death, Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research, Mumbai, Janvary, 2007.

semi-medium farmers. This is further accentuated by low yield, low prices, high input costs and other expenses on health, education, daughter's marriage etc. If the condition of the small farmers is precarious than that of the marginal farmers and agricultural labour would be worsen. Vaidyanathan A (2006) examined that people are driven to the extreme step of suicide not only because of large borrowings from high cost sources for non-productive uses but also because of the increase in net incomes from loans used for productive purposes falls far below expectations. Suicide afflicted households have also borrowed heavily for digging/deepening wells and for cultivating input-intensive high-value crops (like Bt Cotton and Spices) in the expectation of high yields and good prices, failure of these expectations is a major reason for their inability to repay these debts. Returns to farmers are also affected by prices. The domestic price of cotton, the major crop in the suicide poor areas, and also spices and plantation crops of Kerala, during the last decade, have increased much less than that of most other crops. During the last five years, their prices have actually declined thereby compounding loss of income due to yield declines².

Rising Malnutrition :

In India Malnutrition is daunting problem and estimated around 200 million children are underweight at any given time, with more than 6 million of those children suffering from the worst form of malnutrition, severe acute malnutrition³. According to the National Family Health Survey (2005-06), malnutrition in terms of whose Body Mass Index is below normal, women is 33 percent and men is 28.1 percent in India. There is an unacceptable extent of under nutrition and malnutrition in India, which occupies a shameful position in all segments of the chronically under-nourished, belongs to families of small and Marginal farmers and land less labour (Swaminathan, 2009) Angus Deaton and Jean Dreze (2009) showed that per capita calorie intake is declining as is the intake of many other nutrients. They argue that this could be due falling calorie need. The fall in consumption is now a worldwide phenomenon. However this view is severely contested by Utsa Patnaik that the decline in consumption is caused both falling availability, which leads to rise in prices and consequent falling purchasing power, besides the falling entitlements [Patnaik (2007)].

² Vaidhyathan A (2006), "Farmers suicides and the Agrarian crises", EPW – September 23, 2001.

³ Todaro.M (2001): "Economic Development in the Third World". Page No.229-232.

Rising Migration :

A few years ago, rural urban migration was viewed favorably in the economic development literature. Regional migration was thought to be a natural process in which surplus labour was gradually withdrawn from the rural sector to provide needed work force for urban industrial growth. On the contrary migration is today seen as the major contributing factor to the ubiquitous phenomenon of urban surplus labour and a force which continues to exacerbate serious urban unemployment problems caused by growing economic and structural imbalances between rural and urban areas (Todaro, 2000). Migration exacerbates these rural urban structural imbalances on supply side, internal migration disproportionately increases the growth rate of urban job seekers relative to urban population growth, on the demand side, most urban job creation is more difficult and costly to accomplish than rural employment creation. Migration today is seen as the major contributing factor to the ubiquitous phenomenon of urban surplus labour and a force which continues to exacerbate already serious urban unemployment problems caused by growing economic and structural imbalances between rural and urban areas. But the impact of migration on the development process is much more pervasive than its obvious exacerbation of urban unemployment and under employment.

The percentage of urban population in India was only 17 percent of the total population in 1951 is expected to jump around 42.5 percent of the total population by 2025. All this will happen because large numbers of people will leave rural areas for urban areas in search of better opportunities. In the last 50 years, the rural population has decreased from 82 percent to 68.9 percent. Migration in India primarily occurs due to disparities in regional development. The planning and development process has helped the towns and cities to grow at a higher rate than rural areas. They have failed to disseminate growth including impulses to spark development in rural areas, so these rural areas have lagged behind the urban areas.

The unprecedented rates of overall population growth are helping along with the rural urban migration, to swell the populations of undivided cities more than even before. Necessarily, socio economic and political problems are being created by the huge rural urban migration (Nanavathi, 2004). The landless poor who mostly belong to lower castes,

indigenous communities and economically backward regions constitute major portion of the migration. The people from the downtrodden and backward communities and backward regions such as Bihar, Odisha, Uttar Pradesh, travel to far distances seeking employment at the lowest wages in construction of roads, irrigation projects, commercial and residential complexes. The total migrants as per the census of 1971 are 167 million persons, 1981 census 213 million, 1991 census 232 million and 2001 census 315 million⁴.

As stated above, the rural areas are suffering from many bottlenecks in India, against to this the employment guarantee is absolutely essential for poverty reduction, prevention of starvation, reducing distress migration and empowerment of the poor (Hiraway, 2004). Due to the agricultural failure, employment opportunities in rural areas are not enough, people prefer migration to “Trickle down failure”.

In the context of India, it is well that, since the late 1970s government has directly intervened to address the incidence of poverty, in this situation if the trickledown effect works then it is crucial at least to show that the government intervention largely remained ineffective⁵. The process of liberalization and industrialization, fast gained importance in India since 1980s. However, it was only in 1990s, after the phenomenon of globalization gaining momentum in India that the Indian economy truly opened up. Globalization has led to increased opportunities to the average Indian increase in employment, income output and investment and also to a rapid expansion of the banking and financial sector, telecommunication sector, and growth in export potential and social sector projects (Bhupathi, 2007).

The rural India comprises 71 percent of the total population of India, agriculture and allied activities are the main sources of income and this primary sector contributes to almost 25% of India’s GDP. The advantages of globalization, as vision of the government have not trickle down to the rural poor there has been no evidence of growth in the un-organized sector of the economy. Globalization, it is said, is adversely affecting the rural India. The opening up of the country signifies cheaper imports in a country where agricultural prices are constantly fluctuating this hampers the producers and leads to

⁴ Sudhershnan Rao. “Migration in India Trade Union perspective: In the context A Globalization” IMF – SARD, New Delhi, 2008.

⁵ Santonu Basu and Sushanta Mallick (2008), “When does growth trickle down to the poor? The Indian case”. Cambridge Journal of Economics 2008, 32, 461 – 477.

further losses. India is a labour surplus country, which is caused by population explosion. And this surplus labour comprises from the rural areas. Increased investment and adopting technology will lead to unemployment. Various employment schemes and controlling poverty in rural India are ineffective due to the bureaucracy and wide spread corruption. Due to the failure of the trickledown effect, inequalities in rural India are exceedingly difficult to tackle without adequate improvement in the government's delivery mechanism, the despair of the average rural India will be prolonged⁶.

Over the past seventy years, our economic policies based on the premises that the rural economy will grow by riding piggyback on the urban / industrial economy. In other words it will automatically benefit from the "trickle down" that results from overall national progress. The main reason is that capitalists are interested to invest in industries – heavy and light, but always big – urban infrastructure, which is assumed to provide higher returns than investments in small and decentralized initiatives. The result is that there are more than twice as many poor people and less than half as many trees. The trickledown effect sounds good in theory, but has not worked in practice.

As the previous anti-poverty programmes measurements for rising the nutritional standards, to check the farmers suicides, agricultural distress and trickle down failure and also to control the migration on account of invariability of livelihood resources, and various employment programmes that indeed failed in the country. So the employment guarantee is needed to modify the conditions of rural people.

1.4. Statement of the Problem :

MGNREGS is not a welfare programme or scheme what government of India implemented earlier, in fact, it is a right based programme. Hence, it has to be implemented as per the provisions of the Act, which ever mentioned (NREGA, 2005 Act). In our constitution, we have drafted a lot of legal rights and making amendments to the constitution to cope up with emerging needs of the country. However, there is a wide gap between the legal rights and their realization. If MGNREGA is a right, how does the poor use this right? How is the poor going to know that they now have a right to employment? Even if they know, can they demand it? Can the government set up the

⁶ Bhupathi Gursale "Globalization and Rural India" www.chillibreeze.com.

system to respond to a demand driven system? Is it helpful to tribes? How the tribal areas people came to know the Act and its features? Are there any differences between different tribes and realization of the Act? How the gram panchayat should play a vital role in the implementation has it provisioned in the programme? What are the outcomes and changes because of MGNREGA in the living conditions of the tribal people? The present study aims to investigate and address some of these questions raised above.

Apart from the above questions this study aims at studying the impact of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme on different tribes within the Telangana state that can give the idea of the impact of the programme.

1.5. Objectives of the Study :

The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme has come with the objective providing hundred days of employment to the rural household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work. However, it should not be seen as a government welfare programme as like others. It might be a well-focused approach but more of it gives rights to the people to demand work and earn wages to live their life.

This Study Mainly Focuses on :

1. To estimate the number of person days provided among the selected households from four selected tribal villages.
2. To gauge the development potentiality of the assets created in selected four tribal villages
3. To examine the impact of MGNREG Scheme on migration before and after the scheme on selected tribes, and
4. To study the impact of the scheme on agricultural wages in the selected four tribal villages.

1.6. Methodology and Data Sources :

Since the success of MGNREGS is dependent on the basic structure of the local economy as well as on the capacity of the local governments, a study attempting to

understand the factors affecting impacts of MGNREGS needs to take into account various micro and macro level factors. In order to capture qualitative aspects on impacts of the programme have taken the comparative study approach besides the quantifiable data.

The study classifies the factors that are likely to influence MGNREGS into two categories demand-side factors and supply-side factors. The extent of poverty, size of the agricultural/casual labour force and people's awareness about MGNREGS constitute demand side factors. Generally in tribal areas, a higher share of poor people are agricultural/casual labourers, there exists unemployment, lack of productive assets, poverty and migration problems are serious concerns which makes a higher demand for the MGNREGS.

On the supply side, the infrastructural backwardness of the area (which actually creates the potential for designing a higher number of schemes under MGNREGS), capacity of the gram panchayats in terms of adequate work force to plan and execute the works and the timely receipt of MGNREGS funds are the important factors determining the efficiency of implementation.

For this study the data is collected both from primary and secondary sources. The secondary data sources used for the study includes the information available on the official website of MGNREGA (www.mgnrega.nic.in) for all India data and www.mgnrega.telangana.nic.in for Telangana state data and for selected districts, mandals are collected.

The selection of districts is done on the basis of the tribes and concentration of that tribe's population. In case of Gond, this tribe is concentrated more in Adilabad district and it is selected for the study on Gond tribe. In case of Koya tribe, it is concentrated more in Khammam district and are far from the mainstream society, and this district is selected for Koya tribe. In case of Chenchu tribe it is a primitive tribal group and they are concentrated in Nallamala forest area which is in Mahabubnagar district and it is selected. In case of Lambada tribe they are more in Warangal district in the ITDA area of Kothaguda and this district is selected for the study on Lambada tribe.

The selection of villages is done on the basis of ITDA agency areas in that districts. The Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages are selected in the Adilabad district for the study on Gond tribe where these two small hamlets having roughly 95 households. In case of Koya tribe, the Gummadidoddi village is selected in Wazeed mandal of Khammam district, where the concentration of Koya tribe is more and this village is having 170 households out of which 160 households are Koya tribe only. This village is involving more in the scheme and is a backward area in the border to Chhattisgarh state. In case of Chenchu tribe the Yerrapenta village of Lingal mandal is selected from Mahabubnagar district. This is a small hamlet having 91 households in the village located far from mainstream society in the Nallamala forest region where tribals follow primitive practices in all spheres of life. This hamlet is selected to know how the Chenchu tribe is benefiting from the scheme. In case of Lambada tribe, the Ootai thanda village of Kothaguda mandal is selected from Warangal district. This thanda is a big village having around 236 households and majority of the households are having agricultural land for cultivation. In spite of having lands to villagers this village is selected to know how the villagers are involving in the scheme.

The selection of households is done on the census basis, why because all the villages are completely tribal dwellings and having a few households in each village except Ootai thanda of Lambada tribe. Random selection is not possible hence census basis is adopted for all the tribes in all the villages for selection of households in the study.

The Primary data used in this study has been obtained through a field survey, which covered 300 households, covering 75 households in each village i.e. Beharanguda and Kundelpahad two Gond hamlets of Chintapally grama panchayat of Dandepally Mandal in Adilabad district, Gummadidoddi village of Wazeedu Mandal of Khammam district for Koya Tribe, Yerrapenta hamlet of Chennampally gram panchayat of Lingal Mandal in Mahabubnagar district for Chenchu tribe and Ootai Thanda of Ootai gram panchayat in Kothaguda Mandal of Warangal district in Telangana State. The survey covered 300 households those who are going to work under MGNREGS, to know about the outcomes with respect to number of working days they worked, to know about person days created in the four villages, to assess the durability and development potentiality of the assets created, to know about the impact of the scheme on out migration among four tribes in

four villages of four districts and to analyze the impact of MGNREGS on agricultural wages in the four villages. A structured questionnaire with a number of open-ended questions was used for this survey, while questions relating to household details were posed to the head of the family, MGNREGA related questions were posed to persons in the family who have participated in the MGNREGS works during a period preceding the survey. In addition to interviewing the selected villages, we also interviewed the available Gram Panchayat members, field Assists, mates and others those who are involved in MGNREGS implementation. The survey was carried out during the period 2015-16. The study uses simple statistical measures such as averages and percentages and random sampling techniques.

1.7. Limitations of the study :

This study is mainly focused on the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme which has been implementing since April 2006, all over India in general and Adilabad, Khammam, Mahabubnagar and Warangal Districts of Telangana in particular. This study made an attempt to assess the impact of MGNREGS in Adilabad, Khammam, Mahabubnagar and Warangal Districts of Telangana and find out the basic facts and observations for which this study carried out primary survey in the selected four villages. But the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Programme implementation is varies from one region to other, according to geographical social and climatic conditions. To minimize these variations and to get accurate impact of the programme on all the four tribes, the villages are selected from the agency regions of selected districts where Integrated Tribal Development Agency (ITDA) functioning. Even though the problems and issues are involved in MGNREGA also different in village to village and region to region. In this view, this study remains partial, while showing the particularities.

1.8. Organization of the study :

This study is organized into seven chapters. Chapter I is introduction, which includes background, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, methodology and data sources. Chapter II deals with the survey of literature on MGNREGA and macro overview of employment programmes in India. Chapter III deals with understanding the

Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA 2005). Chapter IV is discussion on implementation of MGNREGA, a macro overview about India, Telangana, and also Dandepally, Wazeedu, Lingal and Kothaguda Mandals of Adilabad, Khammam, Mahabubnagar, and Warangal districts of Telangana State respectively. Chapter V deals with MGNREGS a micro study about the implementation in selected four tribal villages Beharanguda and Kundelpahad ,Gummadidoddi, Yerrapenta and Ootai thanda villages and their demographic profiles, labour profiles, land profiles, implementation of MGNREGS in the four villages Chapter VI deals with the comparative study of the four tribes in implementation, impact of MGNREGS on person days, assets created, on migration and impact on agricultural wages and finally Chapter VII gives summary and conclusions along with policy recommendations.

CHAPTER – 02

MGNREGS: Review of Literature

There is a growing realization over post-reforms period that the issue of equity has been neglected which in turn had a decelerating impact on growth itself. After reaching a high in the early 1980`s public investment in agriculture has come down to half the levels of the early 1970`s (Bhalla, 2009). The benefits of the green revolution have seen in a plateau yields. But the nearest hits have been the dry land crops grown and eaten by our poorest farmers, coarse cereals, pulses and oil seeds. The 1990`s saw each of these crops register a negative rate of growth. The distinguished feature of the most of the Adivasi peasants is that they hold land of very poor quality which forces them to work additionally as an agricultural labour to feed their families. In the backward regions of India, returns to private investment are low. A major reason for this is that health, water, education or basic infrastructure that govern this rate of return are missing in these areas. Without these development of such regions will always prove difficult. These considerations underscore the need for public investment. The backward regions of India suffer from, what in development economics used to call a “Low Level Equilibrium Trap”. And to get out of this trap a truly “Big Push” is needed (Rosenstein Rodan, 1943). The Big Push describes a situation of market failure where there may not be enough incentives for any individual to undertake any activity, this is because significant non-linearities, threshold externalities, complementarities, long gestation and lumpiness of investment characterize the growth process. Individual profit maximizers are unlikely to have either the willingness or the ability to undertake such investments. No major transformation in India occurred despite several pushes of the kind and this necessitated a massive employment programme. Mihir Shah (2007) described MGNREGS as a big push for India being the largest employment programme. We shall take stock of views expressed by different researchers on MGNREGS in the following way.

2.1. Macro view of the Employment Programmes in India :

On the eve of independence India was not only poor but also suffered from various social and economic handicaps. Under British rule handicrafts were destroyed, industrial revolution impact did not touch the country and discouraged the domestic industries and agriculture suffered many institutional barriers (Dutt. R.C. 1991). India after independence has adopted a policy of planned economic development. From the first plan onwards removal of poverty and unemployment has been an important objective of economic planning in the country. The planning commission has all long assumed that increase in public investment would be accompanied by increase in employment as well as increase national income of the country. In the first and second five year plans employment generation left to the public and private investment. From the third plan onwards employment targets were fixed by adding the increase in the labour force and backlog of unemployment and the direct attack laid down to removal of poverty and unemployment. In the third five year plan rural works programme was introduced to provide employment in the needed areas on the construction of civil works in view of curbing the migration in off seasons. Under the British rule handicrafts were destroyed, industrial revolution impact did not touch the country and discouraged the domestic industries and agriculture suffered many institutional barriers (Dutt. R.C. 1991). India after independence has adopted a policy of planned economic development. From the first plan onwards, removal of poverty and unemployment has been an important objective of economic planning in the country. The planning commission has all long assumed that increase in public investment would be accompanied by increase in employment as well as increase national income of the country. In the first and second five year plans employment generation left to the public and private investment. From the third plan onwards employment targets were fixed by adding the increase in the labour force and backlog of unemployment and the direct attack laid down to removal of poverty and unemployment. In the third five-year plan rural works programme was introduced to provide employment in the needed areas on the construction of civil

works in view of curbing the migration in off seasons. The Crass Scheme for Rural Employment (CSRE) was introduced in 1971-72 to provide rural employment with an aim of direct generation of employment in all the districts of the country at the rate of 2.5 lakhs of man days per annum in each district. This employment generation provided by execution of labour intensive projects and creation of durable assets in consonance with local governments' development plans. The total outlay sanctioned on CSRE among all states and union territories was Rs 126 cr. Reports confirm that the scheme could create 3168.35 lakhs person days of employment (Khan, 1976) throughout the country. Food for Work Programme (FFWP) was instituted in 1977 for providing food grains to labour for works undertaken in selected 20 districts in the country 13 districts only sent periodical progress reports. The panchayats were the implementing agencies of the programme at the village level. The distribution of food grains was mainly entrusted with fair price shops and village panchayats. During the 1978-79 financial year utilisation of food grains, 2 districts reported 100 percent utilisation of rice, whereas 7 districts reported 100 percent utilisation of wheat. On an average 77 percent of villages reported 100 percent utilisation of food grains. In this 53 percent of the selected beneficiaries belonged to the age group of 16-30 years, and SC/ST 70 percent. The additional employment generated per selected households through the Food for Work Programme during the financial year 1978-79 per year from 2 to 167 person days. The Training of Rural Youth for Self- Employment (TRYSEM) a centrally sponsored scheme launched on 15th August 1979. It aimed at providing basic technical and entrepreneurial skills to the rural poor in the age group of 18-35 years, enable them to take up income generating activities like self and wage employment. It had been laid down that the coverage of youth from SC/ST communities should be at least 50 percent of total rural youth trained. Out of the total beneficiaries at least 50 percent should be women. It was aimed at to cover 40 youth from each block in the country per year and supposed to cover 10.05 lakhs youth. As against to this target 9.4 lakhs youth covered in the years 1980-85, which was 93.3 percent of the target. On the total youth trained in this period 31.5 percent from SC/ST, while 34.8 percent of them were women (Kathkar

1989:6). The scheme has been merged with Swarnajayanthi Gram Swarojgar Yojana (SGSY) along with IRDP, DWACRA etc., from April 1999. The Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP) is launched in the financial year 1978-79 and extended throughout India by 1980. It is a self-employment programme intended to raise the income generation capacity of target groups among the poor. The programme emphasized the family rather than individual approach in the identification of beneficiaries. The programme is financed by the central and state governments on 50:50 basis. The aim is to raise recipients above the poverty line by providing substantial opportunities for self-employment. During the 7th five-year plan, the total expenditure under the program was Rs.33.2 million, and Rs.53.7 million of term credit was mobilized. Some 13 million new families participated, bringing total coverage under the program to more than 18 million families. These development programs have played an important role in increased agricultural production by educating farmers and providing them with financial and other inputs to increase yields. The Development of Women and Children in Rural Areas (DWACRA), the scheme was aimed to improve the socio-economic status of the poor women in the rural areas through the creation of groups of women for income-generating activities on a self-sustaining basis. The main strategy adopted under the programme was to facilitate access for poor women to employment, skill upgradation, training, credit and other support services so that the DWACRA women as a group could take up income-generating activities for supplementing their incomes. It sought to encourage collective action in the form of group activities which were known to work better and are more sustainable than the individual effort. It encouraged the habit of thrift and credit among rural poor women to make them self-reliant. It was started in 1982-83 on a pilot basis, in 50 districts and has now been extended to all the districts of the country. Since the inception of the scheme till 1996-97, 1, 87,918 DWACRA groups were formed at an expenditure of Rs.248.95 crore, covering 30, 39,383 rural women. It was in the Eighth Plan that DWACRA received a fillip with the government taking several initiatives to strengthen the programme. These include, among others, extending its coverage to all the districts of the country, increasing

the revolving fund from Rs.15, 000 to Rs.25, 000, permitting the formation of smaller DWACRA groups in difficult terrain and remote areas, and permitting operation of joint accounts by the group organiser and another member of the group elected as treasurer of the group rather than the gram Sevikas and the group organiser, so as to facilitate the DWACRA groups in managing their own affairs. The Child Care Activities (CCA) component was introduced in the DWACRA programme in 1995-96 with the objective of providing child care services for the children of DWACRA women. Similarly the Information Education and Communication (IEC) component was introduced to generate awareness among rural women about the development programmes being implemented for their upliftment and welfare. The Eighth Plan also saw the extension of the Community Based Convergent Services (CBCS), a component of DWACRA, to 141 districts of the country.

The Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (RLEGP) was started on August 15, 1983 to provide employment and expanding employment opportunities for the rural landless with a view to providing guarantee of employment to at least one member of every landless household up to 100 days in a year and creating durable assets for strengthening the infrastructure so as to meet the growing requirements of the rural economy. An outlay of Rs. 500 crores to be fully financed by the central government was provided under this programme in the sixth plan. The implementation of the programme was entrusted to the states and union territories, but they were required to prepare specific projects for approval by a central committee. During 1983-85, the central committee approved 320 projects with an estimated cost of Rs. 906.59 crores. The target for employment generation in 1983-84 and 1984-85 was fixed at 360 million man days against which 260.18 million man days of employment was actually generated.

Mid-way through the sixth plan, the RLEGP was revamped. It started with the dual objective of expanding employment opportunities in the rural areas and

providing sharper focus on the landless labour households which constitute the hardcore of the people below the poverty line. Efforts are being made to implement a limited guarantee for providing 80 to 100 days employment to the landless labour households through this programme. In the seventh plan and outlay of Rs.1,25,081 crores has been provided for RLEGP in the Central Sector which will be matched equally by the states. An outlay of Rs.1,74,378 crores has been provided in the seventh plan for RLEGP which will be borne entirely by the centre. Based on the average wage of Rs.8.61 per day as in 1984-85 and a wage material cost ratio of 50:50, a total employment of 1,445 million man days under NREP and 1,013 million man days under RLEGP is likely to be generated during the seventh plan period at an average rate of around 290 million man days and 200 million man days per annum respectively.

By merging the two erstwhile wage employment programmes – National Rural Employment Programme (NREP) and Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (RLEGP) the Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY) was started with effect from April 1, 1989 on 80:20 cost sharing basis between the centre and the states. The main objective of the yojana was additional gainful employment for the unemployed and under-employed persons in rural areas. The other objective was the creation of sustained employment by strengthening rural economic infrastructure and assets in favour of rural poor for their direct and continuing benefits. Though the people below the poverty line were the target groups for employment, the preference was to be given to the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and freed bonded labourers. Thirty percent of the employment opportunities were to be reserved for women in rural areas. Gram Panchayats were to be involved in the planning and implementation of the programme.

At the instance of the Planning Commission, the Programme Evaluation Organization (PEO) undertook a quick study of the JRY with a view to assess the extent to which the Yojana helped in providing employment to the target group, analyse the type of assets created under the yojana including their quality and

usefulness, comprehend the arrangements for the maintenance of assets created, and study the problems encountered in the implementation of the Yojana. The scheme has a special provision for women where 30 percent of the work is reserved for women, it will also benefit nomadic tribes, schedule caste, landless families, while preferences would also be given to the people living below poverty line. The budget of 2100 crore has been allocated for this scheme, where the Panchayat will be the implementing body thus eliminating the role of middlemen. Again the investment will be shared between the central government and state government in the 80:20 ratio. The programme is implemented by Yojana's Panchayati where the funds allocated to them would be eighty thousands to one lakh to implement the Yojana's. The objective is to provide employment to one member from each family of four hundred and forty lakh families and the responsibility will be on the village Panchayat on how they spend the funds allocated to them. The funds allocated to village will also depend upon the number of households are living in below poverty line and its backwardness. Its main purpose was to allocate funds to backward areas and develop them, though the Yojana's was successful , it had also some positive sights , like a person can now know how much fund was allocated to his village for the programme, and how many people are working with him under the programme.

A very large chunk of the country's rural population is employed in agriculture sector which is precarious by its very nature. Being a seasonal activity, agriculture sector is not in a position to offer employment for full year. Hence, as a welfare measure for the rural poor, central government introduced Employment Assurance Scheme. The primary objective of the Employees Assurance Scheme (EAS) is creation of additional wage employment opportunities during the period of acute shortage of wage employment through manual work for the rural poor living below the poverty line. The secondary objective is the creation of durable community, social and economic assets for sustained employment and development. The Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS) was launched on October 02, 1993 for implementation in selected blocks. Over the years, the

scheme was extended to all the blocks of the country. At present, all the districts of the country are covered under the scheme.

Initially when the scheme was launched way back in 1993-94, the central allocation of Rs.600 crores was made under it. The following year i.e. in 1994-95 the provision was doubled to Rs.1,200 crore. In 1995-96, the allocation was further raised to Rs.1,700 crore. Since then more and more funds have been allocated for the scheme. In 1999-2000 a massive allocation of Rs.2,040 crore was provided for EAS. In the on-going year 2000-2001 an amount of the order of Rs.1,300 crore has been earmarked for the purpose. The year-wise allocation of funds have not increased proportionately to its expansion/coverage of blocks/districts. EAS envisaged that to provide employment during the period of acute shortage of wage employment to those who are living below the poverty line and are in need of it and are seeking employment. However, to provide assured employment to all the needy persons living below poverty line in rural areas was to be achieved through a combination of plan and non-plan schemes of all other departments/ministries of the government of India and State/UT governments as well as EAS. During 1999-2000, central allocation for the scheme was Rs.2,040 crore, which was released in two instalments. The central allocation during 2000-2001 is Rs.1,300 crores. It does not include watershed works and construction of rural roads. For these two activities, funds have been provided separately. The scheme has proved to be very useful for the rural poor and that explains why there is a demand from states and union territories for enhancing funds under the scheme¹.

Swarnajayanti Gram Swarojgar Yojana (SGSY) is an initiative launched by the Government of India to provide sustainable income to poorest of the poor people living in rural & urban areas of the country. The scheme was launched on April 1, 1999. The SGSY (Swarnajayanti Gram Swarojgar Yojana) aims at providing self-employment to villagers through the establishment of Self-Help

¹ Research, Reference and Training Division (2008). India 2008. New Delhi: Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India. pp. 712-713. ISBN 81-230-1488-0.

Groups. Activity clusters are established based on the aptitude and Skill of the people which are nurtured to their maximum potential. Funds are provided by NGOs, banks and financial institutions. Since its inception, over 2.25 million Self-help groups have been established with an investment of ₹14,403 crore (US\$2.2 billion), profiting over Rs 6,697 million people. The Swarnajayanti Gram Swarajgar Yojana (SGSY) was launched as an integrated programme for self-employment of the rural poor with effect from April 1, 1999.

Since its inception in 1999, around 2,252 million SHGs have been established comprising 3,554 million people. Apart from SHGs, the scheme has also benefitted 3,143 million self-employed individuals. The total investment provided for the cause has been calculated at Rs. 14,403.73 crores including Rs.1,200 crores provided by the Government of India for the calendar year 2006-07. Of the beneficiaries, 45.54 percent have been SC/STs and 47.85 percent, women².

The Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (English: Universal Rural Employment Programme) was a scheme launched by the Government of India to attain the objective of providing gainful employment for the rural poor, from 1 April 1999. EAS became an allocation-based scheme, the programme was implemented through the Panchayati Raj institutions. The Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana was launched on 25 September 2001 by merging the provisions of Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS) and Jawahar Gram Samridhi Yojana (JGSY). The programme is self-targeting in nature and aims to provide employment and food to people in rural areas who lived below the poverty line.

The Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY) has been launched w.e.f. September 25, 2001 to provide wage employment in the rural areas. Under the Scheme, 50 lakh tonnes of food grains amounting to Rs.5,000 crore (at economic cost) will be provided every year, free of cost, to the State Governments and Union

² DPIO, Press Information Bureau, New Delhi.

Territory Administrations. The remaining funds (Rs.5,000 crores), will be utilized, to meet the cash component of wages and material cost. The expenditure of the scheme will be shared by the Centre and State in the ratio 10 of 87.5:12.5.

However the cash component is shared between centre and state in the ratio of 75.25. The payment of food grains will be made by the Ministry of Rural Development to the Food Corporation of India (FCI) directly. About 100 crore man-days of employment are envisaged to be generating wage employment under SGRY generated every August 2001. The new programme was launched on 25th September 2001 with an annual outlay of Rs.10, 000 crores. Under the Scheme, 50 lakh tonnes of food grains amounting to Rs.5, 000 crores (at economic cost) will be provided every year free of cost to the State Governments and Union Territory Administrations.

The expenditure of the scheme will be shared by Centre and States in the ratio of 87.5: 12.5. Under the scheme, about 100 crore man days of wage-employment is envisaged to be generated every year. Even though the EAS and the JGSY have been merged with this new scheme, in order to avoid confusion, these two schemes will be implemented as a part of the SGRY during the remaining part of the year 2001-2002, in the rural areas through the SGRY.

2.2 Review of Literature on MGNREGS Implementation in India :

Of the so many earlier studies on MGNREGS with regard to the provisions like entitlements of the workers, job cards, implementation, minimum wages, employment days, assets created and their durability and sustainability, involvement of the panchayat raj institutions, accountability and transparency as ensured and the impact on living conditions of the rural labour in discouraging migration along with social audits, A lot of literature has reviewed in the following way to acquaint with the current trends, research constructs and

methodology to identify the gaps so as to fit in this study into the existing body of knowledge.

T.S. Papola (2005) argues that an employment programme should ensure provision of work to everyone who is in need. It is to provide not a dole nor as a privilege but as payment for labour employed in productive work. The provision that works under MGNREGS are offered to only persons below the poverty line is well intentional. According to the author limit of employment to 100 days per household is unnecessary and the two points to kept in mind while fixing the wage rate are, minimum income to meet the daily subsistence needs of the households of the workers and the really needy households be assigned work. The author concludes that diversion of labour from other productive works be not encouraged.

Indira Hirway (2006) has stated that MGNREGS is a major development in the history of poverty reduction strategies by guaranteeing wage employment of a minimum of 100 days to a rural household. Effective implementation of the act requires the planning of right kind of rural assets of labour intensive nature. The study has elaborated the contents of the act and suggestions for the effective implementation of the act which pose a challenge. The author states that the governments both central and state needs to keep the relevant issues in view and plan carefully to benefit the poor. In conclusion it is summed up on that this powerful guarantee of wage employment be not treated as a poverty alleviation programme but be converted as an instrument to empower the poor and to promote inclusive growth in the rural economy.

Vijay Shankar et al (2006) have analyzed the schedule of rates (SOR) worked out by the state government and noted that SORs can be revised to ensure that MGNREGS wage is close to the market wage. The authors argue that the average wage for the whole state is unjust as there are variations in the nature of MGNREGS works. Geographical variations, climatic variations, variations within the work force and variations in the type of work are to be kept in view while

determining the wage rates. The study suggests special provisions for extra wages for work in drought prone, malnourished, hazardous, disability prone tribal and back ward areas.

National Rural Employment Guarantee Act 2005 – Report (2007).

National level monitors had visited the districts where the programme was in operation (330) presented the outcomes in the form of a report to the Indian Parliament for consideration as stipulated in the Act. The report states that NREGS is a peoples act by providing wage employment to the poor in the rural areas and it has been appreciated all over for its focus on accountability transparency, design of wage employment programmes and approach. The report shows that about 62 percent of the employment generated under the Act has been in favor of SC and ST households in the country.

Krishna Ranaver (2007) has taken the financial year 2006-07 to examine MGNREGS in Andhra Pradesh where in it stated that all the 19.15 Lakh rural households demanding employment were covered. 46,000 households were provided 100 days of employment and average number of works taken up in a district was 13,757 against the national average of 3,581. Average employment provided in a district was 1, 47,325 in A.P. against the national average of 91,685. The study reveals that only 46.2 percent of allotted funds of Rs 999.61 crore were utilized in 2006-07 and the expenditure on wages, materials and administrative aspects were 87.76; 0.89; and 17.35 percent respectively. Andhra Pradesh has been doing extremely well in MGNREGS as the average expenditure on a district was 39.43 crore against the national average expenditure of Rs 35 crore on a district as opined by the author.

Chakraborty, P (2007), explores the use of funds released under MGNREGS by the central government and observes no difference in Govt expenditure on rural employment programs as the allocations to earlier programmes sharply declined. The state governments are to submit work plans and

budget proposals to central governments based on which MGNREGS funds are released under the act. As the capacity of the backward states to formulate AWPB is low they are not in a position to get funds adequately as a result of which MGNREGS is not effective in the poorer states. The author suggests better coordination between the centre and the states to expand MGNREGS besides making it effective.

Khera R (2008) has described the experience of the Jagrut Adivasi Dalit Sanghathan in Madhya Pradesh with regard to MGNREGS. The study high lights the power of grass-root organizational work in making MGNREGS effective. Employment days per year in the Sanghaqtan area 85 per house hold per year and nearly half of the households have worked for 100 days. Most of the beneficiaries have earned the minimum wage as mandated, the study reveals. The author opines that the act can promote overall rural development and alter the balance of power in the villages.

National Federation for Indian Women (NFIW) (2008) has conducted a study in Rajnandagaon (Chhattisgarh) Jhabua (Madhya Pradesh) Mayurbhanj (Odisha) and Cuddalore (TamilNadu) to examine the impact of MGNREGS on the socio-economic empowerment of women. The study contends that a silent revolution is taking place in rural India with respect to women in the form of MGNREGS. Women are able to contribute to household expenditure through wage employment and they bear the cost of children education and health care. Women have become more active in their public relations by taking up MGNREGS work and responsibilities. The study further reveals that migration has come down and households have started to repay their debts. It is concluded that MGNREGS has brought a difference in the lives of women and they are willing to accept more work if offered.

Ritesh singh et al (2008) in their study has elaborated the reasons for the success of social audits in A.P. and the impact of social audits in the program and

payment process. The authors compare Karnataka where social audit has not been introduced. To examine the overall impact of MGNREGS even in A.P. the authors compared the mandals with and without social audit for the years 2006-07 and 2007-08. Social audits create social awareness and ensure accountability by contribution for the success of MGNREGS as observed in A.P. by the study. The authors conclude that the social audit experiment in A.P. can be replicated in other states with political support and policy framework as it is a powerful instrument to stream line the expenditure of MGNREGS by empowering citizens in making the program successful.

Mehrotra, S (2008) examines the experience of MGNREGS in the first two years. Total employment generated in the first two years is much larger than earlier employment programmes like NREP, SGRY. The author suggests addressing the major challenges in the implementation of MGNREGS like creation of awareness about the programme, effective monitoring and information systems with which MGNREGS can serve as a beacon light for other rural development programmes by improving the rural wages, productivity and discourage migration. The author opines that MGNREGS has addressed some shortcomings of the previous government programmes with the integration of legislative incentives and compliance systems.

Ambasta, P et al (2008) in their article have examined the deficiencies in the implementation of MGNREGS which include lack of professionals, under staffing, delays in administration, lack of peoples, planning, poor quality of and inappropriate wage rates. The authors state that major reforms are needed to improve agricultural productivity through MGNREGS of which deployment of full time professionals, building up of massive cadre of well-trained officials at the panchayat level continuous monitoring and evaluation, wide use of information technology and revision of schedule of rates are important. The authors suggest that machines and contractors be banned, programme to be gender sensitive providing a role to the civil society and the like to make it more effective.

G. Sudarshan and V. Srinivasa Rao (2009) have made an attempt to emphasize the imperatives of effective service delivery in implementing the various social inclusion strategies like MGNREGS as the Eleventh Five year plan has stressed the importance of more inclusive growth. The authors have elaborated the concept of social inclusion is about tackling social inclusion from different angles and state that social inclusion is about tackling social exclusion. It is stated that social inclusion is about helping to ensure that everyone feels able to contribute and be involved in his or her local community and in India as growth imbalances are more on the economic and social front as social inclusion strategies are more important. Majority of the Indians more so, SCs and STs have been by passed by the process of economic development over the years, despite the constitutional guarantees and affirmative action in favor of them by the government.

MGNREGS in the context of inclusive growth was introduced from February, 2006 and by 2008 all the districts in India were brought into the act. MGNREGS is a law where by any adult willing to do unskilled manual labour is entitled to be employed on public works within 15 days of applying for work in rural areas. 100 days of work is guaranteed to a rural household and the act has the potential for providing food security and creating durable community assets for the development of rural areas. The study has highlighted the provisions of the MGNREGS and the entitlements of the workers along with the role of Panchayat Raj institutions and the process of social auditing.

The authors conclude that, the Right to information and MGNREGS acts would become two eyes to the poorest of the poor in India and these acts ensure food security to them. They can become a strong lifeline for the rural poor in India as stated by Nirmala Laxman and as Quoted by the authors.

K. Karemulla et al (2009) have analyzed the impact of MGNREGS on rural livelihood and the nature of MGNREGS works like water and soil conservation. It

is observed in the study that A.P, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh are the leading states in the country in implementing MGNREGS in terms of employment days, expenditure and the number of beneficiaries. Anantapur district in A.P. has been analyzed at a micro level and it is stated that 2 / 3 of the beneficiaries are small and marginal formers. The study reveals that only 25 days of employment was provided in a year though migration decreased from 27 % to 7 % and the beneficiaries used the MGNREGS incomes on basic amenities like food, education of children and health. The study suggests that the employment days be increased to 100 as stipulated in the Act and the soil and water conservation works on agricultural lands be continued in the rain fed areas.

Action for Food production Report (2009) is based on its study in Chainpur block of the Gunla district of the state of Jharkand. 37 works in 28 villages and 10 Grama Panchayats of the block have been covered in the study. MGNREGS works were selected randomly from different years with 2006 selected works included ponds, wells, roads, check dams, earthen bounds, land leveling sites and guard walls. The study identifies the areas of development as effective participation of villages / beneficiaries in the decision making process, selection of needed schemes and ownership of the schemes. Better tools to workers, orientation to the functionaries, coordination at different levels and priority to small structures for soil and water conservation are some of the measures suggested in the study.

Raghbendra Jha et al (2009) have pooled the household data for the states of Rajasthan and Andhra Pradesh to assess the relationship between land holdings and MGNREGS participation. The study has noted a reverse relationship in Rajasthan against a positive relationship in A.P. The authors have compared inequity in land holdings, wage rates and interferences in both states and concluded that size of the land holdings has a negative impact on the MGNREGS participation in Rajasthan while in A.P. the programme has experienced capture, relatively more inequality in land distribution, higher MGNREGS wages and more political interference at village level in A.P. have been noted in the study and

extent of capture varies across based on the nature of the programmes in A.P. as revealed by the study.

Govind Kelkhar (2009) has made a study to draw policy attention to the complex inter relationship between gender equity, the ownership and control of assets by analyzing MGNREGS. The study has taken states of Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan, Maharashtra and Karnataka questioning the ability of MGNREGS in eliminating poverty and gender inequality. It is stated that women should take up asset management in MGNREGS for which training in new technologies and management skills be provided. The study points out that MGNREGS programmes be redesigned with a bias to women and they can be linked with SHGs following the model of Kerala and U.P. It is further added that gender responsive public policy by providing equal rights to women on productive assets would increase economic activities in the schemes and promote the empowerment of women in diverse capacities.

Administrative Staff College of India (ASCI) (2009) conducted a study in six mandals of three districts – Anantapur, Adilabad and Guntur of Andhra Pradesh. The study was carried out to identify the good practices in MGNREGS with regard to process, procedures and impact. Ground water level increased in Anantapur as a result of the assets under MGNREGS while agricultural yields improved in all districts along with reduction in poverty as revealed by the study. Delays in wage payments and the poor quality of assets were shown as problems in the implementation.

Ghosh, J. (2009) states that MGNREGS is desirable from a social or welfare perspective besides the direct economic benefits it provides with which the slowdown in demand can be tackled. Wage employment schemes imply higher multiplier effects since the beneficiaries under MGNREGS are the poor with the desire to spend more. The author states that MGNREGS is completely different from the earlier govt. employment schemes as it treats employment as a right and

local infrastructure and land productivity are improved. Local people are encouraged to participate in the planning, monitoring and evaluation besides involving women, SCs and STs as workers giving priority and thus help inclusive growth as opined by the author. In conclusion it is mentioned that it is mentioned that the positive indicator is greater participation of women though the MGNREGS potential has not been realized for which capacity building and support at local govt. levels are the key elements.

Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad (2009) has undertaken a survey in Jalpaiguri in West Bengal and Dangs in Gujarat to make an appraisal of MGNREGS as part of the professional institutional network set up by the Ministry of Rural Development in collaboration with the UNDP. The study notes that agricultural wage rate has increased due to increased demand for labour resulting from increased land productivity, higher reservation wage due to off season, employment opportunity and increased collective bargaining power. As employment in MGNREGS is provided on demand basis non-poor workers constituted 20-30 percent of the work force as found in the study.

Yamini Aiyar et al (2009) have analysed the institutionalized social audits in the implementation of MGNREGS in Andhra Pradesh and for this study 840 MGNREGS workers from Kadapa, Khammam and Medak districts have been interviewed to elicit their opinions on MGNREGS. The study has noted that 98 to 99 percent of the respondents are aware of the MGNREGS besides issue of job cards by 99 percent, 96 percent of the respondents possessing knowledge about wage payments and work site facilities to be encouraging. Social audit has contributed much for the success of MGNREGS in Andhra Pradesh with a proactive government and the involvement of civil society as observed in the study. The authors suggest regularity in auditing feedback mechanisms and grievance redressal to make social audits more effective.

Jean Dreze et al (2009) state that workers have to fight in reality at every step for their entitlements under MGNREGS to get employment, to be paid on time, to earn the minimum wage, to avoid harassment and so on. The authors put it as “battle for Employment Guarantee”, the battle stretches from the interior villages to the national capital to ensure the implementation of the act in letter and spirit the authors mention that 100 days of employment is a distant dream in most of the states. However they conclude that MGNREGS has helped in rising wages, discouraging migration to urban centers, creating productive assets and changing power equations in the rural areas.

Pulak Mishra et al (2010) have examined MGNREGS as a delivery institution for the tribal communities amidst other social groups across the Indian states stating that institutional reforms and coordination of the Ministry of Tribal Affairs with MGNREGS for realizing the benefits as essential. The study observes that tribes are better placed in terms of job cards and number of days of employment though in some states with higher concentration of tribes the progress is not satisfactory. Pointing out the variations in the benefits provided to the tribes under this scheme the study suggests strict enforcement of the rules to protect the tribes by adopting a holistic approach for tribal development. Proactive role of the Ministry of Tribal Affairs is needed to protect the rights of the tribes over natural resources like land and forests as opined by the authors.

D. Narasimha Reddy et al (2010) in their study have examined the implementation of MGNREGA with regard to its institutions, governance and innovations in the Indian states of Bihar, Rajasthan and A.P. The outcomes of the study show that all the job card holders have not participated in MGNREGS and state wise 47 percent in A.P., 25% in Rajasthan and 63% in Bihar have not participated in the actual MGNREGS activities during 2008-09. The practices in A.P., like bio-metric smart cards for payments and computerization of the employment days and wages are stated to be progressive measures to be followed by other states in the opinion of the authors. The study maintains that MGNREGA

has assured the role of “An employer of the last resort” to ensure sustainable rural livelihoods under adverse conditions and suggests that quality of work, decision making in selecting the assets and other related issues in MGNREGS are to be improved.

Dheeraja, C et al (2010) have made a study on the impact of MGNREGS on gender relations in 102 districts in 27 states in India. The major outcomes of the study state that gender relations in favour of women increased in the post MGNREGS period, self-esteem, self-image and confidence levels of women improved through their participation in MGNREGS and together with SHGs changes in gender relations have been consolidated. The study concludes that gender relations consisting of social, economic and political dimensions have improved after the implementation of MGNREGS.

Institution for Development of Youth Women and Child (IDYWC) (2010) has conducted a study in four districts, spread over two states i.e. Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan to evaluate development effectiveness, asset creation and livelihood sustainability through MGNREGS. Most marginalized sections including women are taken in the sample purposefully as a result of which the sample households comprise STs at more than half, SCs at 21.5 percent and OBCs 17.3 percent. The findings show that MGNREGS has improved the livelihood scenario of rural India by increasing the average wage and by creating more flexible and fair labour market in rural areas. The study reveals that the average income of the sample households has increased considerably. The study has also found that the structures built under MGNREGS are sustainable and durable as wells, check dams and Ana cuts have been built with right quality and technical inputs. Agriculture productivity in the sample villages has shown a positive trend and with the continuation of the present level of investment in rural economy would increase agricultural growth in the coming years in the MGNREGS districts where implementation is effective, as per the study.

Kumar A.A. (2010) in his study examined the various factors associated with the creation of assets under MGNREGS by taking one block each from three districts of Bihar. The study is based on total assets created in 2006-07 and 2007-08 in the respective blocks. The study found that the assets were productive and effective when the rules and regulations of MGNREGS were followed. Public or community assets like ponds and canals have been found to be more effective while private assets are less productive as they irrigate limited areas and with regard to maintenance of private assets are better as the private beneficiaries want the benefits for a long time while the public assets have not been maintained properly and the author feels that the public assets are not going to be sustainable in the long run. The study offers two reasons for the dissatisfaction of the labourers viz., less number of days of work under the scheme and delay in wage payment affecting their regular activities.

Pankaj A; et al (2010) have used a field survey to examine the empowerment effects of the MGNREGS on rural women in Bihar, Jharkand, Rajasthan and Himachal Pradesh. The study shows that women have gained from the scheme because of wage employment with its impact on income – consumption, Intra household effects and the enhancement of choice and capability. Gender discrimination in wages in the rural labour market has been eliminated to some extent as the MGNREGS ensures equal wages. The study concludes stating that collective mobilization of women in the MGNREGS improves their status, more so, in the backward states.

Samarthan – Report (2010) - A study was conducted in 16 districts of Madhya Pradesh dividing the sample units' geographical area wise, phases of implementation, performance on employment generation and also different categories of households. Some of the key findings of the study include low awareness levels of the beneficiaries, no clear strategy to maintain the assets and funds to be used for maintenance of assets and social audits not being conducted in some areas which show the issues of less wage payment as reported by 69 percent

of the beneficiaries and other related problems. On the positive side a majority of the households spend MGNREGA incomes on food, medicine and clothes for the family members at 81, 51 and 45 percent respectively.

Rao MV., et al (2010) in their report on convergence initiative of MGNREGS in India studied 115 districts across 22 states during 2009. Convergence initiatives according to them, help to pool up resources, technology transfer and value addition by avoiding wastage of resources in rebuilding rural India with productive assets. It is observed in the study that most of the district officials have not appreciated the idea of convergence. They have observed that most of the convergence projects insist on maintaining 60-40 wage-material ratio and this has become a problem in some states as wage component comes down. States like A.P., Kerala, Himachal Pradesh and West Bengal have consulted the local communities in planning and implementation of the convergence process. The authors feel that convergence is effective where gram panchayat is effective and the focus on Tribal groups in the convergence planning adopted in A.P. and Chhattisgarh are to be followed by other states. The study concludes that maintenance arrangements be well defined and MGNREGS planning be shifted to convergence mode.

Institute of Rural Management (2010) in its report on MGNREGS in Sikkim has analyzed the major works implemented under MGNREGS like water conservation, land development, plantation, afforestation and road connectivities. The report reveals that the employment in 2009 – 10 was to 55,000 rural households with Rs.40 crore on wage payments. The major outcomes of the study include, increase in the dignity of labour work, provision of purchasing power to the rural people to ensure food security, active participation of the community with better levels of coordination. It is suggested in the study that durability and sustainability of the assets need new strategies in the long run.

S. Subramanyam et al (2010) have taken six objectives and examined the implementation of MGNREGS in the districts of Ganjam, Rayagada, Kalhandi, Bolangir, Sambalpur and Mayurbhanj in the state of Odisha. It is noted that a majority of the rural households are not aware of the aspects of MGNREGS. They have also observed that registration of the households and the issue of job cards to be defective, local requirements of employment are not assessed properly, scheme is not implemented in the selected districts on demand base, delay in wage payments and the MGNREGS funds used mostly for laying down roads but not to increase agricultural productivity. The field study reveals that transparency and accountability are not effective and social audit has not taken place. The authors suggest that MGNREGS should be made more effective in the backward state of Odisha to enable the rural people to get the benefits from it.

Ratan et al (2010) have examined six districts in Bihar to assess planning and implementation of MGNREGS during 2006-07 by collecting data from the districts and observed that only 60% of the allotted funds were utilized. Coverage of the disadvantaged sections like STs and SCs to be encouraging, Low awareness of the scheme in the districts, low level of women participation, inter district variations in many aspects of the scheme, more than 78 percent of the job cards issued to the males showing gender discrimination, discouraging work site facilities, ineffective functioning of the vigilance and monitoring committees and limited involvement of NGOS in MGNREGS have been noted in the study.

B G Harish et al (2011) evaluated the impact of MGNREGS on income generation and labour supply in agriculture by taking a district in the state of Karnataka. 16% increase in the employment days, 9.04% increase in wages and impact of the gender, education and family size of the job card-holders on employment are highlighted in the study. Area under labour intensive crops like tomato has decreased by 30% and labour supply for agricultural operations like weeding and sowing decreased by 53 and 30 percent respectively as revealed by the study. Labour shortage has constrained some farmers to leave a part of their

land uncultivated. However MGNREGS has contributed to increase the consumption expenditure in view of the increase in employment and income, the study maintains and it is suggested to limit MGNREGS works to the off season to tackle the problem of labour shortage in agriculture.

Rishabh Khosla (2011) has examined the effect of caste reservation politics in Gram Panchayats in A.P. by analysing the MGNREGS data. The study finds that MGNREGS is effective in A.P. but influenced by politics, beaurocracy has been shattered by political parties and local leaders to achieve their own political goals. The major findings of the study include patronage in antipoverty schemes to be relatively more in Coastal Andhra, one community getting more benefits from MGNREGS at the cost of other communities and forward castes showing little interest in MGNREGS employment even though they are at the centre in the power politics of the Gram Panchayats. In conclusion more research has to be done on these issues is suggested by the study.

Shyeashri Shankar et al (2011) have examined the relationship between possession of information, gaining access to and the efficacy of delivery of MGNREGS in three states in India. Actually poor in need of wage income have little information and their ability to derive benefits from this valuable scheme is low as observed in the study. Non-poor sections with accession to information have captured relatively more benefits in A.P. and Maharashtra while corruption at the implementation level is high in Rajasthan due to lack of information to the poor, in the opinion of the authors. It is suggested that the Governments should invest more on the awareness campaigns about MGNREGS, particularly in the poorest regions with effective monitoring as MGNREGS, undoubtedly, has brought in positive changes to improve the situation in rural India.

Pellisery et al (2011) have examined the impact of MGNREGS on women in 22 districts of Andhra Pradesh during 2007-10 with respect to women participation and wage payments to them. The study has found that the shares of

the women in MGNREGS are 53.56 and 57.63 percent in work participation and wage payments respectively which indicate a little tilt in favor of women in MGNREGS in Andhra Pradesh. It is revealed in the study that single women, breast feeding mothers and elderly women have been given preference in allotment of the works with facilities for child care at the work sites. Women in the study have preferred infrastructure facilities under MGNREGS works while men have preferred creation of assets useful to enhance agricultural production.

M. Sundara Rao et al (2011) have examined the implementation of MGNREGS in the Narasannapeta mandal of Srikakulam District. The authors have collected the opinions of the respondents as to the background of the beneficiaries and management aspects of the MGNREGS implementations. It is found that MGNREGS has promoted employment in the study villages besides active participation by the local bodies in making the scheme successful. The study concludes that wage employment programs like MGNREGS can offer only temporary solutions as economic development is feasible with skill formation and creation of proper environment in rural areas.

V. Preetha et al (2011) have examined the impact of MGNREGS on women empowerment from different dimensions and concluded that it is very much helpful in empowering women. To then the act is a leap forward in employment generation providing opportunities for improving gender relations in some of the most remote areas of the country. The study suggests that efforts be made to strengthen MGNREGS to achieve the desired goals.

Babu. S. et, at (2011) in their study in Pachim Medinipur and Burdwan districts of West Bengal have assessed the impact of MGNREGS on labour markets with regard to changes in land use, Cropping patterns and economics of agriculture. Notable changes have taken place in land use and fallow lands have been brought under cultivation as revealed in the study paddy cultivation has become costlier to small and marginal farmers in view of the increase in the wages

and here also expenses on irrigation have come down facilitated by the irrigation works under MGNREGA as noted in the study.

Das Gupta S et al (2011) state that MGNREGS provides income supplement to the rural poor by providing 100 days of work to a rural household. The study has analyzed the NSSO survey 2004-05 and MGNREGS data from the official sites and the major findings include that women's participation has been increasing, women's participation is higher in MGNREGS and women prefer MGNREGS employment as the wage discrimination is little or nil. The study holds that MGNREGS increases the power of women and reduce the gender bargaining disparities in the labour market.

Kumar P et al (2011) in their study makes an attempt to assess MGNREGS with respect to employment generation, its effect on rural urban migration, asset creation determination and implementation in five districts of Karnataka. The major outcomes of the study are that the household size, land owned, BPL card, wage rate, age of members, education and other employment opportunities are the major factors determining the participation in MGNREGS. The study has noted an increase of 50 percent in wage rate both for skilled and unskilled workers in agriculture as well as non-agriculture jobs. After the implementation MGNREGS, enhanced the food security by providing employment as reported by 55 percent of the beneficiaries and protection against poverty as opined by 37 percent of the participants.

Shah V D et al (2011) have made an assessment of MGNREGS with respect to employment generation, rural - urban migration, asset creation, determinants of participation and implementation in 5 districts of Gujarat. The study shows that migration is discouraged to some extent though low wages and employment days encourage some households to migrate to other places. Increase in food consumption of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS is noted and the quality of assets created has been poor due to lack of proper planning and maintenance. More than

90 percent of the respondents have stated that the assets are useful to the village community and MGNREGS provides scope for infrastructural development of the village.

Sudershan R M (2011) has examined women's participation in selected areas in the states of Kerala, Himachal Pradesh and Rajasthan. It is found that MGNREGS has succeeded in bringing the large number of women into wage employment. Reasons for significant variations in the participation of women in MGNREGS across and within the states are explored in the study and suggestions are given. The author states that has empowered women to some extent in the economic and social spheres. The study suggests that local development challenges and priorities be addressed through MGNREGS to generate better outcomes.

Vaidya C S et al (2011) have made an attempt to assess MGNREGS with respect to employment generation, wage differentials, rural urban migration, asset creation, determinants of participation and implementation in five districts of Himachal Pradesh. The main findings show that migration was due to higher wages in the urban centers, MGNREGS enhanced food security in the villages, provided economic independence to the women and purchasing power to the local economy. The study has found that the assets created under MGNREGS are of good quality.

Berg E et al (2012) have examined the impact of MGNREGS on agricultural wages in 249 districts across 19 Indian states and concluded that the daily wage rates increased by 5.3 percent. The increase has taken six to eleven months to be discernible. The authors conclude that most of the poor live in the rural areas and the poorest of the poor are agricultural wage labourers who are being benefited by public works in the form of MGNREGS.

P Bonner K et al (2012) have elaborated the MGNREGS performance in Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh with regard to the impact of socio economic

characteristics of the states, political influences and organizational capacities of the respective state governments. They find out that the strength of the district, block and Gram Panchayats with their organization and administrative capacities determine the success. Since, the Grama Panchayats in U.P. lack skills and administrative competency leading to little success in MGNREGS when compared to Tamil Nadu. Unemployment allowance has not been paid in both states as observed by the study. It is observed in the study that participation of women is low in U.P. due to caste and religion related issues where as women participation is higher in Tamil Nadu in view of the favourable cultural factors, effective state and local institutions and SHGs.

Engler M et al (2012) have examined 1064 rural households from 200 villages of Medak district, Andhra Pradesh to analyse the impact of MGNREGS. The study indicates that MGNREGS significantly increased the monthly per capital expenditure on food by 9.6 percent on non-food consumables by 23 percent ensuring food security. Probability of saving increased by 21 percent, improvement in health indicators and proper utilization of time increased by 21 percent improvement in health indicators and proper utilization of time for increased incomes have also been noted by the authors. The scheme, though attracted more non-agricultural labour (78 percent), in the initial years, it is now attracting agricultural labour (55.3 percent) as observed in the study. The study concludes that labour market distortions may take place as MGNREGS is viewed not just as an employment assurance during the slack agriculture season but as an alternative to agriculture labour work.

Dr. Prasad K V S (2012) has referred to MGNREGS as the flagship program of the government that directly touches the poor and promotes inclusive growth, while examining the contents of the Act by using secondary data, the study has analyzed the achievements between 2007-08, 2011-12 and found that performance has been significant in quantitative terms as it plays a vital role in rural development. It is noted that migration has been discouraged, rural

productive assets have been improved and MGNREGS employment becomes a safety net to the rural unemployed during famines and drought contributing to sustainable development.

Merin's et al (2012) in their study on the impact of MGNREGS on the labour supply in agriculture sector of Wyanad district in the state of Kerala have observed that there has been a raise in the wages due to MGNREGS as a standard minimum wage is mandated. The study reveals that the scheme has been effective in the reduction of rural poverty and also in empowering the women. It is suggested that the scheme should involve private participation to an extent of 50% besides fixing the wage rate by taking the market wage into consideration. The projects under MGNREGS be planned during the lean season of agricultural operations to benefit the agricultural labour as opined by the authors.

P M Honnekeri et al (2012) have made a study in two villages in Gulbarga district of Karnataka to examine the impact of MGNREGS on rural – urban migration. Sixty households have been surveyed to examine the living conditions of the poor and it is noted that employment security is provided by the MGNREGS. The study concludes by asserting that MGNREGS is capable of discouraging rural urban migration by providing means of livelihood in the villages through wage employment.

S Krishnan et al (2012) have observed that the scanty rainfall has been stored by the villagers under MGNREGS and the stored water has helped to increase the area under cultivation. Thus, agriculture has become sustainable with the storage of water and employment has been created through water conservation work in the village. Food security is ensured and incomes to the beneficiaries through wage work have improved living conditions. It is stated in the conclusion that water shed program has reduced poverty both directly and indirectly.

Shilip Varma et al (2012) have studied the impact of water security programs under MGNREGS by taking a purposive sample of case studies of over 140 best performing water sheds in 75 villages across four states. The authors state that construction, repairs and renovation of rural water structures, both private and public have been taken up under MGNREGA as the world's largest water security program. The study makes a note that employment has been created at the same time, to generate incomes to the rural households besides adding to the irrigation potential.

Srinivasa Rao Didda et al (2013) have observed in their study the extent to which MGNREGS has reached the tribals' in terms of employment generation, asset creation and wage payment. Buduruvada village of parvatipuram mandal in the agency area of vijayanagaram district in A.P. has been taken for the study during 2006-11, data is secondary and simple tools of analysis have been used and it is observed that the awareness of the tribals' is limited as to the MGNREGS provisions. The study reveals that employment days have been 24-25 and unemployment allowance has not been paid. It is noted that wages in the range of Rs.50 – 90 alone have been paid and the delay up to 20 – 30 days in the payment of wages has been observed. The study suggests policy orientation to enable the SC and ST workers in the villages, more so, backward areas to get real benefits.

Amarender Reddy A (2013) starts his paper with the statement that labour shortages in rural India have become an issue since last decade for which farmers blame MGNREGS even though, there is no concrete evidence to substantiate this contention. While estimating the trends in rural wages the author has examined the relationship between growth in wages and MGNREGS, urbanization, share of agriculture and migration by analyzing thirteen states in India with ranks to the above variables. It is interesting to note from the study that three of the top six states in MGNREGS working days per household are among the top four states in growth of rural wages implying the strong impact of MGNREGS on rural wages growth rate. Migration of rural labour is negative in one of these states (A.P.) and

considerably low in one state (Tamilnadu) while it is higher in one state (Karnataka) in view of the higher percentage of overall urbanization there. Substantial upward shift in rural wages from 2007 onwards across the selected states in the study is noted for which the impact of MGNREGS is considerable and the impact on reduction of migration from rural to urban is discernible too.

P. Tara Kumari et al (2013) have examined the impact of MGNREGS on the economic status of rural women by studying 300 MGNREGS workers, spread over three mandals in Visakhapatnam. The authors have examined briefly, the provisions of MGNREGS first and then evaluated the progress of MGNREGS in Andhra Pradesh, year on, up to 2009-10. They argue that MGNREGS provides guaranteed employment during the slack season of agricultural operation and empowers the rural communities to demand work as part of their basic entitlements and enables them to participate in the larger process of development in the country.

Their findings based on primary data reveal that more than half of the sample women are in the age group of 31-45 years, 82% of the respondent women are illiterates, BC women beneficiaries are relatively more followed by OCs while STs are 11% and SCs are just 2%, main occupation of two thirds of the respondents is agricultural labour, awareness about the wages is at higher level (86A%), employment days are above 80, to more than 50 percent of the sample women and monthly incomes to three fourth of the sample women are in the range of Rs.1,000-2,000.

The authors suggest more training and publicity to raise the level of awareness, more employment days to increase incomes and conclude the illiterate women in the rural areas are benefitted through wage employment under MGNREGS which would enhance their economic status. The authors feel that MGNREGS has ensured the objective of “Inclusive Growth” and suggest the scheme to be extended by bringing in more workers into its fold.

MGNREGS reduced poverty by up to a third and gave a large number of women their first opportunity to earn cash income, Officials from the Ministry of Rural Development (MoRD) and the National Council of Applied Economic Research (NCAER) released a report in August, 2015. This data used for the period of 2004-05 and 2011-12 involving 26,000 rural households across the country.

During two periods, the programme reduced poverty overall by up to 32 percent and prevented 14 million people from falling into poverty. The numbers shows that the MGNREGS is likely to have had a much smaller impact on the rural job market and on rural wages than is commonly believed.

The part of the rural job market that the MGNREGS did seem to have a more significant impact on was for female work. About 45 percent of women MGNREGS workers were either not working or worked only in a family farm in 2004-05 indicating that the MGNREGS may will be the opportunity many women have to earn cash. As a result, there was a substantial increase in women's control over resources – including cash in hand and the livelihood, of having a bank account, and improvement in women's ability to make independent decisions about their health etc.

Conclusions :

By over view some of the reviews made by several authors on over a period of one decade implementation of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme in the country it makes the following observations. First, the MGNREGS is a much needed programme for the marginalized sections of society. Two, the programme is providing employment to roughly 37 percent of total issued job cards in the country. Three, women are able to contribute to household expenditure through wage employment. Four, old and disabled persons also benefited through the scheme. Five, assets created in rural areas like land

development and soil conservation are much helpful to farmers notable changes have taken place in land use like fallow lands and forest lands have been brought under cultivation. Six, issue of job cards are defective and local requirements of employment are not assessed properly. Seven, there has been deceleration of budget allocations in terms of job card holders and employment generation.

Many studies have pointed out that the MGNREGS has caused to reduce seasonal unemployment, rural urban migration, assets created, empowerment of women, increasing agricultural wages thereby increasing agricultural costs, at macro level. But there are no studies the impacts of MGNREGS on tribes in terms of some of the objectives guaranteed in the scheme. The present study is an attempt to fill the gaps on this concerns of MGNREGS.

CHAPTER – 03

Understanding the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment

Guarantee Scheme- 2005

The basis for the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) in India emerged from the thinking that a society which has failed to reduce the unemployment problems through the growth process in six decades of development cannot ask its unemployed to wait indefinitely. India's rural workforce neither had clearly benefited from the marked acceleration of the GDP since the eighties and agriculture as a livelihood was facing a series of crisis with the prospect of an imminent structural collapse. The consequent rise in distress migration, hunger, starvation deaths, farmer suicides, and violence in the country side were understandable and improving measures necessitated an employment guarantee backed by the state.

It is heartening that for the first time since Independence the Government of India is genuinely tried to grapple with the nuts and bolts of providing an employment guarantee to its people. A Constitution that feels obliged to protect the right to private property must surely feel similarly obliged to guarantee the right to work, especially when six decades of planned development has failed to do so¹. The National Rural Employment Guarantee Bill is introduced in the Lok Sabha on 21st December 2004.

The national Rural Employment Guarantee Act came into effect on 1st April 2006, and was launched by Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh, in Bandlapalli village in Andhra Pradesh. The Act is applicable to areas notified by the central government and will cover the whole country within five years. In its first phase, it was notified in 200 districts across the country. In the second phase, the act has been notified in the financial year 2007-2008 in an additional 130 districts, bringing the total of number of districts covered by MGNREGA to 330. In these districts, pre-existing wage employment programmes like the National Food for Work Programme (NFFPW), and the Sampoorna Grameena Rozgar Yojana (SGRY) were merged with MGNREGA. The remaining districts have been notified under MGNREGA with effect from April 1, 2008. The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005 (MGNREGA) guarantees 100 days of

¹ Shaw,M (2004), “ A Workable Right to Employment” ,the Hindu , Tuesday , Aug 24 ,2004

employment in a financial year to any rural household whose adult members are willing to do unskilled manual work. According to MGNREGA 2005, “to provide for the enhancement of livelihood security of the households in rural areas of the country by providing at least one hundred days of guaranteed wage employment in every financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work and for matters connected there with or incidental thereto”².

3.1 Salient Features of the MGNREGA 2005 :

As mentioned in the [section 1(3)] chapter-1 of MGNREGA, it should come into force on such date as the central government may by notification in the Official Gazette, and different dates may be appointed for different states or for different areas in a state and any reference in any provision to the commencement of this Act shall be constructed as a reference to the coming into force of that provision in such State or, as the case may be, in such area.

1. According Section 2 (g) “Implementing agency” includes any department of the Central Government or a State Government, a zilla parisad, panchayat at intermediate level, Gram panchayat or any local authority or Government undertaking or non-government organization authorized by the Central Government or the State Government to undertake the implementation of any work taken up under a scheme.
2. Chapter-II explains that every person who has done the work under the scheme shall be entitled to receive wage rate for each day of work. The disbursement of daily wages shall be made on a weekly basis or in any case not later than a fortnight after the date on which such work was done.
3. Chapter-III of the Act specifies that until such time as a wage rate is fixed by the Central Government in respect of any area in a state, the minimum wage fixed by the State Government under section 3 of the Minimum Wages Act, 1998 for agricultural laborers, shall be considered as the wage rate applicable to that area [Section, 6(2)]. In case of payment of wages is not made within that period, the

² The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005, No. 42, Ministry of Law and Justice.

labourers shall be entitled to receive payment of compensation as per the provisions of the payment of wages Act, 1936 (4 of 1936), as utters in schedule – II, sub.30.

3. Section 7 (1) of the Act states that if an applicant for employment under the scheme is not provided such employment within fifteen days of receipt of his application seeking employment or from the date on which the employment or from the date on which the employment has been sought in the case of an advance application whichever is later, he shall be entitled to a daily unemployment allowance at the rate of 1/3 of the daily minimum wage in accordance with this section. The state government reported under sub-section (1) to the concerned household as expeditiously as possible (section 8, sub 3).

4. Chapter IV of MGNREGA is dealt with implementing and monitoring authorities, and its responsibilities such as Central Employment Guarantee Council and State Employment Guarantee Council (section 10-12) Section 13 of the MGNREGA implies that the panchayats at district, intermediate block and village levels should be the principal authorities for planning and implementation of the schemes made. As mentioned in the Act, the Gram Panchayat should be responsible for identification of projects in the Gram panchayat area to be taken up under the scheme as per the recommendations of the Gram sabha and Ward Sabhas and for executing and supervising such works. As per the Section 17, the Gram Sabha shall monitor the execution of works within the Gram panchayat and conduct regular social audits of all projects undertaken up within the panchayat.

6. Chapter-V of the Act discuss about establishment of National and State employment guarantee fund which are responsible for the proper utilization and management of the funds at their disposal for the purpose of implementing the Scheme. Section 24 of the Act follows the Central Government, in consultation of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India, prescribe appropriate arrangements for audits the accounts of the scheme at all levels as well as State Government.

7. Schedule I of MGNREGA clears up that of the scheme should be on the following works in their order of priority:-

- i) Water Conservation and water harvesting;
- (ii) Drought proofing (including afforestation and tree plantation);
- (iii) Irrigation canals including micro irrigation works;
- (iv) Provision of irrigation facility to land owned by households belonging to SC's and
- (v) ST's land beneficiaries of land reforms or that of the beneficiaries under the Indira Awas Yojana of the Government of India;
- (vi) Renovation of traditional water bodies including desilting of tanks
- (vii) Land development;
- (viii) Flood control and protection works including drainage in water logged areas;
- (ix) Rural connectivity to provide all-weather access; and
Any other work, which may be notified by the Central Government in consultation with State Government.

8. Schedule II of the MGNREGA expresses that, as far as possible, employment should be provided within a radius of five kilometers of the village where the applicant resides at the time of applying. In cases the employment is provided outside such radius, it must be provided within the Block, and the laborers shall be paid ten percent of the wage rates to meet additional transportation and living expenses,

The facilities of safe drinking water, shade for children and periods of rest, first-aid box with adequate material for emergency treatment for minor injuries and other health hazards connected with the work being performed shall be provided at the work site. In case the number of children below the age of six years accompanying the women working at any site is five or more, provisions should be made to depute one such women worker to look after such children.

Objective of the Act :

The basic objective of the Act is to enhance livelihood security in rural areas by providing at least 100 days of guaranteed wage employment in a financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work. This work

guarantee can also serve other objectives; generating productive assets, protecting the environment, empowering rural women, reducing rural – urban migration and fostering social equity, among others.

3.2. Registration and Employment :

The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act provides the enhancement of livelihood security of the household's in rural areas of the country by providing at least one hundred days of guaranteed wage employment in every financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work. Those who are willing to do work under MGNREGS, have to register their details that include age, sex, family members, community status and residential particulars at the Gram Panchayat. Verification of these households according to their local residence and number of adults in the households is confirmed by the gram panchayat issues job cards to the every registered household. The new applications are conveyed once a week by the Gram Panchayat to the programme officer at the block level.

Under the MGNREGS, employment is provided to the applicant by the Gram Panchayat within 15 days of the date of receipt of the applicant. As said before, if a worker who has applied for work under the scheme is not provided employment within 15 days of receipt of application, they will be entitled to a daily unemployment allowance (MGNREGA, section, 7).

Employment shall be provided within a radius of five kilometers of the village where the applicant resides at the time of applying. In case where employment is provided outside of such radius, it must be provided within the block, and the laborers shall be paid 10 percent of the wage rate as extra wages to meet additional transport and living expenses.

3.3. Works :

The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005, indicated the kind of works that may take up for providing employment as discussed above. Thus as one can understand, the Act is entirely designed to improve natural resource management, like

improving tanks, canals, commons and secondly, it aims at improving the quality of lands of marginalized sections like dalits. It is also aimed against diversion of funds for building panchayat buildings or roads as it is used to be under previous employment programs.

3.4. Payment of Wages :

Every person working under the MGNREGS shall be entitled to wages at the minimum wage rate fixed by the State Government for agricultural laborers under the Minimum Wages Act, 1948. As stated in the Act (Schedule I, Section 6), laborers shall not be paid less than Minimum wage rate under any circumstances, equal wages shall be paid to both men and women workers. It is essential to ensure that wages are paid on time.

Wages may be paid on piece-rate basis. Where wages are paid on a piece-rate basis the work norms must be such that any person working at a normal pace for seven hours earns no less than the minimum wage, as per the Rural Schedule of Rates. The value of work done by labor is currently estimates using the Schedule of Rates (SoR) prepared by the state government departments. What SoRs do, in effect, is set up equivalence between the physical quantum of work performed and the financial payments to be made for this work. This equivalence arrived at based on the estimated quantum of work an average worker can perform in different strata. The SoRs prescribe a “competent authority” (usually an executive engineer) who can effect a change in the SoR. If necessary, the schedule of rates may be revised to ensure that the earnings are near the wage rate”.

Workers are entitled to being paid on weekly basis, and in any case within a fortnight of the date on which work was done (MGNREGA, Section3 (3)). In the event of any delay in wage payments, workers are entitled to compensation as per the provisions of the payment of wages Act, 1936 (MGNREGA, Schedule II, section30).

3.5. Funding :

The National Rural Employment Guarantee Programme is implemented as a centrally sponsored scheme as cost sharing the state and centre. The Centre Government

bears the amount required for payment of wages for unskilled manual workers under the, MGNREGS. The centre and state constituting 75:25 ratio of the cost of material and wages for skilled, semi-skilled workers. The ratio of wage costs to material costs should not be less than the minimum norm of 60:40 stipulated in the Act. This ratio should be applied preferably at the Gram panchayat, Block and District levels.

Administrative expenses as may be determined by the respective governments, which include inter alia, the salary and allowances of programme officers and their support staff and work facilities. The state government bears the cost of unemployment allowance payable in case the state government cannot provide wage employment within 15 days of application.

A National Employment Guarantee Fund has been set up by the Central Government to be engaged according to the rules made for this purpose. The grants to state governments or Districts for implementation of MGNREGS shall be released from this fund. The State Government Guarantee Fund, this fund is to be expended and administrated as a revolving fund, with rules that govern and ensure its utilization according to the purpose of the Act, similar revolving funds should be set up under MGNREGS at the District, Block and Gram Panchayat levels. The state government will design a complete financial management system for the transfer and use of funds. This must ensure transparency, efficiency and track the use of funds towards the outcomes. Separate bank accounts shall be opened for funds under the scheme at the State, District and Block levels. The accounts shall be opened in public sector banks, funds allocated to MGNREGS should not be used for other purposes under any circumstances.

Release of funds :

Under the scheme, each state will formulate and submit a state Annual Work Plan and Budget proposal (AWPB) to the Ministry of Rural Development, which plan will enable the Ministry to decide and sanction the budget likely to be used by the state in that year. The AWPB will be based on the demands for funds received from the Districts Panchayats. The AWPB will also report on the use of the previous funds received by the state, as well as on the key performance indicators determined under the scheme. This will enable a qualitative assessment of the proposals received from a State Government,

to help to decide the quantum of assistance likely to be released to it for a financial year. The actual release of funds to a State Government will depend on its actual utilization of funds previously released.

The initial installment as seed money of the Revolving Fund under the Scheme will be released in single installment to the receptacle fund, as may be decided by the Ministry of Rural Department. After utilizing 60 per cent of the funds earlier released, the District Programme Coordinator or the State Government may apply to the MoRD for the next installment out of the Central Employment Guarantee Fund. The release of the central share of funds during the next financial year will depend on the submission of the Audit Report and Utilization Certificate for the previous year to the satisfaction of the MoRD. The central government will normally release funds equal to the expenditure incurred and admissible under the scheme. The state share of funds will be released by the state government within 15 days of the release of the central funds. The Programme Officer will release funds to the other implementing agencies in the Block for the works sanctioned to them for execution. The sanctioned amounts will be communicated to all panchayats, and especially to the gram panchayats.

Convergence of NREGS funds :

NREGS funds are intended to create additional employment to the people and already existing employment programmes are displayed by the NREGS. Funds available with PRIs from other sources (such as the National Finance Commission, State Finance commission, State departments) and other centrally sponsored schemes (such as SGSY, DPAP, DDP, RSVY, Backward Area Grant, etc.) can also be dovetailed with MGNREGS funds for the creation of durable community assets permissible under MGNREGS. Convergence of the MGNREGS funds with funds from other sources of the creation of durable assets is permissible but not vice-versa. But social sector programmes such as literacy and health missions must be converged within the MGNREGS to extend the benefits of these programmes to REGS workers and beneficiaries.

Maintenance of Funds by the Gram panchayat:

The finance resources made available to the gram panchayat should be in consonance with the operational responsibility given to them. In other words, funds must

follow Functions GPs are allotted all operational responsibilities the funds required would be more than the minimum 50 percent stipulation laid down by the act.

Each Gram panchayat will have a single bank account for implementing MGNREGA works. The President and the Secretary of the Gram Panchayat will operate this MGNREGA account jointly. Funds from the MGNREGA account may be spent on MGNREGA works after only these works have received the required Administrative and Technical Sanction from the competent authorities. The President of the Gram Panchayat will be authorized to spend the money released to them on the works that have been sanctioned for them to execute. After 60 percent of the allocation given to any Gram panchayat has been spent, the gram panchayat may apply to the Programme Officer/DPC for release of additional funds. The proposal of the Gram Panchayat shall be accompanied by a statement of Work-wise expenditure together with the report of the Vigilance and Monitoring Committee duly approved by the Gram Sabha.

3.6. Monitoring and Evaluation:

At village level, the Gram Sabha and Gram panchayat involve in this procedure. They monitor all the works at the village level as well as the employment provided to each person who has applied for work, the registration and issue of job cards, works execution, muster roll maintenance, and payments made. At intermediate level, programme officer monitors the registration of households, employment provision, unemployment allowances paid, social audits, flow of funds, timely and correct payment of wages, and progress quality of works. In the District level, District programme coordinator monitors the scheme. State level and District level officers should inspect at least 2% and 10% of works respectively. Block level officers should inspect 100% works. In the monitoring process, field visits, inspections and sample checks are undertaken on a regular basis to ensure comprehensive and continuous assessments of the scheme. Verification and quality particulars are monitored by the National Quality Monitors at National level, State Quality Monitors at State level as well as District Quality Monitors at District levels.

A comprehensive Monitoring and Information System (MIS) is developed by the Ministry of Rural Development to facilitate monitoring. All programme implementation

authorities-from the programme Officer to the District and State levels- should report regularly on this system. Due to this system, maintenance of records become easy and also the information will be available to everyone, as per the Right to Information Act 2005.

Regular evaluations and sample surveys of the specific REGS should be conducted. District wise studies should be conducted and commissioned by the State Employment Guarantee. Block-wise evaluation studies should be conducted by the District programme coordinator. The findings of the evaluation studies should be used by SEGC, the District Panchayat and other institutions for intimating corrective action.

3.7. Social Audit :

The main feature of the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act is that it gives a central role to 'social audits' as a means of continuous public vigilance [MGNREGA section 17]. The basic objective of a social audit is to ensure public accountability in the implementation of projects, laws and policies. Social Audit is primarily public vigilance and verification of records in all the stages of MGNREGA implementation. The social audit helps make the local communities including the laborer families aware of the programme and see that the benefits reach the targeted. This in turn leads in reducing corruption, malpractices and leakages in implementation. Social audit sends a loud and clear message that officials and functionaries are accountable and answerable to the community.

In the context of MGNREGS, the process of social audit includes public vigilance and verification of the following stages of implementation: registration of families, issuance of job cards, receipt of work applications, preparation of shelf of projects, selection of sites, development and approval of technical estimates and issuance of work, allotment of work to individuals, implementation and supervision of work payment of unemployment allowances, payment of wages.

Evaluation of work at each of these stages, there are various ways in which implementation process may fail to meet the norms of the social audit which mentioned

below. The social audits can be seen as a means of promoting some basic norms in public matters.

Transparency :

Complete transparency in the process of administration and decision making, with an obligation on the government to give people full access to all relevant information. The information should be displayed in the local language at the worksite and at a prominent place in Gram Panchayat.

Participation :

An entitlement for all the affected persons to participate in the process of decision making and validation.

Accountability :

The responsibility of the elected representatives and government functionaries to answer questions and provide explanation about relevant action and in connection to the concerned and affected people. A set of norms through which the findings of social audits and other public investigations receive official sanction, have necessary outcomes , and supposed to be reported back to the people, along with information on action taken in response to complaints.

Redressal :

A set of norms through which the findings of social audits and other public investigators receive official sanction, have necessary outcomes, and are reported back to the people, along with information on action taken in response to complaints.

In the context of MGNREGS, the process of social audit should include public vigilance and verification of the following stages: registration of families, distribution of job cards, receipt of work applications, preparation of shelf of projects and selection of sites, development and approval of technical estimates and issuance of work order, allotment of work to individuals, implementation and supervision of works, payment of

unemployment allowances, payment of wages, evaluation of work and mandatory social audit in the Gram Sabha.

3.8. Role of Information Technology :

Information technology tools can contribute significantly to “disrupt” old ways of managing employment schemes. It can correct the major ills of earlier employment schemes, help citizens with valuable information in real time and enhance efficiency to implement a massive task such as in MGNREGS involving in several activities. It helps in demystification, simplification, transparency and accountability.

IT intervention in MGNREGS that the use of innovative tools developed through e-governance can contribute significantly towards reducing leakages and delays in wage payment. Information and communication technology (ICT) can be used in multiple ways to encourage transparency in MGNREGA³. Job cards, for instance, can be computerized. Through this computerization process, GPs and citizens can verify that beneficiaries with job cards get, paid for the number of days they work. The use of IT can effectively make possible, reduction in time taken for tasks such as estimation, planning and managing fund flows as also standardization of procedures, reducing or eliminating the scope of “discretions” and “judgments” exercised to disguise malpractices, reduction in time taken over administrative decisions, particularly on sanction and releases by proactively offering information, and making data transparently available on a network for monitoring, thus enabling concurrent vigilance and audits⁴.

3.9. Role of Gram Panchayat :

In the implementation of MGNREGS, Gram Panchayat is a key grass root level body, in part as an effort to strengthen GPs in order to ensure the accountability and transparency in the scheme implementation. It is an Act with a potential socio political significance for the rural poor that are matched by the 73rd Amendment. The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act provides glimmers of hope for a new participatory democracy such as the 73rd Amendment empowering local bodies of self-governance.

³ Aiyar, Y and Salimah Samji, “Improving the Effectiveness of Rural Employment Guarantee Act” EPW, 2006.

⁴ Ambasta, P (2008) et al, “Two Years of NREGA: The Road Head”, EPW, February, 23, 2008

This raises hopes that there will be greater transparency and people's ownership of MGNREGA schemes⁵.

On the recommendations of the Gram sabha, Gram Panchayat will estimate the labour demand likely to be raised in the next financial year. Gram panchayat will indicate the works that it will execute to meet the estimated demand and also recommended executing agencies for each work. The priority in which works have to be taken up must also be mentioned. The gram panchayat have the power to open work be started based on the order of priority.

The National Rural Employment Guarantee Programme is implemented by the agencies that are central government, state government, zilla parishad at district level, intermediate panchayat at block level and gram panchayat at village level. But these agencies are suffering from lack of sufficient staff. These are addressed by the lack of professionals and under staffing. In many cases, the programme officers and coordinators are appointed by deputation from the departments and irrigation department mainly. They do not have any technical Knowledge about the MGNREGS, and by the additional responsibilities. All these things caused by the delay in the administrative process of the scheme.

Minimum real wage rate should be fixed at a level that meets a fixed basket of minimum needs of an average household. Wage rate should be based on all India poverty line, average household size and worker-population ratio (Mishra, S and Manoj panda (2004)). Under the scheme, wage rate fixed by the state government for agricultural laborers under the minimum wages Act, 1948. As stated in the Act (schedule I, section 6), laborers shall not be paid less than minimum wage rate under any circumstances. But, in the process of piece-rate basis, laborers are getting below the minimum wage rate under the MGNREGS. Due to several difficulties at the work site, the people are unable to get the minimum wages also.

Equal wages shall be paid to both men and women workers, as per Act. But in some regions, the laborers are using their own tools of these works, at the time, the discrimination occurred in wages of MGNREGS.

⁵ Shah, M (2004), "National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, A Historic Opportunity", EPW, December 11, 2004.

It is essential to ensure that wages are paid on time. Workers are entitled to being paid on a weekly basis, and in any case within a fortnight of the date on which work has done (MGNREGA, Section 3 (3)). In the event of any delay in wage payments, workers are entitled to compensation as per the provisions of the payment of wages Act, 1936 (MGNREGA, schedule II, section 30). In reality, most of the areas, the workers are getting their wages for 15-25 days of work done. Everywhere this common delay existed in implementation of MGNREGS. However, the matter of payment of compensation for delay is now here. The reason is that there is no awareness among the people and there is no mechanism for this.

According to the MGNREGA, 2005, employment provided to the applicant within 15 days of the date of receipt of the application. In practice, within the delay of administrative process, there is no such kind of provision within 15 days. If a worker, who has applied for work under the scheme, is not provided employment within 15 days of receipt of application, they will be entitled to a daily unemployment allowance (MGNREGA, Section 7). But, no one has the knowledge about the unemployment allowance, and also about MGNREGS.

Work site facilities are to be ensured by the implementing Agency. Medical aid, drinking water, shade, and crèche if they are more than five children below the age of six years will have to be provided (MGNREGA, Schedule II, section 27&28).

The gram panchayat is the major implementation body of MGNREGS at grass root level. As mentioned in the Act, it has more responsibilities of success of the programme. But in practical sense, it suffers lack of staff, over burden, lack of coordination among the village officials.

The main feature of National Rural Employment Guarantee Act is that it gives a central role to 'social audits' as a means of continuous public vigilance (MGNREGA, section 17). The basic objective of a social audit is to ensure public accountability in the implementation of projects, laws and policies, in practice, the social audit conducted as nominal manner. But what happens in reality depends how well the social auditing is done. Surely for such a gigantic level we have enough civil society groups to conduct social audits. As we found in our study village, college students have done the social

audit, without bothering what people express as opinions and complaints from the people for public accountability. And it reports only figures given by the field assistant. We can also found that they do not take into account by verification of records for the conducting of social audit.

Conclusion :

The MGNREGS is completely different in conception from the earlier government employment schemes since it treats employment as a right and the programme is intended to be demand-driven. The MGNREGS is an important step towards realization of the right to work. It is one of the largest single right-based social protections in the world. It is expected to enhance people's livelihood security on a sustained basis, developing economic and social infrastructure in rural areas. MGNREGS is also supported by an extraordinary set of guidelines issued by the Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India. These guidelines are unique in the emphasis they place on planning of works and mechanisms of social audit. According to the Act, anyone in the village, irrespective of the class, can come and register for work and should be given work within 15 days, failing in which they would receive compensation. There is an elaborate administrative mechanism designed by the MGNREGS for the success of the programme at different levels of implementation. One of the most distinguishing features of the MGNREGS is its approach towards empowering citizens to play an active role in the implementation of the employment guarantee schemes, through gram sabhas, social audit, participatory, planning and other activities. It aims at doing away with the gender disparity. The work plans have to come through gram panchayats and they should be related to durable asset creation. Thus, it is a predominantly clear that MGNREGS is not a welfare programme dishing out doles. For the sake of better implementation of the MGNREGS, it has to put in place the tools and instruments needed to actualize the right to employment through a scheme, even in the best of circumstances, then only the Act will turn into an employment right.

CHAPTER – 04

Implementation of MGNREGS- A Macro over View

The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (2005) was enacted by the Indian Parliament in 2005 to provide a minimum guaranteed wage employment of one hundred days in every fiscal year to rural households with unemployed adult members ready to do unskilled manual work. First it was started in 200 districts and later on it was extended to all over India. The basis for the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) in India emerged from the thinking that a society which has failed to reduce the unemployment problem in six decades of planned development cannot ask its unemployed to wait indefinitely for the utterly uncertain prospect of employment growth catching up with population growth. India's rural workforce had definitely not benefited from the growth of the GDP since the eighties and agriculture as a livelihood was facing a series of crises with the prospect of an imminent structural collapse. The continuous rise in distress migration, hunger, starvation deaths, farmer suicides, and discouraging rural atmosphere were understandable and improving measures necessitated an employment guarantee backed by the state.

In this chapter it is discussed about the trends in implementation of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act 2005 at all India level i.e. top and bottom level states in terms of implementation. At the Telangana state level top and bottom level districts are analysed along with mandals where the field villages of selected tribes exists during the selected financial year 2015-16. The Act is applicable to areas notified by the Central Government and will cover the whole country within five years. In its first phase during 2006 it was notified in 200 most backward districts across the country. In its second phase the act has been extended to another 130 districts in the financial year 2007-08 increasing the total number of districts covered by MGNREGA to 330. In these districts pre-existing wage employment programmes like the National Food for Work Programme (NFFWP), and the Sampoorna Grameena Rozgar Yojana (SGRY) were merged with MGNREGA. The remaining districts have notified under MGNREGA with effect from 1 April, 2008. The extension of the MGNREGA to the whole country is an unprecedented opportunity to build the foundations of a social security system in rural India, flourish village economies, promote social equity, and empower rural labour.

4.1 MGNREGS at all India Level -Provision of Employment to Households :

Table 4.1: MGNREGS at all India Level -Provision of Employment per Household during the Financial Year 2015-16

(In Lacks)

State	Cumulative No of HH issued Job Cards up to 2015-16				No. of HH Provided Employment				EMP. Provided No. of Women	Households Completed 100 Days			
	SCs (%)	STs (%)	Others (%)	Total	SCs (%)	STs (%)	Others (%)	Total		SCs (%)	STs (%)	Others (%)s	Total
Andhra Pradesh	20.76 (24.71)	7.06 (8.40)	56.17 (66.86)	84.01 (100)	9.02 (25.01)	3.66 (10.15)	23.38 (64.84)	36.06 (100)	32.29	1.2 (20.41)	0.95 (16.15)	3.74 (63.60)	5.88 (100)
Arunachal Pradesh	0.02 (0.96)	1.91 (91.83)	0.17 (8.173)	2.08 (100)	0.01 (0.55)	1.65 (91.16)	0.16 (8.84)	1.81 (100)	0.6	0	0.01 (50.0)	0.01 (50.0)	0.02 (100)
Assam	2.72 (5.92)	7.69 (16.72)	35.57 (77.36)	45.98 (100)	0.84 (5.59)	2.95 (19.64)	11.23 (74.76)	15.02 (100)	7.88	0.03 (7.14)	0.07 (16.66)	0.33 (78.57)	0.4 (100)
Bihar	34.46 (25.95)	2.29 (1.72)	96.02 (72.32)	132.8 (100)	3.55 (23.87)	0.25 (1.68)	11.06 (74.38)	14.87 (100)	7.66	0.15 (25.86)	0.01 (1.72)	0.42 (72.41)	0.58 (100)
Chhattisgarh	4.11 (10.53)	13.35 (34.21)	21.55 (55.23)	39.02 (100)	2.09 (9.61)	8.07 (37.12)	11.58 (53.26)	21.74 (100)	20.23	0.17 (6.99)	1.24 (51.02)	1.02 (41.97)	2.43 (100)
Goa	0	0.09 (28.13)	0.22 (68.75)	0.32 (100)	0.02 (33.33)	0.01 (16.67)	0.04 (66.67)	0.06 (100)	0.05	0	0	0	0
Gujarat	2.65 (7.60)	12.63 (36.24)	19.55 (56.1)	34.85 (100)	0.36 (6.46)	2.62 (47.04)	2.59 (46.50)	5.57 (100)	4.69	0.02 (10.53)	0.07 (36.84)	0.11 (57.89)	0.19 (100)
Haryana	3.44 (45.09)	0	4.19 (54.91)	7.63 (100)	0.91 (53.85)	0	0.78 (46.15)	1.69 (100)	1.1	0.01 (25)	0 (0)	0.02 (50)	0.04 (100)
Himachal Pradesh	3.17 (27.02)	0.72 (6.14)	7.83 (66.75)	11.73 (100)	1.17 (27.66)	0.32 (7.56)	2.75 (65.01)	4.23 (100)	3.2	0.05 (25)	0.02 (10)	0.13 (65)	0.2 (100)
Jammu And Kashmir	0.85 (6.96)	1.74 (14.24)	9.62 (78.72)	12.22 (100)	0.41 (6.28)	1.05 (16.08)	5.07 (77.64)	6.53 (100)	2.58	0.02 (5.71)	0.05 (14.28)	0.27 (77.14)	0.35 (100)
Jharkhand	4.62 (12.54)	14.02 (38.06)	18.2 (49.4)	36.84 (100)	1.34 (11.90)	4.45 (39.52)	5.48 (48.67)	11.26 (100)	5.58	0.21 (12.07)	0.69 (39.65)	0.84 (48.27)	1.74 (100)
Karnataka	9.32 (16.73)	4.63 (8.31)	41.74 (74.94)	55.7 (100)	2.12 (17.15)	1.08 (8.74)	9.16 (74.11)	12.36 (100)	14.24	0.2 (15.04)	0.11 (8.27)	1.02 (76.69)	1.33 (100)
Kerala	4.11 (12.88)	0.9 (2.82)	26.9 (84.27)	31.92 (100)	2.39 (15.88)	0.49 (3.26)	12.17 (80.86)	15.05 (100)	14.36	0.3 (18.07)	0.07 (4.22)	1.28 (77.11)	1.66 (100)
Madhya Pradesh	12.85 (16.26)	23.77 (30.07)	42.41 (53.66)	79.04 (100)	4.36 (16.13)	9.62 (35.6)	13.04 (48.26)	27.02 (100)	22.96	0.38 (16.89)	0.72 (32.0)	1.15 (51.11)	2.25 (100)
Maharashtra	7.68 (9.81)	10.76 (13.75)	59.83 (76.43)	78.28 (100)	1.21 (9.49)	2.49 (19.53)	9.05 (70.98)	12.75 (100)	10.86	0.19 (8.71)	0.43 (19.72)	1.56 (71.56)	2.18 (100)
Manipur	0.14 (2.60)	2.42 (44.98)	2.81 (52.23)	5.38 (100)	0.13 (2.75)	2.36 (49.89)	2.24 (47.36)	4.73 (100)	1.89	0	0	0	0
Meghalaya	0.03	4.53	0.31	4.88	0.03	3.38	0.27	3.68	2.44	0.02	0.48	0.01	0.49

	(0.61)	(92.83)	(6.35)	(100)	(0.81)	(91.85)	(7.34)	(100)		(4.08)	(97.96)	(2.04)	(100)
Mizoram	0	1.85 (99.46)	0.01 (0.54)	1.86 (100)	0	1.89 (99.47)	0.02 (1.05)	1.9 (100)	1.04	0	0	0	0
Nagaland	0.03 (0.71)	4.06 (95.53)	0.15 (3.53)	4.25 (100)	0.04 (0.96)	3.98 (95.44)	0.15 (3.59)	4.17 (100)	2.04	0	0.01 (100)	0	0.01 (100)
Odisha	12.31 (18.46)	18.48 (27.71)	35.91 (53.84)	66.7 (100)	3.39 (16.97)	7.39 (37.01)	9.2 (46.06)	19.97 (100)	12.51	0.29 (14.72)	0.95 (48.22)	0.73 (37.05)	1.97 (100)
Punjab	8.71 (74)	0.03 (0.255)	3.05 (25.91)	11.77 (100)	3.69 (77.85)	0.01 (0.21)	1.05 (22.15)	4.74 (100)	3.29	0.05 (71.43)	0	0.02 (28.57)	0.07 (100)
Rajasthan	18.02 (18.16)	17.58 (17.72)	63.62 (64.11)	99.23 (100)	8.56 (20.28)	9.78 (23.17)	23.87 (56.55)	42.21 (100)	37.33	1.08 (23.03)	1.2 (25.59)	2.4 (51.17)	4.69 (100)
Sikkim	0.04 (4.71)	0.31 (36.47)	0.5 (58.82)	0.85 (100)	0.03 (4.61)	0.25 (38.46)	0.38 (58.46)	0.65 (100)	0.38	0.04 (40)	0.04 (40.0)	0.05 (50)	0.1 (100)
Tamil Nadu	23.41 (27.69)	1.32 (1.561)	59.81 (70.74)	84.55 (100)	17.11 (28.27)	0.81 (1.34)	42.61 (70.39)	60.53 (100)	58.86	2.38 (28.13)	0.08 (0.94)	5.99 (70.80)	8.46 (100)
Telangana	12.64 (22.74)	8.56 (15.4)	34.38 (61.86)	55.58 (100)	6.06 (23.64)	4.18 (16.31)	15.39 (60.05)	25.63 (100)	26.01	1.06 (25.36)	0.7 (16.75)	2.41 (57.65)	4.18 (100)
Tripura	1.08 (17.65)	2.45 (40.03)	2.59 (42.32)	6.12 (100)	1.02 (17.90)	2.33 (40.88)	2.35 (41.23)	5.7 (100)	4.59	0.53 (17.38)	1.38 (45.24)	1.14 (37.37)	3.05 (100)
Uttar Pradesh	52.09 (32.39)	1.59 (0.98)	107.15 (66.62)	160.8 (100)	18.94 (34.84)	0.55 (1.01)	34.87 (64.15)	54.36 (100)	20.86	0.65 (34.95)	0.03 (1.61)	1.17 (62.90)	1.86 (100)
Uttarakhand	2.24 (19.81)	0.41 (3.62)	8.64 (76.39)	11.31 (100)	0.93 (17.09)	0.21 (3.86)	4.3 (79.04)	5.44 (100)	3.63	0.04 (20)	0.01 (5)	0.15 (75)	0.2 (100)
West Bengal	32.9 (26.7)	9.43 (7.65)	80.88 (65.64)	123.2 (100)	19.48 (31.88)	5.34 (8.74)	36.28 (59.37)	61.11 (100)	40.02	1.41 (34.31)	0.36 (8.76)	2.34 (56.93)	4.11 (100)
Andaman & Nicobar	0	0.04 (7.69)	0.48 (92.31)	0.52 (100)	0	0.01 (10)	0.09 (90)	0.1 (100)	0.06	0	0	0.002 (100.0)	0.02 (100)
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	0	0.03 (100)	0.01 (33.33)	0.03 (100)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Daman & Diu	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lakshadweep	0	0.08 (100)	0.01 (12.5)	0.08 (100)	0	0.01 (100)	0	0.01 (100)	0	0	0	0	0
Puducherry	0.194 (28.12)	0.01 (1.45)	0.49 (71.01)	0.69 (100)	0.11 (33.33)	0	0.22 (66.67)	0.33 (100)	0.3	0	0	0	0
Total	274.67 (21.29)	174.79 (13.55)	840.8 (65.16)	1290 (100)	109.3 (22.71)	81.17 (16.86)	290.86 (60.43)	481.32 (100)	363.67	10.44 (21.53)	9.7 (20.00)	28.34 (58.45)	48.48 (100)

Source: www.mgnrega.nic.in

Table 4.1 presents the provision of employment under MGNREGA at all India level during the financial year 2015-16. Cumulative no of Households issued job cards up to 2015-16 was among SCs was 274.672 lacks of cards, STs was 174.797 lacks of cards, Others was 840.797 lacks of cards and reaching a total of 1290.266 lacks of cards. During the financial year 2015-16 all India no of households provided employment among SCs was 109.287 lacks, STs was 81.172 lacks, Others was 290.86 lacks and reaching a total of employment was 481.324 lacks of households, among these women constitute a major share i.e. 363.675 lacks of women workers participated in the scheme. However, as per the provisions of the act every job card holder family must be provided 100 days of employment in a financial year. If we see, the no of households completed 100 days of employment in India is very low when compared to job cards. It was 10.441 lacks of households among SCs, 9.702 lacks of households among STs, and 28.337 lacks of households among Others only completed the 100 days of employment bringing to a total of 48.48 lacks of households completed 100 days of employment at all India level as against to the 1290.266 lacks which is just 3.76 percent.

The place of Telangana at all India level in the implementation of MGNREGS is far better than the other big states in the country. It is in 10th place in issue job cards in the country with 55.58 lacks of job cards, and in 7th place to provide employment to more number of households with 25.63 lacks of households and occupies 4th place in percentage of households completed 100 days of employment in the country.

4.2 Comparison between Top and Bottom level States in Provision of Employment during 2015-16 in India :

Table 4.2 gives the comparative analysis of the top and bottom level implementation of MGNREGS in states during 2015-16 in India. In the percentage of provision of employment to households West Bengal tops in the country with 12.70 percentage of total employment provided, followed by Tamil Nadu with 12.57 percent, next to these states Uttar Pradesh holds third place with 11.29 percent, Rajasthan occupies fourth place with 8.77 percent and Andhra Pradesh stands in the fifth place with 7.49 percent of total employment provided in the scheme even after its bifurcation. Community wise SCs provided 17.83 percent of total SCs in the country in West Bengal as a top state and Uttar Pradesh followed it with 17.33 percent whereas Rajasthan stands at fifth place with 7.83 percent. As a matter of STs Rajasthan far better than top 5 states

with 12.05 percent of total STs provided employment in the country, and least of this table is Uttar Pradesh with 0.68 percent. When come to Others Tamil Nadu stands top of the table with 14.65 percent. But this ranking alters in the context of percentage of households completed 100 days of employment, Tamil Nadu tops the list with 17.46 percent of total households completed 100 days of employment at all India level. Next to this state, Andhra Pradesh stands in the second place with 12.14 percent, followed by Rajasthan with 9.67 percent, fourth place goes to Telangana with 8.61 percent and fifth place occupied by West Bengal with 8.48 percent of total percentage of households completed 100 days of employment in the country. Community wise SCs stands first place in top state Tamil Nadu with 22.82 percent, in case of STs Rajasthan providing better employment with 12.40 percent of households completed 100 days of employment where no other state is near to Rajasthan except Andhra Pradesh with 9.82 percent. In case of Others also Tamil Nadu did better than the other states with 21.17 percent of its households completed 100 days of employment during the financial year 2015-16.

Table: 4.2 Comparison between Top and Bottom level States in Provision of Employment

States	% of No. of HH Provided Employment				% of EMP. Provided Women	% of Households Completed 100 Days				
	SCs	STs	Others	Total		States	SCs	STs	Others	Total
Top Five States										
West Bengal	17.83	6.58	12.47	12.7	11.05	Tamil Nadu	22.82	0.84	21.17	17.46
Tamil Nadu	15.66	1	14.65	12.57	16.18	Andhra Pradesh	11.45	9.82	13.19	12.14
Uttar Pradesh	17.33	0.68	11.99	11.29	5.74	Rajasthan	10.39	12.4	8.47	9.67
Rajasthan	7.83	12.05	8.21	8.77	10.26	Telangana	10.15	7.26	8.51	8.61
Andhra Pradesh	8.25	4.5	8.04	7.49	8.88	West Bengal	13.49	3.71	8.26	8.48
Bottom Five States										
Goa	0.01	0.17	0.14	0.12	0.01	Goa	0	0	0	0
Sikkim	0.27	0.30	0.13	0.14	0.15	Manipur	0	0	0	0
Haryana	0.83	0	0.26	0.35	0.33	Mizoram	0	0	0	0
Arunachal Pradesh	0	2.38	0.054	0.38	0.16	Arunachal Pradesh	0	0.1	0.1	0.03
Mizoram	0	2.33	0.004	0.39	0.29	Nagaland	0	0.15	0	0.03

Source: Calculated from data available from www.mgnrega.nic.in

As against to this the bottom level 5 states in terms of MGNREGS implementation are Goa, Sikkim, Haryana, Arunachal Pradesh, and Mizoram in provision of employment, Goa occupies the last place with 0.012 percent of employment provided in total

employment created by states, and next followed by Sikkim with 0.136 percent of employment, Haryana with 0.350 percent of employment, next is Arunachal Pradesh with 0.377 percent and Mizoram occupies last fifth place with 0.395 percent of employment of total employment provided in the country. But this ranking also alters in completion of 100 days of employment among households in the country as the last three places occupied by Goa, followed by Manipur, Mizoram with 0 percent of households completed 100 days of employment in the states and then the fourth place occupied by Arunachal Pradesh with 0.03 percent and finally Nagaland stands in the fifth place with minute difference 0.03 percent of total households completed 100 days of employment in the country during the financial year 2015-16. Interestingly all the bottom level states both in provision of employment and households completed 100 days of employment in the MGNREGS are from the northeastern states of the country except Goa.

4.3. MGNREGS in Telangana :

Telangana is the 29th state of the country, which came into existence from 2nd June 2014 after six decades of struggle for self-rule. Telangana has geographical area of 112077 Sq.Km and has a population of 3,52,86,757. The state consists of 10 districts in number out of which 1 district Hyderabad is the capital city and completely urban dwelling so MGNREGS is implementing in 9 districts only in the state. MGNREGS has been implemented in the state since 2006 as a part of erstwhile Andhra Pradesh state. Let us examine the implementation of MGNREGS in the state.

Table 4.3 gives the information about the community wise provision of employment in Telangana during the financial year 2015-16. The MGNREGS is implemented in 9 districts in the state except the 10th district i.e. Hyderabad which is capital city and completely urban area. In the state there are about 56,82,579 households were given MGNREGS job cards till the year but the households who are actually working are 2490956 which is 43.83 percent of job cards given. In these BCs occupies 52.76 percent, SCs 24.01 percent, STs 17.32 percent, others 5.90 percent only. No of households who completed 100 days of employment in the state is 10862 for the financial year 2015-16. The average number of days of employment provided for a household in a year in the state is 25.83. The average wage rate paid per worker per day is Rs 126/-. Out of 9 districts Nizamabad is doing well with top position in provision of employment with

57.06 percent of the job card holder households and, then followed by Adilabad with 53.22 percent and the bottom level districts are Mahbubnagar with 36.17 percent in the least place and above to this district is Nalgonda with 36.18 percent of households are working. When looking by community wise SCs are provided better employment in Ranga Reddy district with 30.40 percent followed by Karimnagar with 28.83percent. STs are better provided employment in Khammam with 38.85 percent of households followed by Adilabad with 29.98 percent, followed by Warangal district with 21.73 percent of households provided employment. BCs are better in all most all the districts of the state top place is occupied by Mahbubnagar with 63.33 percent followed by Karimnagar with 60.60 percent of households provided employment, as against to this Khammam and Adilabad districts are below in the table .Others are more in Nizamabad and Ranga Reddy districts. To sum up this BCs are more in population and are provided 52.76 percent of state`s employment in the scheme during the financial year 2015-16. On the whole Adilabad district is doing well in terms of households completed 100 days of employment in the state with 3514 households` tops the table. Adilabad district also tops the table in the state in terms of average wage rate per day per worker with Rs 140.73/-. In Telangana state the total number of households worked for 100 days of employment is 10862 which is 0.44 percent of total working households.

Table 4.3 MGNREGS in Telangana in Provision of Employment in Rural Areas during Financial year 2015-16.

District	No of HHs issued Job cards	No of HH working (%)	SC HH working (%)	ST HH working (%)	BC HH working (%)	Others HH working (%)	No of HH Completed 100 days (%)	Average days of emp. per HH	Average Wage per Day
Adilabad	576338	306728 (53.22)	70891 (23.11)	91962 (29.98)	132693 (43.26)	11182 (3.64)	3514 (1.14)	34.17	140.73
Karimnagar	662507	301694 (45.54)	86971 (28.83)	13687 (4.54)	182824 (60.60)	18212 (6.04)	434 (0.14)	20.38	129.69
Khammam	598304	217409 (36.34)	44507 (20.47)	84469 (38.85)	73087 (33.62)	15346 (7.06)	383 (0.18)	22.36	121.77
Mahbubnagar	919778	332700 (36.17)	74285 (22.33)	28012 (8.42)	210688 (63.33)	19715 (5.9)	977 (0.29)	25.8	121.46
Medak	552433	266599 (48.26)	74497 (27.94)	19388 (7.27)	157760 (59.18)	14954 (5.61)	1463 (0.55)	30.32	126.63
Nalgonda	877681	317581 (36.18)	73627 (23.18)	71781 (22.60)	155412 (48.94)	16761 (5.28)	329 (0.10)	17.14	112.06
Nizamabad	482725	275456 (57.06)	62688 (22.76)	35447 (12.87)	154478 (56.08)	22843 (8.29)	1272 (0.46)	28.54	121.18
Ranga Reddy	298571	142815 (47.83)	43410 (30.40)	15097 (10.57)	71973 (50.40)	12335 (8.64)	1695 (1.19)	38.84	137.98
Warangal	714242	329974 (46.2)	67305 (20.40)	71692 (21.73)	175252 (53.11)	15725 (4.76)	795 (0.24)	21.54	113.13
Total	5682579	2490956 (43.83)	598181 (24.01)	431535 (17.32)	1314167 (52.76)	147073 (5.90)	10862 (0.44)	25.83	126.03

Source :www.mgnrega.telangana.nic.in.

Table: 4.4. Comparison between Top and Bottom level Performing Districts in Telangana in Provision of Employment during 2015-16.

District	No of HHs issued Job cards	No of HH working (%)	SC HH working (%)	ST HH working (%)	BC HH working (%)	Others HH working (%)	No of HH Completed 100 days	Average days of emp. per HH	Average Wage per Day
Top 2 Districts									
Nizamabad	482725	275456 (57.06)	62688 (22.76)	35447 (12.87)	154478 (56.08)	22843 (8.29)	1272	28.54	121.18
Adilabad	576338	306728 (53.22)	70891 (23.11)	91962 (29.98)	132693 (43.26)	11182 (3.64)	3514	34.17	140.73
Bottom 2 Districts									
Mahbubnagar	919778	332700 (36.17)	74285 (22.33)	28012 (8.42)	210688 (63.33)	19715 (5.9)	977	25.8	121.46
Nalgonda	877681	317581 (36.18)	73627 (23.18)	71781 (22.60)	155412 (48.94)	16761 (5.28)	329	17.14	112.06

Source: Calculated from available data www.mgnrega.telangana.nic.in

Table 4.4 gives the complete information about the comparative analysis of top and bottom implementing districts in Telangana state during the financial year 2015-16. Nizamabad district was doing well in the financial year 2015-16 with 482725 households were issued the job cards until the year 2016 out of which 275456 households are actively participating in the scheme which accounts for 57.06 percent of total job cards were issued for households. Next to this Adilabad district was also doing well in the MGNREGA scheme with a total of 576338 households were issued the job cards until the year 2016, out of which 306728 job cards of households were actively involving in the MGNREGA scheme during the financial year 2015-16. In the top 2 performing districts SCs were involved about 23.11 percent of households of total households, STs were got participated in the scheme with about 29.98 percent in Adilabad district, BCs are more involved in Nizamabad district 154478 households job cards which accounts for 56.98 percent of total job cards in the district and Others were also more involved in Nizamabad district with 22843 households which accounts for 8.29 percent of district's total job cards. AS against to this there are two districts where the households were participating at low proportionately. Mahabubnagar district was low in the state with 919778 households were issued job cards out of which 332700 households were involved actively in the MGNREGA scheme, which accounts for 36.17 percent of total district job cards during the financial year 2015-16. Next to this district just above in the table is Nalgonda district where 877681 households were issued the job cards, out of which 317581 households were actively involved in the scheme which accounts for 36.18 percent of total district wise issued job cards. No of households who completed 100 days employment in the scheme Adilabad district is doing well in the state with 3514 households. This district is

also on top in terms of average number of days of employment provided and average wage rate per day in the state. If we look at community wise participation of SCs and STs were involved more in these bottom level districts in Nalgonda district with 74285, and 71781 job cards which accounts for 23.18 percent and 22.60 percent respectively out of total district wise issued job cards in the financial year 2015-16. BCs were actively involved more in Mahabubnagar district with 210668 households which accounts for 63.33 percent of the total district wise job cards issued. Others were also more in Mahabubnagar district with 19715 households were got employment in the district which accounts for 5.9 percent of total district wise employment provision.

In case of STs the Adilabad and Khammam districts are doing well in the state. In Adilabad district out of 306728 households, 91962 ST households are working which accounts for 29.98 percent of total working households. Likewise in Khammam district also 84469 ST households are working in the scheme out of 217409 total households in the district. In case of households completed 100 days of employment among Adilabad and Rangareddy districts are top in the state with 3514 and 1695 households respectively.

4.4. MGNREGA in Dandepally Mandal of Adilabad district :

Dandepally mandal is about 160 km from district headquarters of Adilabad. This mandal has 21 gram panchayats. This mandal has the total geographical area of around 194.48 Sq.Km and consisting a total population of about 49741 persons which includes 24794 males, and 24947 females. This mandal possess ST population about 4573 which almost equally shared by men 2286 and women 2287. Dandepally mandal possess agricultural labourers about male labour 1519 and female labour 1526 making a total of 3045 labour at mandal level.

Table 4.5 gives the information about the implementation of MGNREG scheme in Dandepally mandal of Adilabad district during the financial year 2015-16. In this Dandepally mandal there are 21 Gram Panchayats, and issued a total of 12479 job cards until the year 2016, out of which 5875 households' job cards holders are actively participating in the scheme, which accounts for 47.08 percent of total job cards issued. If we look at community wise SCs have issued 1699 job cards which accounts for 28.92 percent of total card of the mandal, STs were given 623 job cards which accounts for

Table 4.5.MGNREGS in Dandepally Mandal of Adilabad district in Provision of Employment during the financial year 2015-16

Gram Panchayat	No of HH issued Job cards	No of HH working (%)	SC HH working (%)	ST HH working (%)	BC HH working (%)	Others HH working (%)	No of HH Completed 100 days	Average days of emp. per HH	Average Wage per Day
Chintapally	767	325 (42.37)	63 (19.38)	90 (27.69)	169 (52)	3 (0.92)	0	15.4	135.43
Dandepally	1665	789 (47.39)	189 (23.94)	96 (12.17)	499 (63.24)	5 (0.63)	0	17.13	125.55
Dharmaraopet	243	180 (74.07)	88 (48.88)	0	92 (51.11)	0	0	26.77	137.97
Dwaraka	521	240 (46.07)	98 (40.83)	0	141 (58.75)	1 (0.42)	1	25.48	106.48
Gudem	699	234 (33.48)	42 (17.95)	0	192 (82.05)	0	0	13	125.62
Gudirevu	485	207 (42.68)	80 (38.65)	6 (2.90)	121 (58.45)	0	0	18.31	133.78
Kannepally	436	248 (56.88)	63 (25.40)	0 (0)	184 (74.19)	1 (0.40)	0	19.91	113.82
Kasipet	304	143 (47.04)	65 (45.45)	0 (0)	78 (54.54)	0	0	23.55	90.89
Korvichelma	949	344 (36.25)	81 (23.55)	10 (2.91)	253 (73.55)	0	0	11.4	124.69
Laxmi Kantapur	330	221 (66.97)	49 (22.17)	24 (10.86)	147 (66.52)	1 (0.45)	0	31.91	152.89
Lingapur	418	236 (56.46)	70 (29.66)	126 (53.39)	40 (16.95)	0	1	34.16	114.89
Mamidipelly	767	447 (58.28)	76 (17.00)	65 (14.54)	303 (67.79)	3 (0.67)	0	13.12	95.08
Medaripet	685	300 (43.80)	150 (50.00)	6 (2.00)	140 (46.67)	4 (1.33)	0	14.19	106.21
Nagasamudram	374	249 (66.58)	47 (18.87)	38 (15.26)	163 (65.46)	1 (0.40)	0	31.16	98.72
Nambala	467	149 (31.91)	12 (8.05)	7 (4.70)	130 (87.25)	0	0	13.5	163.4
Narsapur	351	165 (47.01)	57 (34.54)	19 (11.51)	89 (53.94)	0	0	25.35	145.13
Nelki Venkatapur	617	354 (57.37)	90 (25.42)	44 (12.43)	220 (62.15)	0	0	20.07	131.74
Peddapet	471	320 (67.94)	177 (55.31)	0 (0)	143 (44.69)	0	0	17.23	139.45
Rebhenpally	666	320 (48.05)	99 (30.94)	11 (3.44)	209 (65.31)	1 (0.31)	0	10.47	108.2
Tallapet	701	313 (44.65)	103 (32.91)	81 (25.88)	129 (41.21)	0	0	11.74	130.88
Velganoor	563	91 (16.16)	0	0	91 (100.00)	0	0	14.08	116.19
Total	12479	5875 (47.08)	1699 (28.92)	623 (10.60)	3533 (60.14)	20 (0.34)	2	19.33	121.91

Source:www.mgnrega.telangana.nic.in

10.60 percent, BCs were given 3533 job cards were issued which accounts for 60.14 percent and Others were allotted just 20 job cards mandal wise which accounts for only 0.34 percent of total mandal wise cards given during the financial year 2015-16.If we examine gram panchayat wise cards and community wise distribution of cards and employment, Chintapally gram panchayat was performing well in the mandal and given 767 cards out of which 325 households were actively working in the scheme which

accounts for 42.37 percent of the panchayat wise total issued cards and least involving gram panchayat is Velganoor which was given 563 job cards in the panchayat but working is only 91 households accounts for 16.16 percent of the total cards. Let us examine comparative analysis of top and bottom level performing gram panchayats in the mandal. The households who completed 100 days of employment in the mandal is just 2, one in Dwaraka panchayat and another in Lingapur gram panchayat. The average number of days of employment provided per household in the mandal is 19 days per annum. The average wage rate earned by the workers in the mandal is Rs 122/- per day per person which is low when compared to the district average. Gonds are doing well in Lingapur and Chintapalle gram panchayats in this mandal and Chintapalle is selected for the study.

Table: 4.6. Comparison between Top and Bottom level Performing Gram Panchayats in Dandepally Mandal in Provision of Employment during 2015-16.

Panchayat Name	No of HHs issued Job cards	No of HH working (%)	SC HH working (%)	ST HH working (%)	BC HH working (%)	Others HH working (%)	No of HH Completed 100 days	Average days of emp. per HH	Average Wage per Day
Top 2 Gram Panchayats									
Dharmaraopet	243	180 (74.07)	88 (48.88)	0 (0)	92 (51.11)	0	0	26.77	137.97
Peddapet	471	320 (67.94)	177 (55.31)	0 (0)	143 (44.69)	0	0	17.23	139.45
Bottom 2 Gram Panchayats									
Velganoor	563	91 (16.16)	0 (0)	0 (0)	91 (100.00)	0	0	14.08	116.19
Nambala	467	149 (31.91)	12 (8.05)	7 (4.70)	130 (87.25)	0	0	13.5	163.4

Source: Calculated from available data www.mgnrega.telangana.nic.in

Table 4.6. Gives the comparative analysis of gram panchayats in Dandepally mandal during the financial year 2015-16. In this mandal there are 21 gram panchayats and selected top 2 gram panchayats in performance and another 2 gram panchayats performing at bottom level. Among the top 2 gram panchayats Dharmaraopet gram panchayat is doing well in the mandal with a total issued job cards of 243, out of which 180 job card holders households were actively participated in the scheme which accounts for 74.07 percent of total cards during the year 2015-16. Next to this panchayat Peddapet panchayat is doing with 67.94 percent of cards. If we look at community wise Peddapet panchayat was doing well in case of SCs with 55.31 percent, and least in bottom level

panchayat Velganoor with zero percent. In case of STs they provided more employment in Lingapur panchayat in this mandal and followed by Chintapalle panchayat with 27.69 percent. In case of BCs Velganoor panchayat is doing well with 100 percent of job card holders are working and all of them belongs to BC community. In case of Others Madaripet panchayat is having job card holders and only 4 households are working out of 20 households in the mandal.

4.5. MGNREGA in Wazeedu Mandal of Khammam district :

Wazeedu mandel is about 240 km from district headquarters of Khammam and nearest to the Chattisgarh state. This mandal has 9 gram panchayats. This mandal has the total geographical area of around 128.89 Sq.Km and consisting a total population of about 24816 persons which includes 12248 males, and 12568 females. This mandal possess ST population about 3814 which a share of men 1932 and women 1882. Wazeedu mandal possess agricultural labourers about male labour 3810 and female labour 3994 making a total of 7804 labour at mandal level.

Table 4.7. MGNREGS in Wazeedu Mandal of Khammam district in Provision of Employment during the financial year 2015-16

Gram Panchayat	No of HHs issued Job cards	No of HH working (%)	SC HH working (%)	ST HH working (%)	BC HH working (%)	Others HH working (%)	No of HH Completed 100 days	Average days of emp. per HH	Average Wage per Day
Cherukur (G)	849	331 (38.99)	14 (4.23)	295 (89.12)	22 (6.65)	0 (0)	0	21.06	142.64
Chintoor	1345	604 (44.91)	200 (33.11)	200 (33.11)	195 (32.28)	9 (1.49)	0	16.66	124.61
Edzerllapally	822	411 (50)	89 (21.65)	130 (31.63)	192 (46.72)	0 (0)	0	18.5	121.11
Gummadidoddi(Z)	339	154 (45.43)	5 (3.25)	146 (94.80)	3 (1.95)	0 (0)	0	25.45	132.31
Kongala (G)	502	155 (30.88)	31 (20.0)	104 (67.10)	20 (12.90)	0 (0)	0	31.7	162.46
Krishna Puram (G)	863	484 (56.08)	29 (5.99)	440 (90.91)	15 (3.10)	0 (0)	0	17.39	137.27
Murmur(G)	872	527 (60.44)	51 (9.68)	414 (78.56)	62 (11.76)	0 (0)	0	25.32	152.97
Peruru(G)	992	276 (27.82)	88 (31.88)	29 (10.51)	157 (56.89)	2 (0.72)	0	18.5	117.79
Wazeedunagaram	800	222 (27.75)	28 (12.61)	175 (78.83)	18 (8.11)	1 (0.45)	0	16.71	151.59
Total	7384	3164 (42.85)	535 (16.91)	1933 (61.09)	684 (21.62)	12 (0.38)	0	20.26	138.32

Source:www.mgnrega.telangana.nic.in

Table 4.7 gives the complete picture about the implementation of MGNREGS scheme in Wazeedu mandal of Khammam district during the financial year 2015-16. This mandal has 9 gram panchayats and all the gram panchayats were involved in the scheme

and a total of 7384 households were issued job cards until the year 2015-16, financial year. But only 3164 households who were having job cards were participated in the scheme during the said period, which accounts for 42.85 percent of the total issued cards. Murmur (G) gram panchayat was doing well in the mandal with 60.44 percent of households were actively involved. As against to this Wazeedunagaram gram panchayat was least in the mandal with 27.75 percent of households were involved in the scheme. If we look at community wise STs involved in top position with 61.09 percent followed by BCs with 21.62 percent, followed by SCs with 16.91 percent and Others with 0.38 percent of job card holders of households were got employment during the financial year 2015-16. Let us examine the top and bottom level performing gram panchayats in the mandal. The households who completed 100 days of employment in the mandal is zero. The average number of days of employment provided per household in the mandal is 20 days per household during the financial year 2015-16. The average wage rate received by the workers in the mandal is Rs138/- per day per person. The highest wage rate earned by the Kongala 6(G) gram panchayat households is Rs 162/- per day in the mandal. In case of Koya tribe they are involving more in Krishnapuram (G) and Murmur (G) in the scheme but they are other than the Koya tribe, so Gummadidoddi (Z) is selected for the study.

Table: 4.8. Comparison between Top and Bottom level Performing Gram Panchayats in Wazeedu Mandal in Provision of Employment during 2015-16

Mandal	No of HHs issued Job cards	No of HH working (%)	SC HH working (%)	ST HH working (%)	BC HH working (%)	Others HH working (%)	No of HH Completed 100 days	Average days of emp. per HH	Average Wage per Day
Top 2 Gram Panchayats									
Murmur(G)	872	527 (60.44)	51 (9.68)	414 (78.56)	62 (11.76)	0 (0)	0	25.32	152.97
Krishna Puram (G)	863	484 (56.08)	29 (5.99)	440 (90.91)	15 (3.10)	0 (0)	0	17.39	137.27
Bottom 2 Gram Panchayats									
Wazeedunagaram	800	222 (27.75)	28 (12.61)	175 (78.83)	18 (8.11)	1 (0.45)	0	16.71	151.59
Peruru(G)	992	276 (27.82)	88 (31.88)	29 (10.51)	157 (56.89)	2 (0.72)	0	18.5	117.79

Source: Calculated from available data www.mgnrega.telangana.nic.in

Table 4.8 gives the information about the comparative analysis of top and bottom level performing gram panchayats of the mandal during the financial year 2015-16. If we look at top 2 gram panchayats Murmur(G) is doing well with 60.44 percent of its households were actively involving in the scheme. SCs were involved with least 9.68

percent, STs were more in number with 78.56 percent, BCs were participating with 11.76 percent and Others were zero involvement in the panchayat. Krishna Puram (G) was also doing well with 56.08 percent of its households were involving in the scheme. As against to these there are two gram panchayats were least in the table like Mandal head quarter panchayat Wazedunagaram doing low with 27.75 percent and followed by Peruru (G) also low in the table with 27.82 percent. If we look at community wise SCs are almost less involved except Peruru (G) with 31.88 percent and least in Krishna Puram (G) with 5.99 percent, STs got maximum employment in the Mandal and top in Krishna Puram (G) panchayat with 90.91 percent of its households were actively involved in the scheme and least in Peruru (G) panchayat with 10.51 percent. BCs were better involved in Peruru (G) panchayat with 56.89 percent and least in Krishna Puram (G) panchayat with 3.10 percent. Others are negligible in all most all the panchayats in the Mandal. In this Mandal also there are no households involved 100 days of employment in the scheme. In case of the average number of days of employment provided per household in top and bottom level gram panchayats the Murmur (G) tops the table with 25 days which more than Mandal average days, and least in Wazedunagaram gram panchayat with 16 days of employment. In case of the average wage rate received by the workers in the gram panchayats, once again Murmur gram panchayat tops the list with Rs 152/- per day per worker and least in Peruru (G) panchayat with Rs 117/- per worker per day.

4.6 MGNREGA in Lingal Mandal of Mahabub Nagar district :

Lingal Mandal is about 170 km from district headquarters of Mahabubnagar. This Mandal has 13 gram panchayats. This Mandal has the total geographical area of around 227.61 Sq.Km and consisting a total population of about 34979 persons which includes 18055 males, and 16924 females. This Mandal possess ST population about 10245 which a share of men 5173 and women 5072. Lingal Mandal possess agricultural labourers about male labour 2221 and female labour 3084 making a total of 5304 labour at Mandal level.

Table 4.9 gives the information about the working of MGNREGS in Lingal Mandal of Mahabubnagar district during the financial year 2015-16. In this Mandal 13 gram panchayats are there and the job cards were issued to 13884 households, but out of these only 3193 households were actively participating until the year 2016 which accounts for only 23.00 percent. Dhararam gram panchayat was doing well with 50.20 percent of its households were actively participated in the scheme. As against to this Surapur gram

panchayat was involved very low with 26(2.74 percent) of its households were participated in the scheme out of 948 job card holders. If we look at community wise SCs involved in the scheme with 12.15 percent followed by STs with 41.09 percent, followed by BCs with 42.84 percent and others with 3.91 percent of job card holders of households were got employment during the financial year 2015-16. Let us examine the top and bottom level performing gram panchayats in the mandal. The households who completed 100 days of employment in the mandal is just 4, in two gram panchayats one is Anbatpalle with 3 households and 1 household in Kothakuntapalle. The average number of days of employment provided in the mandal is 17 days per household which is very low as against to the district level 25 days per year. In case of average wage rate is concerned it is Rs 129/- per worker per day, where some gram panchayat workers receiving more Rs 166/- in Lingal gram panchayat. In case of Chenchu tribe they are concentrated and working more in Appaipalli with 306 households and followed by Dhararam panchayat with 278 households and Chennampally with 248 households. But in first two panchayats Sugali tribe concentrated more in number, so Yerrapenta village is selected in Chennampally panchayat for the study on Chenchu tribe.

Table 4.9: MGNREGS in Lingal Mandal of Mahabubnagar district in Provision of Employment during the year 2015-16

Gram Panchayat	No of HHs issued Job cards	No of HH working (%)	SC HH working (%)	ST HH working (%)	BC HH working (%)	Others HH working (%)	No of HH Completed 100 days	Average days of emp. per HH	Average Wage per Day
Anbatpalle	1506	198 (13.15)	11 (5.55)	36 (18.18)	144 (72.73)	7 (3.53)	3	26.83	154.76
Appai Pally	1833	629 (34.32)	19 (3.02)	306 (48.65)	285 (45.31)	19 (3.02)	0	20.11	147.51
Ausali Kunta	500	183 (36.6)	71 (38.79)	42 (22.95)	67 (36.61)	3 (1.64)	0	12.88	131.61
Chennampally	962	371 (38.57)	18 (4.85)	248 (66.84)	92 (24.8)	13 (3.5)	0	12	162.7
Dhararam	769	386 (50.2)	24 (6.22)	278 (72.02)	80 (20.72)	4 (1.04)	0	11.46	119.97
Jeelugu Pally	564	126 (22.34)	13 (10.32)	39 (30.95)	71 (56.35)	3 (2.38)	0	16.1	121.17
Komati Kunta	518	50 (9.65)	22 (44)	2 (4.0)	22 (44)	4 (8)	0	12	114.25
Kothakuntapalle	795	241 (30.31)	73 (30.29)	42 (17.43)	122 (50.62)	4 (1.66)	1	27.47	160.97
Lingal	2880	130 (4.51)	1 (0.77)	125 (96.16)	4 (3.08)	0 (0)	0	63	166.31
Rayavaram	744	156 (20.97)	10 (6.41)	73 (46.79)	65 (41.67)	8 (5.13)	0	21.68	138.55
Sainpeta	660	149 (22.58)	8 (5.37)	95 (63.76)	40 (26.84)	6 (4.03)	0	7.07	107.56
Surapur	948	26 (2.74)	0 (0)	25 (96.15)	1 (3.85)	0 (0)	0	16.7	120.65
Vallabha Pur	1205	548 (45.48)	118 (21.53)	1 (0.18)	375 (68.43)	54 (9.85)	0	15.77	99.89
Total	13884	3193 (23)	388 (12.15)	1312 (41.09)	1368 (42.84)	125 (3.91)	4	17.18	129.27

Source: www.mgnrega.telangana.nic.in.

Table: 4.10. Comparison between Top and Bottom level Performing Gram Panchayats in Lingal Mandal in Provision of Employment during 2015-16

Villages	No of HHs issued Job cards	No of HH working (%)	SC HH working (%)	ST HH working (%)	BC HH working (%)	Others HH working (%)	No of HH Completed 100 days	Average days of emp. per HH	Average Wage per Day
Top 2 Gram Panchayats									
Dhararam	769	386 (50.20)	24 (6.22)	278 (72.02)	80 (20.72)	4 (1.04)	0	11.46	119.97
Vallabha Pur	1205	548 (45.48)	118 (21.53)	1 (0.18)	375 (68.43)	54 (9.85)	0	15.77	99.89
Bottom 2 Gram Panchayats									
Surapur	948	26 (2.74)	0 (0.0)	25 (96.15)	1 (3.85)	0 (0.0)	0	12	125.45
Lingal	2880	130 (4.51)	1 (0.77)	125 (96.16)	4 (3.08)	0 (0.0)	0	63	166.31

Source: Calculated from available data www.mgnrega.telangana.nic.in

Table 4.10 gives the information about the comparative analysis of top and bottom level performing gram panchayats of the Lingal mandal during the financial year 2015-16. If we look at top 2 gram panchayats Dhararam is doing well with 50.20 percent of its households were actively involving in the scheme. SCs were involved with least at 6.22 percent, STs were more in number with 72.02 percent, BCs were participating with 20.72 percent and others were 1.04 percent involvement in the panchayat. Vallabha Pur was also doing well with 45.48 percent of its households were involving in the scheme. As against to these there are two gram panchayats were least in the table like Surapur gram panchayat doing low with 2.74 percent and followed by mandal head quarter gram panchayat Lingal very poor involvement in the scheme and low in the table with 4.51 percent. If we look at community wise SCs are almost less involved in Surapur panchayat with zero percent and top in Vallabha Pur with 21.53 percent, STs got maximum employment in the mandal and top in Lingal panchayat with 96.16 percent of its households were actively involved in the scheme and least in Vallabha Pur panchayat with 0.18 percent. BCs were better involved in Vallaha Pur panchayat with 68.43 percent and least in Lingal panchayat with 3.08 percent .Others were doing well in VallabhaPur panchayat and almost zero Surapur and Lingal gram panchayats in the mandal during the financial year 2015-16. The number of households who worked for 100 days of employment in the mandal is zero. In case of average number of days of employment provided in top and bottom level performing gram panchayats, the Lingal gram panchayat tops the table with 63 days and least in Dhararam gram panchayat with 11 days only. In case of average wage rate received by worker in the mandal the Lingal gram panchayat

tops with Rs 166/- per day per person. There is a cross section performance in gram panchayats in case of person days wage rates etc in the mandal.

4.7. MGNREGA in Kothaguda Mandal of Warangal district :

Kothaguda mandal is about 70 km from district headquarters of Warangal this mandal has 16 gram panchayats. This mandal has the total geographical area of around 205.43Sq.Km and consisting a total population of about 39575 persons which includes 19721 males, and 19855 females. This mandal possess ST population about 24393 which a share of men 12268 and women 19855. Kothaguda mandal possess agricultural labourers about male labour 2060 and female labour 3993 making a total of 6053 of labour at mandal level.

Table 4.11. MGNREGS in Kothaguda Mandal of Warangal district in Provision of Employment during the year 2015-16

GramPanchayat	No of HHs issued Job cards	No of HH working (%)	SC HH working (%)	ST HH working (%)	BC HH working (%)	Others HH working (%)	No of HH Completed 100 days	Average days of emp. per HH	Average Wage per Day
Batthulapalle	1117	503 (45.03)	37 (7.35)	437 (86.88)	25 (4.97)	4 (0)	0	18.85	128.2
Gangaram	566	480 (84.81)	4 (0.83)	466 (97.08)	8 (1.67)	2 (0.42)	7	36.55	105.76
Gundam	364	323 (88.74)	3 (0.93)	179 (55.42)	135 (41.79)	6 (1.86)	0	31.48	103.63
Jangavanigudem	588	472 (80.27)	88 (18.64)	366 (77.54)	13 (2.75)	5 (1.06)	0	13.71	143.96
Karlai	256	151 (58.98)	3 (1.99)	143 (94.7)	5 (3.31)	0 (0)	0	21.04	93.87
Komatlagudem	1102	617 (55.99)	90 (14.59)	466 (75.53)	48 (7.78)	13 (2.11)	4	36.49	119.54
Kothaguda	1621	932 (57.5)	63 (6.76)	665 (71.35)	192 (20.6)	12 (1.29)	9	34.25	125.85
Madagudem	367	269 (73.3)	28 (10.41)	238 (88.47)	2 (0.74)	1 (0.37)	2	29.22	113.03
Marrigudem	535	317 (59.25)	11 (3.47)	302 (95.27)	3 (0.95)	1 (0.31)	8	32.46	130.28
Musimi	656	550 (83.84)	10 (1.82)	439 (79.82)	89 (16.18)	12 (2.18)	7	44.84	145.12
Ootai	795	487 (61.26)	72 (14.78)	312 (64.07)	101 (20.74)	2 (0.41)	0	20.85	118.38
Pogallapalli	910	517 (56.81)	24 (4.64)	202 (39.07)	286 (55.32)	5 (0.97)	1	28.9	114.94
Ponugondla	505	251 (49.7)	1 (0.4)	236 (94.02)	14 (5.58)	0 (0)	2	51.32	119.68
Sadireddipalli	1101	531 (48.23)	9 (1.7)	174 (32.77)	316 (59.51)	32 (6.02)	1	32.96	113.69
Velubelly	1082	809 (74.77)	39 (4.82)	545 (67.37)	224 (27.69)	1 (0.12)	12	35	128.1
Yedulapalle	983	702 (71.41)	28 (3.99)	271 (38.6)	393 (55.98)	10 (1.42)	12	36.94	113.77
Total	12548	7911 (63.05)	510 (6.45)	5441 (68.78)	1854 (23.44)	106 (1.34)	65	33.57	121.76

Source: www.mgnrega.telangana.nic.in

Table 4.11 gives the information about the provision of employment in MGNREGA in Kothaguda mandal of Warangal district during the financial year 2015-16. This mandal has 16 gram panchayats and the job cards were issued to 12548 households, but out of these 7911 households were actively participating until the year 2016 which accounts for 63.05 percent. Gundam gram panchayat was doing well with 88.74 percent of its households were actively participated in the scheme. As against to this Batthulapalle gram panchayat was involved very low with 45.05 percent of its households were participated in the scheme out of 1117 job card holders. If we look at community wise SCs involved in the scheme with 6.45 percent, by STs with 68.78 percent, followed by BCs with percent 23.44 and Others with 1.34 percent of job card holders of households were got employment during the financial year 2015-16. Let us examine the top and bottom level performing gram panchayats in the mandal. The households who participated 100 days of employment in the mandal is 65, among the panchayats Velubelly tops in the mandal with 12 households completed 100 days of employment in the year and as against to this there are some gram panchayats with zero households. The average number of days of employment provided per household is 33 days, where Ponugondla panchayat tops in the mandal with 51 days of employment and least in Jangavanigudem panchayat with 13 days of employment per household. Likewise in case of average wage rate received by workers in the mandal is Rs 121/- per day per worker, where Musimi gram panchayat tops in the mandal with Rs 145/- per day and least in Karlai panchayat with Rs 93/- per day per person. In case of Lambada tribe, they are more in Kothaguda, Bathulapalle, Yedulapalle and Ootai gram panchayats, but Ootai thanda is selected for the study.

Table 4.12 gives the information about the comparative analysis of top and bottom level performing gram panchayats of the Kothaguda mandal during the financial year 2015-16. If we look at top 2 gram panchayats Gundam is doing well with 88.74 percent of its households were actively involving in the scheme. SCs were involved with least at 0.93 percent, STs were more in number with 97.08 percent, BCs were participating with 41.79 percent and Others were 1.86 percent involvement in the panchayat. Gangaram panchayat was also doing well with 84.81 percent of its households were involving in the scheme. As against to these there are two gram panchayats were least in the table like Batthulapalle gram panchayat doing low with 45.03 percent and followed by the gram panchayat Sadireddipalli and its involvement in the scheme is comparatively low in the

Table: 4.12. Comparison between Top and Bottom level Performing Gram Panchayats in Kothaguda Mandal in Provision of Employment during 2015-16

Village	No of HHs issued Job cards	No of HH working (%)	SC HH working (%)	ST HH working (%)	BC HH working (%)	Others HH working (%)	No of HH Completed 100 days	Average days of emp. per HH	Average Wage per Day
Top 2 Gram Panchayats									
Gundam	364	323 (88.74)	3 (0.93)	179 (55.42)	135 (41.79)	6 (1.86)	0	31.48	103.63
Gangaram	566	480 (84.81)	4 (0.83)	466 (97.08)	8 (1.67)	2 (0.42)	7	36.55	105.76
Bottom 2 Gram Panchayats									
Batthulapalle	1117	503 (45.03)	37 (7.35)	437 (86.88)	25 (4.97)	4 (0)	0	18.85	128.2
Sadireddipalli	1101	531 (48.23)	9 (1.70)	174 (32.77)	316 (59.51)	32 (6.02)	1	32.96	113.69

Source: Calculated from available data www.mgnrega.telangana.nic.in

table with 48.23 percent. If we look at community, wise SCs are almost less involved except in Batthulapalle with 7.35 percent and STs got maximum employment in the mandal and top in Gangaram panchayat with 97.08 percent of its households were actively involved in the scheme and least in Sadireddipalli panchayat with 32.77 percent. BCs were better involved in Sadireddipalli panchayat with 59.51 percent and least in Gangaram panchayat with 1.67 percent. Others were doing well in Sadireddipalli panchayat with 6.02 percent and almost zero in Batthulapalle gram panchayat in the mandal during the financial year 2015-16. The number of households who participated 100 days of employment in the top and bottom level performing gram panchayats in the mandal, the Gangaram panchayat is able to provide 100 days of employment to at least 7 households and zero in case of Gundam and Batthulapalle panchayats. In case of average number of days of employment provided per household the Gangaram panchayat tops the table with 36 days of employment in the year and least in Batthulapalle gram panchayat with almost 19 days per year per household. In case of average wage rate is concerned the Batthulapalle gram panchayat tops in the table with Rs 128/- per day per person and least in Gundam with Rs 103/- per day per person.

4.8. Conclusion :

The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act 2006 has changed the rural India in terms of employment and enhancing the livelihood of the

people living below poverty line. It has started in 2006 and continuing throughout the country for a decade. At all India level the states like Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan, are performing well with provision of employment. In the state of Telangana the districts like Nizamabad and Adilabad are better performing in terms of provision of employment. This programme creates employment to the poor people as per their demand, not by the government's will. In provision of employment it is creating assets in rural areas. The marginalised sections of the society like SCs, STs, BCs, Women and Disabled persons, are involving more. The Dandepalle mandal in Adilabad district is doing well in the state and Lingal mandal of Mahabubnagar district is also doing well in the district.

CHAPTER – 05

MGNREGS Implementation **A Micro Study on Selected Tribes in Selected Villages**

The observations and findings on the implementation of the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme on selected tribes in the selected villages are given in this chapter. The villages are Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages in Adilabad district on Gonds, Gummadidoddi village in Khammam district on Koyas, Yerrapenta village in Mahabubnagar district on Chenchus and Ootai thanda village in Warangal district on Lambadas. The objective of the programme is to provide 100 days of work for those who are willing to do manual work. The 'willingness' is at the heart of the programme, where when any one or more come and ask, has to be shown employment. How far Tribal Agency villages' people know that such programme is run by Government of India? Does the MGNREGA administration has such mechanism to plan for the demand for employment? How does it function at present? What is the primary impact of it? How far did the MGNREGA reach the tribal masses? These are the questions that are to be answered from the study of Beharanguda and Kundelpahad, Gummadidoddi, Yerrapenta, and Ootai thanda villages of Dandepally mandal of Adilabad district, Wazeedu mandal of Khammam district, Lingal mandal of MahabubNagar district and Kothaguda mandal of Warangal districts of Telangana state respectively. The fieldwork carried out during 2015-2016. The selection of the tribes are based on the level of development. Two of them are socially and economically advanced and two of them are backward in all respects i.e. Lambada and Gond Tribes are more in number as well as developed when compared to other tribes, and as against to this the tribes like Koya and Chenchu tribes are backward and less in number in Telangana State. Based on the settled areas of these tribes, the villages are selected purely in agency areas and where the concentration of such particular tribes are abundant in number, the Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages are concentrated for Gonds in agency area of Dandepally mandal of Adilabad district, Gummadidoddi village is concentrated for Koya tribe in agency area of Wazeedu mandal of Khammam district, Yerrapenta village is of Chenchu tribe which is located in hilly and agency area in Lingal mandal of MahabubNagar district, and Ootai thanda village is concentrated for Lambada tribe in Kothaguda mandal of Warangal district.

5.1. About Beharanguda and Kundelpahad Villages of Gond Tribe :

5.1.1. Villages Profile :

Beharanguda and Kundelpahad are two small hamlets of Chintapally gram panchayat of Dandepally mandal in Adilabad district of Telangana. These are located about 10 km from the Mandal headquarter of Dandepally and about 170 km from the district headquarters of Adilabad. These two villages together consists around 95 households including two habitations(60+35).The total population of these two villages are 365.

Table 5.1 Population Details of Beharanguda and Kundelpahad Villages

Category	Population (percentage)	Total Households (percentage)
STs	365 (100)	95 (100)
SCs	---	---
BCs	---	---
OCs	---	---
Total	365 (100)	95 (100)

Source: Gram Panchayat, Chintapally.

As these two villages Beharanguda and Kundelpahad belong to gond tribe, there is no possibility of other communities in the villages. There are 365 number of total population in these villages together. There are about 95 households in these two villages.

Table 5.2: Labour profile by age group in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad Villages

Age Group	No of Labourers	% of Total Labour
15-18	45	23.68
19-35	56	29.47
36-60	65	34.22
61 and Above	24	12.63
Total	190	100

Source: Gram Panchayat, Chintapally.

In these two villages there are about 190 workers (52.05% of total population) the highest population of labour is in the age group of 36-60 the percentage is 34.22 which

are 65 in the total population. The second highest age group of labourers is 19-35 is 56 that are 29.47 %. Next to these highest age groups the third highest age group is 15-18 is 45 that are 23.68% of total labour force and followed by the age group 61 and Above is 24 that are 12.63% of the work force. The top three age groups 15-18, 19-35 and 36-60 are physically able bodied and generally demand more works and they constitute roughly 87.37 percent of the labour amounting 166 productive labour who can demand employment in the village.

Table 5.3: Land Details in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad

Land Details	Acres	Percentage of Total Land
Dry Land	85	47.75
Wet Land	57	32.02
Other Land*	36	20.23
Total	178	100

Source: Gram Panchayat, Chintapally,

Note : * Other land includes forest land, fallow land and panchayat land.

In these villages the total land is 178 acres, which include dry land, wet land which is used for cultivation and other land includes fallow land, forest land. Among these 47.75 percent of land is dry land which is used for cultivation of cotton, maize and other crops like black gram, green gram, ground nuts etc. And 32.02 percent of land is wet land which is used for cultivation of paddy, the main source of water is individual Bore wells, followed by some parts of the land is irrigated by Kadam project canal water built on river when it is available.

5.1.2. Occupational distribution of Gond Respondents :

Among the villagers the people used to go for own cultivation as well as labour works in others land whenever they find free time. Out of 95 households in the two villages the respondents were selected on the basis of 33.3 percent of labourers and 66.6 percent from agricultural farmers from both the villages based on the predominance of the occupation of the villagers.

Table 5.4: Occupational distribution in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages

Occupation	No. of Respondents
Labour	26
Agricultural Farmer	46
Artisan	0
Landed Agricultural Labour	0
Others	3
Total	75

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

Table 5.4 describes the occupational details of Gond respondents in Beharanguda and Kundel pahad villages of Chintapally gram panchayat in Adilabad district. Out of 75 selected respondents 26 are labourers, 46 are agricultural farmers, and 3 respondents belongs to other occupation.

Table 5.5: Educational Standards in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages

Education Status	No of Respondents
Illiterate	58
Primary	13
Secondary	3
Above Secondary	1
Total	75

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

Table 5.5 gives the details of educational standards of the Gond tribe respondents in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages in Chintapally gram panchayat of Adilabad district during the year 2015-16. Among the selected 75 households respondents 58 household respondents are illiterates, 13 respondents were educated up to the primary education, 3 of them are finished secondary level and 1 is above secondary standard education. Majority of the respondents are illiterates in the villages.

Table 5.6: House Structure Details in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages

House Structure	No of Respondents
Hut	10
Tiled (Penkutillu)	19
Shed	10
Pakka House	36
Building	0
Total	75

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

Table 5.6 elucidates the house structure details of the Gond tribe respondents in the Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages. In these villages out of 75 selected households 10 respondents are living in the huts with meager facilities, 19 are having old tiled (penkutillu) houses, 10 households have the asbestos sheds and 36 households constructed pakka houses with the help of government. More than 50 percent of the respondents are able to build the pakka houses with the help of government, and remaining households are not managed to construct the pakka houses.

5.7: Source of Toilets in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages

Type of Toilets	Before MGNREGA	After MGNREGA
Open Defecation	75	64
Common Latrines	0	0
Individual Latrines	0	11
Total	75	75

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

Table 5.1.7 gives the details of source of toilet facilities by Gond tribe respondents in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages. Among the selected villages 75 households of the Gond tribe has been using the open defecation completely before start of the MGNREGA scheme in the villages and it had changed little bit 11 households are able to construct individual household latrines and remaining 64 households just continuing the old habit.

Table 5.8: Source of Cooking Fuel in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages

Cooking Fuel Source	Before MGNREGS	After MGNREGS
Fire Wood	75	39
Kerosene Stove	0	1
LPG	0	35
Others	0	-
Total	75	75

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

Cooking fuel source in the two villages of Gond tribe can be understood by the 5.8 table. In these two villages before the start of MGNREGA scheme all the respondents were using the firewood as the main source of cooking fuel and after the scheme implementation 35 respondents were managed to purchase and use the LPG stoves and 1 respondent is using the kerosene stove. As a result the firewood users have come down drastically after the scheme implementation. The reason is that some of the respondents used the income earned in the scheme to purchase LPG stoves and cylinders.

Table 5.9: Provision of Employment in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages during the financial year 2015-16.

Category	Total Households	No of HHs Issued Job Cards	No of HH working	Average No of Person Days Provided	No of HH completed 100 Days
ST	95	90 (94.73)	90 (94.73)	75	---
SC	--	--	--	---	---
BC	--	--	--	---	---
OC	--	--	--	---	---
Total	95	90 (94.73)	90 (94.73)	75	---

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

Table 5.9 gives the implementation of the MGNREGS in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages of Gond tribe. In these villages there are about 95 households, out of which 90 households are given job cards and all job card holders are working in the scheme. In these villages the average number of working days of employment provided is 75 and no household was completed 100 days of employment.

Table 5.10: Durable Assets created in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad Villages for Gond Tribe

Durable Assets Created	No of Assets
Roads	11
Farm Ponds	20
Sinking Pits	150
Band Plantation	600
Deepening of Tanks	2
Total	783

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

The table 5.10 gives about the details of durable assets created in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages of Adilabad district for Gond tribe during the financial year 2015-16. The total durable assets created in the villages are 783 out of which 11 roads which are internal roads as well as connecting to neighbor villages were constructed in the villages, farm ponds were created at about 20, sinking pits were dig about 150 in the two villages, band plantation was taken up at about 600 and deepening of tanks were undertaken 2 in number. All these durable assets were very much useful for the villages in general and tribe in particular. The construction of roads helped the tribes to move freely in the village as well as to go neighbouring villages especially in the rainy season. Deepening of tanks is very much useful to the village domestic animals for drinking water and helped the villagers to cater more animals to earn extra income. Sinking pits are also useful for increasing the ground water levels of the bore wells in the villages. Band plantation was taken up to 600 plants in the two villages preferably teakwood plants which will give financial support in the future.

Table 5.11 gives the information about the private agricultural and non-agricultural works taken up in the Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages during the financial year 2015-16. There are about 236 works taken up in the villages which includes land leveling works with 90 in number, bush clearance works 12, stone clearance works 20, teakwood plantation 4 works, mango plantation 5 works, malbury plantation 5 works and 100 plants were planted in the government schools in the villages. Out of all these works, land

leveling works are very much useful and benefited to the villagers to increase the productivity in the agriculture. All these works were undertaken in the lands of respondents in the two villages except school plantation. There exists two primary schools in two villages and planted 50 plants in each school.

Table 5.11: Private Agricultural and Non- Agricultural Works under taken in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages during 2015-16

Private Agricultural and Non- Agricultural Works	No of Works
Land Leveling	90
Bush Clearance	12
Gattu Nirmanam	--
Stone Clearance	20
Teakwood Plantation	04
Mango Plantation	05
Malbary Plantation	05
Government School Plantation	100
Total	236

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16.

5.2. About Gummadidoddi Village of Koya Tribe :

5.2.1. Village Profile :

Gummadidoddi village is a gram panchayat of Wazeedu mandal in Khammam district of Telangana. This is located about 5 km from the Mandal headquarter of Wazeedu and about 240 km from district headquarter of Khammam. This village consists around 170 households. The total population of this village is 1529. This village is nearest to Chattisgarh state border and majority of the population is Koya tribe and their main occupation is agriculture and allied activities. In addition to Koya tribe the scheduled caste and backward communities households are small in number in the village.

Table 5.12: Population Details in Gummadidoddi Village

Category	Population (%)	Total HHs (%)
ST	1395 (91.24)	145 (85.29)
SC	45 (2.94)	05 (2.94)
BC	89 (5.82)	20 (11.76)
OC	---	---
Total	1529 (100)	170 (100)

Source: Gram Panchayat, Gummadidoddi, 2015-16.

In the Village Gummadidoddi there exists three types of main castes i.e. Koya, Mala, and Yadava communities with 145 koya households, 5 mala households and 20 Yadav households. The number and percentage population in each community is STs are 1395 (91.24), SCs are 45(2.94) and BCs are 89 (5.82). Majority of the population is Koya which is a dominant community in the village and holds all kinds of social and political power in the village. The present village sarpanch is a female and she belongs to koya tribe only.

Table 5.13: Labour profile by age group in Gummadidoddi Village

Age Group	No of Labourers	% of Total Labour
15-18	250	20.04
19-35	258	26.88
36-60	264	27.50
61 and Above	188	19.58
Total	960	100

Source: Gram Panchayat, Gummadidoddi 2015-16.

In the village there are about 960 workers (52.79% of total population) the highest number of labour is in the age group of 36-60 the percentage is 27.50, which are 264 in the total population. The second highest age group of labourers is 19-35 is 258 that are 26.88 percent. Next to these highest age groups, the third highest age group is 15-18 is 250 that are 20.04 percent of total labour force, followed by the age group 61, and above is 188 that are 19.58 percent of the work force. The top three age groups 15-18, 19-35 and 36-60 are physically able bodied and generally demand more works and they constitute roughly 74.42 percent of the labour amounting 772 productive labour who can demand employment in the village.

Table 5.14: Land Details of Gummadidoddi Village

Land Details	Acres	Percentage of Total Land
Dry Land	290	73.23
Wet Land	96	24.24
Other Land*	10	2.53
Total	396	100

Source: Gram Panchayat, Gummadidoddi 2015-16.

Note: *Other land Includes fallow land, forest land and panchayat land.

In this village, the total land is 396 acres, which includes dry land, wet land that is used for cultivation and other land includes fallow land, forestland. Among these, roughly 290 acres (73.23 percent) of land is dry land, which is used for cultivation of chilly, groundnuts and other crops like maize, etc. In addition, roughly 96 acres (24.24 percent) of land is wet land, which is used for cultivation of paddy, the main source of water is individual bore wells.

Table 5.15: Occupational distribution in Gummadidoddi Village

Occupation	No of Respondents
Labour	0
Agricultural Farmer	73
Artisan	0
Landed Agricultural Labour	2
Others	75

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16.

As most of the villagers possess agricultural land including other community households also, out of 170 households in the village, the sample size of 75 households from koya tribe was randomly selected 1 from each 2 households out of total 145 households. Koya tribe occupational distribution can be seen from the table 5.2.4, where out of 75 respondents 73 respondents are farmers and are engaged in agriculture and allied activities throughout the year and only 2 respondents are sometimes go for labour works in the village.

Table 5.16: Educational Standards in Gummadidoddi Village

Education Status	No of Respondents
Illiterate	62
Primary	10
Secondary	2
Above Secondary	1
Total	75

Source: Primary data based on Field Survey, 2015-16

Table 5.16 gives the information about the educational standards of the Koya tribe respondents in Gummadidoddi village of Khammam district. Out of 75 respondents 62 respondents are illiterates, 10 respondents were able to complete the primary education, 2

respondents are managed to complete secondary education and only one respondent finished his graduation among the tribes in the village.

Table 5.17: House Structure Details in Gummadidoddi Village

House Structure	No of Respondents
Hut	30
Tiled (Penkutillu)	11
Shed	3
Pakka House	31
Building	0
Total	75

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

Table 5.17 represents the house structure details of the Koya tribe respondents in the Gummadidoddi village of Khammam district. Out of 75 respondents in the village 30 respondents are living in the huts and 11 respondents are managing with tiled houses, 3 households built sheds and a majority of the respondents 31 were got the pakka houses from the government. The majority of households are waiting for government assistance and some of them are not interested to construct the pakka houses.

5.18: Source of Toilets in Gummadidoddi village

Type of Toilets	Before MGNREGA	After MGNREGA
Open Defecation	74	59
Common Latrines	0	0
Individual Latrines	1	16
Total	75	75

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

In the village, out of 75 respondents 74 habit to go for open defecation before the MGNREGA scheme and only one respondent has constructed the individual latrine. After the introduction of MGNREGA scheme 16 households are able and come forward to construct the individual latrines and using, rest of the respondents are going to open defecation only.

5.19: Source of Cooking Fuel in Gummadidoddi Village

Cooking Fuel Source	Before MGNREGA	After MGNREGA
Fire Wood	75	35
Kerosene Stove	0	0
LPG	0	40
Others	0	0
Total	75	75

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

Table 5.19 gives the full details of source of cooking fuel in the Gummadidoddi village of Khammam district. Out of 75 respondents, 75 households are having the habit of firewood as their cooking fuel, but after the implementation of MGNREGA scheme 40 respondents are able to purchase and using the LPG stoves as their alternative source of cooking fuel. A majority of them are purchased the LPG stoves with the income earned from the MGNREGA scheme.

Table 5.20: Provision of Employment in Gummadidoddi village during the financial year 2015-16

Category	Total Households	No of HHs Issued Job Cards	No of HH working	Average No of Person Days Provided	No of HH completed 100 Days
ST	145	145	145	60	---
SC	05	05	05	---	---
BC	20	15	15	---	---
OC	--	--	--	---	---
Total	170	165	165	60	---

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16.

Table 5.20 gives the implementation of the MGNREGS in Gummadidoddi village of Koya tribe. In this village there are about 170 households, out of which 165 households are given job cards and all job card holders are working in the scheme. Out of 165 households given job cards in the village there are about 145 ST Koya households, 5 SC households, and 15 BCs households are given job cards in and all job card holders are working. In this village the average number of working days of employment provided is 60 and no household was completed 100 days of employment.

5.21: Durable Assets (public) Created in Gummadidoddi village

Durable Assets Created	No of Assets
Roads	02
Farm Ponds	07
Sinking Pits	20
Band Plantation	70
Deepening of Tanks	05
Total	104

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

Table 5.21 gives the complete details about the durable assets created in the Gummadidoddi village of Khammam district under the MGNREGA scheme during the financial year 2015-16. In the village there are about 104 total durable assets were created, out of which 2 internal roads were constructed in the village, 7 farm ponds were provided for utilization of water for both animals as well as for agricultural purposes, sinking pits were dug at about 20 to increase the ground water levels in the village, band plantation was also taken up at about 70 agricultural fields of the respondents and deepening of tanks at 5 tanks. By making use of these assets people benefited a lot especially farm ponds are very much useful for farmers to make use of water that store in the ponds useful for agricultural activities, domestic animals and to make use of the water when rains delay in the seasons for some crops.

5.22: Private Agricultural and Non- Agricultural Works under taken in Gummadidoddi village during 2015-16

Private Agricultural and Non- Agricultural Works	No of Works
Land Levelling	120
Bush Clearance	75
Gattu Nirmanam	--
Stone Clearance	25
Teakwood Plantation	--
Mango Plantation	--
Malbary Plantation	02
Government School Plantation	50
Total	272

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

Table 5.22 gives the information about the private agricultural and non-agricultural works taken up in the Gummadidoddi village during the financial year 2015-16. There are about 272 works taken up in the village which includes land leveling works with 120 numbers, bush clearance works 75 works, stone clearance 25 works, malbury plantation 2 works and 50 plants were planted in the government school in the village. Out of all these works, land leveling works are very much useful and benefited to the villagers to increase the productivity in the agriculture.

5.3. About Yerrapenta Village :

5.3.1. Village Profile :

Yerrapenta village is a hamlet of Chennampally gram panchayat of Lingal mandal in Mahabubnagar district of Telangana. This village is a habitation of Chenchu tribes located in Nallamala forest area. The village is surrounded by forest, hills and wild animals. The Chenchu tribe is one of the nomadic tribes founded in united Andhra Pradesh. This village is located about 10 km from the Mandal headquarter of Lingal and about 98 km from district headquarter of Mahabubnagar. This village consists around 91 households and total population is 516. The people cultivate crops like bazra, maize and paddy as they are their staple food. The villagers go for hunting of small wild animals for food. They also cater the buffalos. Cows and goats. This village is adopted by Rural Development Trust (RDT) a Christian NGO, Anantapur to build pakka houses for all the peoples in 2011 and also providing nutritional supplements for pregnant women, feeder mothers and children daily from 2011 to till today. This village is very backward in the mandal and faraway from main stream society in all respects like education, health and make use of government schemes is because of lack of awareness and superstitions. The Integrated Tribal Development Agency (ITDA) Programme Officer with the help of government, supplying AAY ration i.e. 35 kgs. of rice to every family irrespective of family members at Rs.1/- per kg and making payment of power bill for entire village unconditional. The MGNREGA programme was started in 2009 and providing 180 days of employment per person per year as against 100 days for household as per MGNREGA act 2005. The wage rate is also little bit higher than the minimum wage rate of local government i.e. Rs.180/- per day. This is because of special provisions of ITDA to uplift the most backward tribe.

Table 5.23: Population Details of Yerrapenta Village

Category	Population (Percentage)	Total Households (Percentage)
ST	516 (100)	91 (100)
SC	----	---
BC	---	---
OC	---	---
Total	516 (100)	91 (100)

Source: Grama Panchayat, Chennam pally 2015-16.

The Village Yerrapenta is a Chenchu colony and there resides Chenchu tribe only. At present there are about 91 households with a total population of roughly 516.

Table 5.24: Labour profile by age group of Yerrapenta Village

Age Group	No of Labourers	% of Total Labour
15-18	35	16.99
19-35	62	30.09
36-60	84	40.78
61 and Above	25	12.14
Total	206	100

Source: Gram Panchayat Chennampally 2015-16.

In this village there are about 206 workers (39.92% of total population) the highest population of labour is in the age group of 36-60 the percentage is 40.78, which are 84 in the total population. The second highest proportionate age group is 19-35 is 62 that are 30.09 percent. Next to these highest age groups, the third highest age group is 15-18 is 35 that are 16.99 percent of total labour force, followed by the age group 61, and above is 25 that are 12.14 percent of the work force. The top three age groups 15-18, 19-35 and 36-60 are physically able bodies and generally demand more works in the villages constitutes

roughly 87.86 percent of the labour amounting 181 productive labour who can demand employment in the village.

Table 5.25: Land Details of Yerrapenta Village

Land Details	Acres	Percentage of Total Land
Dry Land	50	34.97
Wet Land	71	49.65
Other Land*	22	15.38
Total	143	100

Source: Gram Panchayat, Chennampally 2015-16,

Note : *other land= waste land.

In this village, the total land is 143 acres, which includes dry land, wet land that is used for cultivation and other land includes fallow land, forestland. Among these, roughly 50 acres (34.97 percent) of land is dry land, which is used for cultivation of maize, bazra, groundnuts and other crops etc. In addition, roughly 71 acres (49.65 percent) of land is wet land, which is used for cultivation of paddy, the main source of water is village tank that recently constructed. There are about 22 acres about 15.38 percent of total land in the village is a waste land which is used for village purposes.

Table 5.26: Occupational distribution in Yerrapenta village

Occupation	No of Respondents
Labour	74
Agricultural Farmer	1
Artisan	0
Landed Agricultural Labour	0
Others	0
Total	75

Source: Gram Panchayat, Chennampally 2015-16

Table 5.26 gives the information about the occupational distribution of the 75 respondents in the Yerrapenta village, a hamlet of Chennampally gram panchayat of Mahabubnagar district. In the village out of 75 respondents 74 respondents are labourers and only one respondent is marginal agricultural farmer. This gives the poverty situation

of the Chenchu tribe in the village. Out of 91 households all are labourers, who depends on agriculture and other works in the village and nearby villages.

Table 5.27: Educational Standards in Yerrapenta village

Education Status	No of Respondents
Illiterate	71
Primary	1
Secondary	3
Above Secondary	0
Total	75

Source: Primary data based on Gram Panchayat, Chennampally, 2015-16.

Table 5.27 gives the information about the educational standards of the Chenchu tribe respondents in Yerrapenta village of Mahabubnagar district. Out of 75 respondent households, 71 respondents are illiterates, 1 respondent was able to complete the primary education, 3 respondents are managed to complete secondary education and these three respondents are working as mates in the MGNREGA scheme in the village.

Table 5.28: House Structure Details in Yerrapenta village

House Structure	No of Respondents
Hut	14
Tiled (Penkutillu)	0
Shed	26
Pakka House(RDT)	35
Building	0
Total	75

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16.

Table 5.28 represents the house structure details of the Chenchu tribe respondents in the Yerrapenta village of Mahabubnagar district. Out of 75 respondent households in the village, 14 respondents are living in the huts and 26 respondents are managing with sheds, and 35 households are built pakka houses with the help of the Rural Development Trust (RDT) a Christian minority charitable trust having regional headquarters at Anantapuram, AP. in the year 2011 at free of cost to all the households who are eligible and living in the village at that time. In the second phase of RDT house construction in the year 2013 they constructed 26 shed houses for the villagers. The remaining 14 respondents who are living in the huts are newly married couples only.

5.29: Source of Toilets in Yerrapenta village

Type of Toilets	Before MGNREGA	After MGNREGA
Open Defecation	75	36
Common Latrines	0	0
Individual Latrines	0	39
Total	75	75

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

Table 5.29 gives the information about the source of toilets in the Yerrapenta village of Mahabubnagar district. Introduction of the swatch Bharath Mission, the Government of India, from 2nd October, 2014 included the construction of Individual Households Latrines (IHHL) under the MGNREGA scheme by a financial support of Rs 12000/- per latrine. Out of 75 respondents in the village all are habituated to open defecation before the start of MGNREGA scheme, but after the start of the MGNREGA scheme this has come down drastically to 36 households only going for open defecation, rest of the respondents 39 are managed to construct the individual household latrines (IHHL) with the help of MGNREGA scheme. The remaining households are also planning to construct the latrines under the MGNREGS.

5.30: Source of Cooking Fuel in Yerrapenta Village

Cooking Fuel Source	Before MGNREGA	After MGNREGA
Fire Wood	75	74
Kerosene Stove	0	0
LPG	0	1
Others	0	0
Total	75	75

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16.

Table 5.30 gives the full details of source of cooking fuel in the Yerrapenta village of Mahabubnagar district. Out of 75 respondents 75 households are having the habit of firewood as their cooking fuel. This is because they are living in the forest and no problems for fire wood. Even though one respondent come forward to purchase and use of LPG stove.

Table 5.31: Provision of Employment in Yerrapenta village during the financial year 2015-16

Category	Total Households	No of HHs Issued Job Cards	No of HH working	Average No of Person Days Provided	No of HH completed 100 Days
ST	91	81	81	360	81
SC	---	---	---	---	---
BC	---	---	---	---	---
OC	---	---	---	---	---
Total	91	81	81	360	81

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16.

Table 5.31 gives the implementation of the MGNREGS in Yerrapenta village of Chenchu tribe. In this village there are about 91 households, out of which 81 households are given job cards and all job card holders are working in the scheme. In this village the average number of working days of employment provided is 360 and all the households were completed 100 days of employment and worked for 360 days during the 2015-16 financial year.

5.32: Durable Assets (Public) Created in Yerrapenta village

Durable Assets Created	No of Assets
Roads	03
Farm Ponds	02
Sinking Pits	20
Band Plantation	50
Deepening of Tanks	03
Total	78

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16.

Table 5.32 elaborates the details of durable assets created in the Yerrapenta village of Mahabubnagar district for chenchu tribe during the financial year 2015-16. There are about 78 durable assets created in the village, out of which 3 internal roads, 2 farm ponds, about 20 sinking pits, about 50 band plantation and 3 deepening of tanks. Band plantation was useful and they were given coconut plants, mango plants about 50 in number and their fruits to be get in near future. Deepening of tanks was highly useful for the villagers because during the summer shortage of water to people as well as domestic animals and this has reduced the water problems to some extent in the village.

5.33: Private Agricultural and Non- Agricultural Works under taken in Yerrapenta village during 2015-16

Private Agricultural and Non- Agricultural Works	No of Works
Land Leveling	50
Bush Clearance	35
Gattu Nirmanam	20
Stone Clearance	05
Teakwood Plantation	--
Mango Plantation	--
Malbary Plantation	--
Government School Plantation	--
Total	110

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16.

Table 5.33 gives the information about the private agricultural and non-agricultural works taken up in the Yerrapenta village during the financial year 2015-16. There are about 110 works taken up in the village which includes land leveling works with 50 numbers, bush clearance works 35 works, gattu nirmanam 20 works, stone clearance 5 works. Out of all these works, land leveling works are very much useful and benefited to the villagers to increase the productivity in the agriculture. Every household benefited about 10000/- from land leveling works in the village.

5.4. About Ootai Thanda Village of Lambada Tribe :

5.4.1 Village Profile :

Ootai thanda is in the gram panchayat of Ootai village which is in Kothaguda mandal of Warangal district of Telangana. This is located about 10 km from the Mandal headquarter of Kothaguda and about 80 km from district headquarter of Warangal. This thanda consists around 236 households. The total population of this thanda is 2509. In this thanda Lambada tribe lives and their main occupation is agriculture and allied activities. The thanda people are better in education, employment, and making use of government schemes.

Table 5.34: Population Details of Ootai Thanda3

Category	Population (Percentage)	Total Households (Percentage)
ST	2509 (100)	236 (100)
SC	---	---
BC	---	---
OC	---	---
Total	2509 (100)	236 (100)

Source: Gram Panchayat, Ootai, 2015-16.

In this thanda there are about 2509 peoples are living and all of them are Lambada only. In this thanda the literacy rate is about 60 percent which is highest of all other four tribes.

Table 5.35: Labour profile by age group of Ootai Thanda

Age Group	No of Labourers	% of Total Labour
15-18	143	7.22
19-35	1209	60.99
36-60	493	24.87
61 and Above	137	6.92
Total	1982	100

Source: Gram Panchayat, Ootai 2015-16.

In this thanda there are about 1982 workers (78.99 of total population). The highest population of labour is in the age group of 19-35 the percentage is 60.99, which are 1209 in the total population. The second highest proportionate age group is 36-60 is 493 that are 24.87 percent. Next to these highest age groups, the third highest age group is 15-18 is 143 that are 7.22 percent of total labour force, followed by the age group 61, and above is 137 that are 6.92 percent of the work force. The top three age groups 15-18, 19-35 and 36-60 are physically able bodies and generally demand more works in the villages

constitutes roughly 93.08 percent of the labour amounting 1845 productive labour who can demand employment in the village which a different factor than other tribes we seen.

Table 5.36: Land Details of Ootai thanda

Land Details	Acres	Percentage of Total Land
Dry Land	643	53.00
Wet Land	500	46.17
Other Land*	10	0.83
Total	1213	100

Source: Gram Panchayat, Ootai, 2015-16,

Note : * Other land includes fallow land and forest land.

In this thanda, the total land is 1213 acres, which includes dry land, wet land that is used for cultivation and other land includes fallow land, forestland. Among these, roughly 643 acres (53.00 percent) of land is dry land, which is used for cultivation of maize, bazra, groundnuts and other crops etc. In addition, roughly 500 acres (46.17 percent) of land is wet land, which is used for cultivation of paddy, the main source of water is individual wells, bore wells.

Table 5.37: Occupational distribution in Ootai thanda

Occupation	No of Respondents
Labour	19
Agricultural Farmer	15
Artisan	2
Landed Agricultural Labour	38
Others	1
Total	75

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16.

Table 5.37 gives the information about the occupational distribution of the 75 respondents in the Ootai thanda of Ootai gram panchayat of Warangal district. In this thanda out of 75 respondents 19 respondents are labourers, 15 respondents are farmers and 38 respondents are landed agricultural labourers. And about 2 respondents are also go

for the artisan works and 1 respondent is not specified. The selection of respondents in this village is randomly done from availability of different occupations at the rate of one household from every three households.

5.38: Educational Standards in Ootai thanda

Education Status	No of Respondents
Illiterate	43
Primary	15
Secondary	15
Above Secondary	2
Total	75

Source: Primary data based on Field Survey, 2015-16

Table 5.38 gives the information about the educational standards of the Lambada tribe respondents in Ootai thanda village of Kothaguda mandal in Warangal district. Out of 75 respondents selected, 43 respondents are illiterates, 15 respondents were able to complete the primary education, 15 respondents are managed to complete secondary education and 2 respondents are educated up to graduation. Literacy rate is less among the middle aged lambada tribe people but their children are now getting education.

Table 5.39: House Structure Details in Ootai thanda

House Structure	No of Respondents
Hut	8
Tiled (Penkutillu)	58
Shed	3
Pakka House	5
Building	1
Total	75

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16.

Table 5.39 represents the house structure details of the Lambada tribe respondents in the Ootai thanda village of Warangal district. Out of 75 respondents in the village, 8 respondents are living in the huts and 58 respondents are managing with tiled houses, and 3 households are constructed sheds and 5 respondents were managed to construct the

pakka houses and 1 respondent who is rich able to build the building. Out of the 75 respondents 58 respondents are living in the tiled houses which can create trouble in the rainy season but they are not coming forward to build the pakka houses.

5.40: Source of Toilets in Ootai thanda

Type of Toilets	Before MGNREGA	After MGNREGA
Open Defecation	75	65
Common Latrines	0	0
Individual Latrines	0	10
Total	75	75

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

Table 5.40 gives the information about the source of toilets in the Ootai thanda village of Warangal district. Out of 75 respondents in the village all are habituated to open defecation before the start of MGNREGA scheme, but after start of the MGNREGA scheme this has come down to 65 and 10 households come forward to build the individual latrines (IHHLs) sanctioned by the MGNREGA and government of India under the Swatchh Bharath Mission programme introduced from 2nd October, 2014, this is very less in terms households.

5.41: Source of Cooking Fuel in Ootai thanda

Cooking Fuel Source	Before MGNREGA	After MGNREGA
Fire Wood	73	42
Kerosene Stove	1	0
LPG	1	33
Others	0	0
Total	75	75

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16.

Table 5.41 gives the full details of source of cooking fuel in the Ootai thanda of Lambada tribe in Warangal district. Out of 75 respondents 73 households are having the habit of firewood as their cooking fuel 1 household partially use kerosene stove and 1 household used LPG stove before the start of MGNREGS. But after the start of the

MGNREGS the people attitude has changed and government is also encouraging the purchase and use of LPG. As a result at about 33 respondent households purchased the LPG stoves and using.

Table 5.42: Provision of Employment in Ootai Thanda village during the financial year 2015-16

Category	Total Households	No of HHs Issued Job Cards	No of HHs working	Average No of Person Days Provided	No of HHs completed 100 Days
ST	236	216	216	70	---
SC	---	---	---	---	---
BC	---	---	---	---	---
OC	---	---	---	---	---
Total	236	216	216	70	---

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16.

Table 5.42 gives the implementation of the MGNREGS in Ootai thanda village of Lambada tribe. In this village there are about 236 households, out of which 216 households are given job cards and all job card holders are working in the scheme. In this village the average number of working days of employment provided is 70 and no household completed 100 days of employment during the 2015-16 financial year.

5.43: Durable Assets (public) Created in Ootai thanda

Durable Assets Created	No of Assets
Roads	06
Farm Ponds	04
Sinking Pits	261
Band Plantation	30
Deepening of Tanks	02
Total	303

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16.

Table 5.43 gives the complete information about the durable assets created for Lambada tribe in Ootai thanda village of Warangal district during the financial year 2015-

16. There are about 303 durable assets were created in the village out of which 6 roads this includes 4 internal roads in the village and 2 roads are enrooted to other villages, 4 farm ponds in the village, 261 sinking pits were dug, band plantation at about 30 in number, and 2 tanks were deepened in the village. Deepening of tanks was given a very much benefit to the domestic animals in the village especially in the summer.

5.44: Private Agricultural and Non- Agricultural Works under taken in Ootai thanda village during 2015-16

Private Agricultural and Non- Agricultural Works	No. of works
Land Levelling	130
Bush Clearance	02
Gattu Nirmanam	32
Stone Clearance	02
Teakwood Plantation	90*
Mango Plantation	10 [#]
Malbary Plantation	--
Government School Plantation	60
Total	326

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16.

Note : * = 9000/100=90 persons

= 1250/125=10 persons

Table 5.44 gives the information about the private agricultural and non-agricultural works taken up in the Ootai thanda village during the financial year 2015-16. There are about 326 works taken up in the village, which includes land-leveling works with 130 numbers, bush clearance 2 works, gattulu nirmanam 32 works, stone clearance 2 works teakwood plantation works 90 households, mango plantation works for 10 households and 60 plants were planted in government schools in the village. Out of all these works, land leveling works are very much useful and benefited to the villagers to increase the productivity in the agriculture along with teakwood plantation and mango plantation will give fruits in near future. Every household benefited about 5000/- from land leveling works in the village.

5.5. Conclusion :

In this chapter the socio, economic profiles of the four selected tribes Gond, Koya, Chenchu and Lambada are analyzed along with the programme implementation. The Lambada and Gond tribes are socially and economically developed than Koya and Chenchu tribes. Out of 567 total tribal households in these four villages of four tribes 532 households are registered in the scheme and issued job cards. At about 532 (93 percent) job card holders are working in the scheme. Women are participating more than men, and old age people are more interested in the employment as the works are early in the morning and not involved much hard work. The majority of households are illiterates and are labour. By making use of the MGNREGS they can purchase LPG cylinders, constructed latrines, plantations were also taken up along with land levelling etc.

CHAPTER – 06

Implementation of MGNREGS - A Comparative Study among Four Selected Tribes in Selected Villages in Telangana

6.1. Introduction :

This chapter gives the complete information about the comparative analysis in implementation of the MGNREGA among selected tribes in selected villages in Telangana state during the financial year 2015-16. The selected four tribes are namely Gond, Koya, Chenchu and Lambada in Adilabad, Khammam, Mahabubnagar and Warangal districts respectively in Telangana state. The villages selected are Beharanguda and KundelPahad for Gond tribe, Gummadidoddi village for Koya tribe, Yerrapenta village in case of Chenchu tribe and Ootai thanda village for Lambada tribe.

6.2. Implementation of MGNREGS - A Comparative Study among Four Selected Tribes in Selected Villages in Telangana :

Table 6.1: Distribution of Selected Sample Households from Selected Villages

Name of the District	Name of the Village	Selected Tribe	Total Households	Selected Sample Households (Percentage)
Adilabad	Beharanguda /Kundel Pahad	Gond	95	75 (78.95)
Khammam	Gummadidoddi	Koya	170	75 (44.11)
MahabubNagar	Yerrapenta	Chenchu	91	75 (82.42)
Warangal	Ootai Thanda	Lambada	236	75 (31.78)
Total			592	300 (50.67)

Source: Field Survey 2015-16.

Table 6.1 gives the details of distribution of selected sample households from selected villages. Gond tribe is selected Beharanguda/Kundel Pahad villages are two hamlets of Chintapally gram panchayat of Dandepally mandal in Adilabad district. In these villages, gonds households are about 95 out of which 75 households are selected on census basis from the villages, which accounts for 78.95 percent. Koya tribe was selected from Gummadidoddi village of Wazeedu mandal in Khammam district. In this village, the

total households are 170 out of which 75 households were selected which accounts for 44.11 percent. Chenchu tribe is selected from Yerrapenta village, which is a hamlet of Chennampally gram panchayat of Lingal mandal in Mahabubnagar district. In this village, the total households are 91 and out of which 75 households are selected which accounts for 82.42 percent. Lambada tribe is selected from Ootai thanda of Ootai gram panchayat of Kothaguda mandal in Warangal district. In this thanda the total households are 236 out of which 75 households are selected which accounts for 31.78 percent. All the tribes are selected equally from the different villages in different districts of the state. Lambada and Koya tribes are more in number as a result the distribution of sample and its percentage is lower.

Table. 6.2: Gender wise Distribution

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	186	62
Female	114	38
Total	300	100

Source: Field survey 2015-16

Among the four selected tribes from four villages, 300 respondents were selected, out of which 186 respondents are male which accounts for 62 percent and remaining 114 respondents are female which accounts for 38 percent of total respondents. This is done with MGNREGS act guidelines that guarantees at least one third of the workers must be women.

Table. 6.3: Age wise Distribution

Age Group	Frequency	Percent
20-30	54	18
31-40	85	28.3
41-50	83	27.7
51-60	51	17
61-70	16	5.3
71 and Above	11	3.7
Total	300	100

Source: Field survey 2015-16.

Among the four tribes, the respondents are selected from different age groups of both men and women starting from the age of 20 years to oldest age 71 and above. A total sample of 300 respondents, in the 20-30 age group 54 respondents are selected which accounts for 18 percent of total sample size. In the 31-40 age group 85 respondents are selected which accounts for 28.3 percent, in the 41-50 age group 83 respondents are selected which accounts for 27.7 percent, in the 51-60 age group the respondents are 51 and which accounts for 17 percent, in the 61-70 age group 16 respondents are selected which accounts for 5.3 percent and in age group 71 and above 11 respondents are selected which accounts for 3.7 percent of total respondents in the sample. The maximum workers are in the age groups of able-bodied age ranging 31-50 together with 168 respondents that accounts for 56 percent of total respondents.

Table 6.4: Educational Standards

Education Status	Beharanguda and Kundel Pahad (Gond)	Gummadidoddi (Koya)	Yerrapenta (Chenchu)	Ootai Thanda (Lambada)	Total (Percentage)
Illiterate	58 (77.34)	62 (82.67)	71 (94.67)	43 (57.33)	234 (78.00)
Primary	13 (17.33)	10 (13.33)	1 (1.33)	15 (20)	39 (13.00)
Secondary	3 (4)	2 (2.67)	3 (4)	15 (20)	23 (7.67)
Above Secondary	1 (1.33)	1 (1.33)	0	2 (2.67)	4 (1.33)
Total	75 (100)	75 (100)	75 (100)	75 (100)	300 (100)

Source: Field survey 2015-16.

Above table elucidates the educational standards of the respondents of the four tribes taken in the field survey. The sample size was 300, which is equally divided among selected four tribes Gond, Koya, Chenchu and Lambada with 75 each. If we look at the educational standards of the respondents of four tribes, out of 300 respondents 234 respondents are illiterates which accounts for 78 percent of total respondents. By community wise Chenchus are more in number with 71 respondents are illiterates, followed by Koyas with 62 were illeterates out of 75 respondents. Next to these tribes, Gond with 58 respondents are illiterates and Lambada tribe somewhat better with 43 respondents' only illiterates out of selected 75 samples. If we look at primary level

education there are 39 respondents are educated up to primary level with 13 in Gonds, 10 in Koya 1 in Chenchu and 15 in Lambada tribe. If we look at secondary level educational standards among respondents 23 respondents completed secondary level education which accounts for 7.67 percent of sample size. Lambada tribe respondents are more with 15, followed by Gond and Chenchu tribes has 3 respondents each and finally Koya tribe respondents has 2 respondents completed secondary level education. Finally above secondary level educational standard are less with 4 respondents only. In Lambada tribe with 4, followed by Gond and Koya tribes' possessed with 1 respondent each.

Table 6.5: Occupation wise Distribution

Occupation	Beharanguda /Kundel Pahad (Gond)	Gummadidoddi (Koya)	Yerrapenta (Chenchu)	Ootai Thanda (Lambada)	Total (%)
Labour	26	10	74	19	129 (43.00)
Marginal Farmers	6	2	0	18	26 (8.67)
Small Farmers	40	60	1	35	136 (45.33)
Artisans	0	3	0	2	5 (1.67)
Others	3	0	0	1	4 (1.33)
Total	75	75	75	75	300 (100)

Source: Field survey 2015-16.

Table 6.5 gives the complete information about the occupational distribution of the respondents among the selected tribes. Out of 300 respondents, 129 respondents were selected labour respondents, which accounts for 43 percent of total sample. In which Chenchu tribe respondents are more in number with 74 out of 75 selected samples among the tribe. Next Gonds consists 26 respondents out of 75 were involved in labour work, Lambada tribe 19 respondents out of 75 are completely involved in labour works and Koya tribe involved only 10 respondents out of 75 with labour occupation. Here chenchu tribe is having more labourers than other tribes among the selected tribes. In next occupational distribution farmers occupy second place with 136 respondents, which accounts for 45.33 percent of total sample size. In this Koya tribe is leading with 60 respondents out of 75 are involved in farming, next to this tribe Gond tribe respondents

are involved with 40 respondents out of 75 respondents. Lambada tribe respondents are 35 and Chenchu tribe have only 1 respondent. Arisans are very nominal in sample with just 5 respondents only that belongs to Koya tribe 3 and Lambada tribe 2 respondents. Landed agricultural labourers consists 26 respondents which accounts for 8.67 percent of total sample, in which Lambada take the leading with 18 respondents, Gonds are 6 respondents and Koya tribe 2 and not having any respondents in case of Chenchu tribe. If we look at others Gonds have 3, Lambada have 1 respondent who were involved in other occupations among selected tribes in selected villages.

Table 6.6: Reasons for Not Having Job Cards

Reasons	Beharanguda /Kundel Pahad (Gond)			Gummadidoddi (Koya)			Yerrapenta (Chenchu)			Ootai Thanda (Lambada)			Grand Total
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	
Own Farming	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	10	10	20	20
Migration	06	04	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	10	10	20	30
Newly Married	-	--	--	04	06	10	10	10	20	--	--	--	30
Pink Card	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Others	-	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	06	04	10	04	06	10	10	10	20	20	20	40	80

Source: Field survey 2015-16.

Table 6.6 reveals the information about the reasons for not having the job cards in the selected tribes in selected villages. Among four tribes in four villages there are about 80 households are not issued the job cards due to several reasons like own farming, migration to urban areas, newly marriages, pink cards cards etc. In Gond tribe 10 households were not given the job cards which includes 6 male headed households and 4 female headed households. The reasons for not having the job cards in the villages are these households have migrated to other places in search of work. In case of Koya tribe in Gummadidoddi village, here also 10 households have not been issued the job cards due to the reason of old age of the persons and their physical disability and health also not permitted to go for work. In the same way among Chenchu tribe in Yerrapenta village 20 households are to be issued the job cards and are waiting for sanction of job cards due to

the reason of newly married couples who are young in the age and not-attaining the 21 years of age. Finally, in Lambada tribe also 40 households are denied the job cards in the Ootai thanda village due to the reasons of 20 household persons are not interested in the scheme due to the own farming and another 20 households migrated to Hyderabad in search of better employment.

Table 6.7: MGREGS Programme Evaluation

Name of the Tribe	Selection of the Works		Work Site Facilities		Social Audit		Mode of Payment		
	Grama Sabha	Other Means	Water	Creech	Regular	Irregular	P.O.	Bank	Cash
Beharanguda /Kundel Pahad (Gond)	Yes	--	Yes	--	Yes	--	Yes	--	--
Gummadidoddi (Koya)	Yes	--	Yes	--	Yes	--	--	Yes	--
Yerrapenta (Chenchu)	Yes	--	Yes	--	--	Yes	--	--	Yes
Ootai Thanda (Lambada)	Yes	--	Yes	--	Yes	--	Yes	--	--

Source: Field survey 2015-16.

This table 6.7 explains about the MGNREGA programme evaluation among selected tribes in selected villages. Selection of works almost done in the same manner in all the villages through grama sabhas only. Sometimes this may change according to village level needs. In work site facilities only water to the workers on appointing one of the workers to bring water near to work site. The MGNREGA scheme guarantee for provision of creech but in practice no one is demanding for this facility in the selected villages. Social audit is being conducted regularly in all the villages except in Yerrapenta village where Chenchu tribes are living. Mode of payment is done in the selected villages with different ways like in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages payment is made through post office, in Gummadidoddi village it is done with the help of bank mithra agents of the commercial banks, in Yerrapenta village it is made in the form of cash, and in Ootai thanda village it is made in the post office only. These facilities are different from place to place especially in mode of payment.

Table 6.8: Savings and Borrowing Agencies

Savings Agency	Beharanguda / Kundel Pahad (Gond)	Gummadidoddi (Koya)	Yerrapenta (Chenchu)	Ootai Thanda (Lambada)	Total
Before MGNREGA					
S H G	8	10	12	8	38
Bank	6	0	0	0	6
Others	1	1	0	0	2
Total	15	11	12	8	46
After MGNREGA					
SHG	36	31	53	3	123
BANK	1	1	0	0	2
Others	2	2	0	0	4
Total	39	34	53	3	129

Source: Field survey 2015-16.

Table 6.8 explains the details of savings and borrowings and their agencies where the respondents and their family members are used to save and borrow the money among the selected tribes in selected villages. Before the start of MGNREGA scheme, about 38 respondents were saving the money with Self Help Groups (SHG) in small amounts like Rs 100 per month. Out of which 12 respondents are belong to Chenchu tribe, 10 respondents' households from Koya tribe, and 8 from Gond tribe. The other agencies like Bank and private agencies are very negligible with together 8 respondents were having known to these institutions to make a total of 46 respondents. But after the start of MGNREGA scheme it has increased to 129 respondents households are making savings and borrowings, out of which 123 households are in SHG only. After the start of MGNREGA scheme, the people increased the savings in SHGs rather than going to private landlords and other means. This is seen more in case of Chenchu tribe with 53 out of 75 respondents families, Gond tribe 36 out of 75 households, Koya tribe 31 out of 75 households are involving more in micro finance, but it is very low in Lambada tribe just 3 households are actively participating in SHG. With the help of the income that the women respondents earn from MGNREGS are now investing in the self-help groups and borrowing the loans from banks to meet their needs.

Table 6.9: Possessing Electrical and Consumer Durable Items

Electrical and Consumer Durable Items	Beharanguda /Kundel Pahad (Gond)		Gummadidoddi (Koya)		Yerrapenta (Chenchu)		Ootai Thanda (Lambada)		Total	
	Before NREGA	After NREGA	Before NREGA	After NREGA	Before NREGA	After NREGA	Before NREGA	After NREGA	Before NREGA	After NREGA
Fan	8	69	5	69	2	58	74	75	89	271
Television	2	59	0	56	1	34	24	73	27	222
Refrigerator	0	07	0	0	0	0	02	08	2	15
MobilePhone	0	54	0	53	0	26	0	72	0	205
Cooler	0	9	0	0	0	4	0	03	0	16
Mixer Grinder	0	0	0	0	0	0	05	15	5	15
Motor Cycle	0	04	0	5	0	3	0	11	0	23

Source: Field survey 2015-16.

Table 6.9 gives the complete information about the usage of different electrical and durable consumer items among the selected tribes in selected villages. The minimum items selected are fan, television, refrigerator, mobile phone, cooler, mixer grinder and motor cycle. In all these home appliances different tribes are using with some variation. The minimum need in home for every family is fan. In this case, before MGNREGS 89 respondents were using and it has increased to 271 after the MGNREGA scheme. The income generated from MGNREGS was used to purchase fan by many respondents in the selected tribes in selected villages. Among the four tribes Lambada was using even before the scheme with large number of respondents and other tribes were less in number. After the MGNREGA scheme, it has increased in all the tribes evenly. In terms of television, all the tribes were using the 27 TV sets, among this Lambada tribe once again leading in four tribes with 24 TVs. But after MGNREGA scheme it has increased to 222 TV sets, total in all four tribes out of 300 respondent households. In this list also all tribes increased their purchasing capacity, Gonds with 59 TV sets, Koya with 56 sets, Chenchu with 34 sets and Lambada with 73 sets out of 75 households each. Refrigerator is a costly electrical appliance and is a luxury item for the tribes, even though before MGNREGA there are 2 households in Lambada were using the refrigerators and after MGNREGA scheme it has increased to the 15 refrigerators out of which Gonds with 7 and 8 refrigerators in Lambadi tribe.

Mobile phones now become a necessary good for every human being in the society; it was zero among the tribes before the start of MGNREGA but after the start of MGNREGA, it has increased to 205 respondents out of 300 respondents. It is 54 among the Gonds, 53 among Koya tribe, 26 in Chenchu tribe and 72 mobiles among the Lambada tribe are using the mobile phones. In case of cooler, it was very less among the tribes with zero before the start of MGNREGA, but after the start of MGNREGA, it increased to 16 items, out of which 9 pieces among the Gond tribe, 4 in Chenchu tribe and 3 among Lambada tribe households are utilizing the coolers. Other electrical item mixer grinders are also very less in use among the tribes, only Lambada tribe is using these 5 pieces before MGNREGA and it has increased to 15 pieces after the start of MGNREGA. In case of motor cycle also it was not used by any respondents among the four tribes before the start of the MGNREGA but after the start of MGNREGA it has increased to 23 motor cycles, out of which 4 motor cycles among Gond tribes, 5 motor cycles among the Koya tribe, 3 motor cycles among the Chenchu tribe and 11 motor cycles among Lambada tribe are using in the selected villages. If not all the electrical and consumer durable items usage increased by MGNREGA but many of them are increased by the income generated from the MGNREGA scheme only.

The below table makes it clear that ownership of land of the respondents to make the classification of farmers into marginal farmers, small farmers and large farmers. The respondents who possess the land less than 2 acres are classified into marginal farmers and who owns the land more than two acres are treated as small farmers. There are about 242 acres of total land possessed by the 300 respondents of four tribes in four villages. The land is divided into four types based on the availability of water source into irrigated by canal, irrigated by tanks, irrigated by wells and bore wells and un-irrigated/ rain fed lands. Majority of lands in the four villages are un-irrigated lands whose cultivation is purely depended on monsoons. There are about 154 acres of land was cultivated dependent on rains before the start of the MGNREGA scheme in the four villages by the respondents. Among this 50 acres of land cultivated by Lambada tribe respondents in Ootai thanda village, 21 acres of land was cultivated by Chenchu tribe respondents in Yerrapenta village, 53 acres of land cultivated by Koya tribe respondents in Gummadidoddi village and another 30 acres of land was cultivated by Gond tribe respondents in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages. Among all the tribes 1-acre land owned respondents are 98 in all the four villages, 2 acres owned respondents are 76, and

there are 3 acres owned respondents about 34 respondents and finally 4 acres respondents 34 in number. Majority of respondents are mainly dependent on rains that cannot guarantee any income for that year.

After the start of MGNREGS the land under cultivation has increased from 242 acres to 276 acres, among this 34 acres of land was brought under cultivation in all most all the villages. The increase can be seen in unirrigated land i.e. from 154 acres before MGNREGA to 180 acres after the start of MGNREGA scheme. The remaining types of lands more or less remained same but only in case of rain fed lands are brought under cultivation. Out of this 24 acres of newly cultivable land, the Chenchu tribe has brought almost 9 acres of land, Lambada tribe brought 8 acres of land, Koya tribe 10 acres of land and Gond tribe 8 acres of land into cultivation with the works taken up under the scheme like jungle clearance, bush clearance, stone clearance and land leveling etc. All these lands are fallow lands and the size of land holding is more or less 1 acre.

Table 6.10: Land Irrigation- Farmers Classification

Land Description	Beharanguda/ Kundel Pahad (Gond)				Gummadidoddi (Koya)				Yerrapenta (Chenchu)				Ootai Thanda (Lambada)				Total
	01	02	03	04	01	02	03	04	01	02	03	04	01	02	03	04	
Before MGNREGA																	
Irrigated by Canal	11	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	3	31
Irrigated by Tank	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	13	2	6	33
Irrigated by Well/Bore Well	5	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	6	4	3	0	24
Un-irrigated/ Rain fed	19	7	1	3	23	15	8	7	8	9	4	0	11	14	10	15	154
Total Area	35	18	3	3	23	16	8	7	9	9	5	0	31	33	18	24	242
After MGNREGA																	
Irrigated by Canal	9	6	1	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	16	1	3	3	30
Irrigated by Tank	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	10	11	5	5	37
Irrigated by Well/Bore Well	5	2	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	1	0	5	7	3	0	29
Un-irrigated/ Rain fed	6	15	1	3	25	15	1	8	25	16	12	8	12	22	5	6	180
Total Area	20	23	2	3	31	15	1	3	26	10	9	8	43	38	16	14	276

Source: Field survey 2015-16.

**Table 6.11: Details of Family Income from Cooli during the Financial Year 2015-16
(Monthly)**

Monthly Income Cooli (Rs.)	Beharanguda /Kundel Pahad (Gond)	Gummadidoddi (Koya)	Yerrapenta (Chenchu)	Ootai Thanda (Lambada)	Total
2000-3000	12	17	17	14	60
3001-4000	3	6	11	22	42
4001-5000	14	13	18	1	46
5001-6000	18	12	20	37	87
6001-7000	21	18	4	0	43
7001-8000	2	3	3	0	8
8001-9000	0	0	1	0	1
9001-10000	5	6	1	1	13
Total	75	75	75	75	300

Source: Field survey 2015-16.

Table 6.11 elucidates the income earned by the respondents in the form of cooli per month among the selected tribes in selected villages during the financial year 2015-16. The income is categorized into class intervals ranging from Rs 2000-3000 to Rs 9001/- to 10000/- per month. Out of 300 respondents from four villages 60 respondents households are in the starting range of income Rs 2000 to 3000 per month, out of which 12 households from Gond tribe, 17 respondents from Koya and Chenchu tribes, and 14 respondents from Lambada tribe are earning the income from cooli as the main occupation. In the next income range from Rs 3001 to Rs 4000 there are 42 respondents earning the income. Out of which 3 from Gond, 6 from Koya, 11 from Chenchu and 22 respondents from Lambada tribe are earning the income from cooli occupation. In the next range of income from Rs 4001 to 5000 there are 46 respondents are earning the income. Out of which 14 respondents from Gond tribe, 13 from Koya tribe, 18 from Chenchu tribe and 1 from Lambada tribe. In this category Chenchu tribe respondents getting more income. In next range of income from Rs 5001 to 6000 there are 87 respondents earning, out of which Lambada tribe leading with 37 respondents, Chenchu tribe with 20 respondents, Gond with 18 respondents and Koya tribe with 12 households. In the next range of income Rs 6001 to 7000 there are 43 respondents, out of which 21 respondents from Gond tribe, 18 from Koya tribe, 4 from Chenchu and zero respondents from Lambada tribe. In the next range of income Rs 7001to 8000 there are 8 respondents, out of which 2 from Gond, 3 from Koya, 3 from Chenchu and zero respondents from

Lambada tribe. In the Rs 8001 to 9000 range, only one respondent from Chenchu tribe is earning the income from cooli as main source. In the next class interval Rs 9001 to 10000 there are 13 respondents, out of which 5 HHs from Gonds, 6 from Koya and 1 from Chenchu and Lambada tribes. Among the four tribes majority of the respondents are earning the income upto Rs 7000 per month with 278 respondents out of 300 respondents in the four villages which accounts for 92.67 percent of total respondents. Among all the tribes Lambada tribe has the lowest brackets of income from cooli source because they are engaged in their agricultural activities.

Table 6.12: Details of Family Income from Farming during the Financial Year 2015-16

(Yearly)

Farming Income Yearly (Rs)	Beharanguda and Kundel Pahad (Gond)	Gummadidoddi (Koya)	Yerrapenta (Chenchu)	Ootai Thanda (Lambada)	Total
20000-40000	14	5	17	11	47
40001-60000	4	9	3	22	38
60001-80000	7	18	3	10	38
80001-100000	6	2	0	13	21
100001-150000	5	5	0	8	18
150001 and Above	0	5	0	6	11
Total	36	44	23	70	173

Source: Field survey 2015-16.

Table 6.12 gives the information about the farming income of respondents among selected tribes in selected villages during the financial year 2015-16. There are 173 farmers in the four villages out of 300 respondents ranging the income levels from Rs 20000/- Rs 40000/-to Rs150001 and above class intervals. Many of the respondents are in the starting class interval range with 47respondents, out of which 14 respondent from Gond tribe, 5 respondents from Koya tribe, 17 respondents from Chenchu tribe and 11 respondents from Lambada tribe. In the next class interval Rs 40001/- to Rs 60000/-there are 38 respondents earning the farm income annually. In this interval out of 38 respondents 4 respondent families from Gond tribe, 9 respondent households from Koya tribe, 3 households from Chenchu tribe and 22 respondents households from Lambada tribe. In this category Lambada tribe occupied more predominancy. If we look at class interval range Rs 60001/- to 80000/- there are 38 respondents who earning this much of income from farming annually. Out of which Koya tribe has more respondents with 18 in

Gummadidoddi village, 10 respondents from Lambada tribe in Ootai thanda, 7 respondents from Gond tribe from Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages and 3 respondents' households from Chenchu tribe from Yerrapenta village. As we look at the next range of income from Rs 80001/- to Rs 100000/- there are 21 respondents who earning the farm income yearly. Here also Lambada tribe takes the lead with 13 respondents' households, followed by 6 respondents from Gond tribe, and 2 from Koya tribe. In the next range Rs 100000/- to 150000/- there are 18 respondents who earning this much of income from farming. Out of which 8 respondents from Lambada tribe, 5 from Gond and 5 from Koya tribe also earning the income yearly. In the last class interval the income range from Rs 150001/- and above there are 11 respondents, out of which 6 respondents from Lambada tribe and 5 respondents households from Koya tribe are earning the farm income annually. At glance, the Lambada tribe respondents are earning the farm income more with 70 out of 75 respondents than all other tribes among the selected tribes in selected villages are and Chenchu tribe is very less with 23 respondents. Here the Chenchu tribe has the lowest brackets of income from the farming source because of the lowest owned acres of land.

Table 6.13: Details of Family Income from MGNREGS during the Financial Year 2015-16 (Yearly)

MGNREGS Income Yearly (RS)	Beharanguda/ Kundelpahad (Gond)	Gummadidoddi (Koya)	Yerrapenta (Chenchu)	Ootai Thanda (Lambada)	Total
3000-5000	2	12	0	6	20
5001-7000	15	19	2	21	57
7001-10000	16	22	0	26	64
10001-12000	26	9	2	5	42
12001-15000	13	5	1	01	20
15001-20000	2	0	7	16	25
20001-25000	1	0	4	0	05
25001-30000	0	8	10	0	18
30001-40000	0	0	23	0	23
40001-50000	0	0	10	0	10
50001-60000	0	0	16	0	16
Total	75	75	75	75	300

Source: Field survey 2015-16.

Table 6.13 gives the complete information about the income earned by the respondents from the participation in the MGNREGA scheme during the financial year

2015-16 by the selected tribes in selected villages. The income range has divided into class intervals starting from Rs 3000 to 5000/- P.A to Rs50001/- to 60000/- P.A. In the starting range of income, there are 20 respondents among all the four tribes in four villages, in these category 12 Koya respondents, 6 from Lambada and 2 from Gond respondents earning the annual income from the MGNREGA scheme during the financial year 2015-16. In the next range of income Rs 5001 to 7000, there are 57 respondents, out of which Lambada 21 respondents, Koya19, Gond 15, and Chenchu 2 respondents who are earned the income for the said period. The highest number of respondents earning range of income is Rs 7001 to 10000 PA, with 64 households. Out of which Lambada tribe respondents tops the position with 26, next is Koya 22, Gond 16 respondents and making Chenchu with zero participation. There are 42 respondents in the class interval income of 10001 to 12000/-, out of which Gond tribe respondents earning more with 26 numbers and Koya tribe with 9, Lambada 5, and Chenchu tribe with 2 respondents only earned the income.

In the next range of income class interval Rs12001 to 15000/- PA there are 20 respondents, out of which 13 households from Gonds, 5 from Koya, 1 from Lambada and Chenchu tribes each. If we look at Rs 15001 to 20000/- PA there are 25 respondents, out of which 16 respondents from Lambada tribe, 7 households from Chenchu tribe and 2 from Gond tribe. In the next class interval income range Rs 20001 to 25000/- there are only 5 respondents out of which 4 from Chenchu tribe and 1 from Gond tribe. The income range of 25001 to 30000/- there are 18 respondents who earning the income annually, out of which 10 from Chenchu tribe and 8 households from Kota tribe. The top income range Rs 30001 to 40000/- PA there exists only 23 respondents from Chenchu tribe only. If we see the next top range of income from Rs40001 to 50000/- annually there are 10 respondents, who are from Chenchu tribe only. In the last top range of income from Rs 50001 to 60000/- PA, here also there are 16 respondents who are only Chenchu tribe only.

The income earning by respondents among selected four tribes from selected four villages, the Chenchu tribe respondents are earning a good amounts annually than any other tribes among the selected four tribes. This is because of the special provision made by the ITDA in Mahabub nagar district for Chenchu tribe is that every adult person in the household is provided 180 days per year at an average wage rate of Rs 180/- per day as against to the MGNREGA 100 days of employment to household in a year at the

minimum wage rate in the state. The chenchu tribe benefited at large to increase the living standards of the people. The Lambada tribe has the lowest brackets of income from MGNREGS, based on the study it earned the income upto Rs 10000/-

Table 6.14: Monthly Expenditure during the financial year 2015-16

Food Items	Beharanga/ Kundelpahad (Gond)	Gummadiddi (Koya)	Yerrapenta (Chenchu)	Ootai thanda (Lambada)	Non-food Items	Beharanga/ Kundelpahad (Gond)	Gummadiddi (Koya)	Yerrapenta (Chenchu)	Ootai thanda (Lambada)
Before MGNREGS									
Rice	98400 (64.37)	102970 (74.37)	5775 (15.73)	78800 (70.57)	LPG	1200 (4.87)	700 (7.61)	0	600 (0.75)
Sugar	2220 (1.45)	2025 (1.46)	1600 (4.36)	2000 (1.79)	TV	500 (2.03)	500 (5.43)	0	1500 (1.89)
Milk	900 (0.59)	2555 (1.85)	0	0	Medicine	0	650 (7.07)	0	0
Oil	9350 (6.12)	7025 (5.07)	6540 (17.81)	7520 (6.73)	Education	3800 (15.42)	1300 (14.13)	0	50500 (63.47)
Vegetables	13250 (8.67)	8130 (5.87)	9800 (26.69)	11000 (9.85)	Electricity	1650 (6.69)	1550 (16.85)	0	1880 (2.36)
Fruits	9700 (6.35)	4450 (3.21)	2500 (6.81)	550 (0.49)	Liquor	16700 (67.75)	4300 (46.74)	28000 (100.00)	25080 (31.52)
Non-vegetarian	19050 (12.46)	11300 (8.16)	10500 (28.60)	11800 (10.57)	Petrol	800 (3.25)	200 (2.17)	0	0
Total	152870 (100)	138455 (100)	36715 (100)	111670 (100)	Total	24650 (100)	9200 (100)	28000 (100)	79560 (100)
After MGNREGS									
Rice	98400 (44.37)	102970 (52.53)	5775 (6.68)	78800 (46.59)	LPG	8050 (10.08)	9050 (13.45)	0	3200 (2.16)
Sugar	6080 (2.74)	6990 (3.57)	4880 (5.64)	5120 (3.03)	TV	8150 (10.20)	8850 (13.15)	6070 (9.82)	9140 (6.18)
Milk	2900 (1.31)	6510 (3.32)	0	0	Medicine	700 (0.88)	5250 (7.80)	1450 (2.34)	1300 (0.88)
Oil	17965 (8.10)	15480 (7.90)	13920 (16.10)	13660 (8.08)	Education	20400 (25.54)	22050 (32.77)	200 (0.32)	61000 (41.21)
Vegetables	24650 (11.11)	15380 (7.85)	18300 (21.16)	19550 (11.56)	Electricity	9520 (11.92)	10140 (15.07)	120 (0.19)	8470 (5.72)
Fruits	35900 (16.19)	24350 (12.42)	21800 (25.21)	26000 (15.37)	Liquor	31050 (38.88)	9700 (14.42)	54000 (87.32)	54900 (37.09)
Non-vegetarian	35900 (16.19)	24350 (12.42)	21800 (25.21)	26000 (15.37)	Petrol	2000 (2.50)	2250 (3.34)	0	10000 (6.76)
Total	221795 (100)	196030 (100)	86475 (100)	169130 (100)	Total	79870 (100)	67290 (100)	61840 (100)	148010 (100)

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16.

The above table gives the complete information about the expenditure made by the respondents on food and non-food items of the selected tribes in selected villages before and after the start of MGNREGS. This expenditure is an approximation based on the memory of the respondents and prevailed prices at that time. The expenditure is divided into food and non-food categories. In food category the main items taken are rice, sugar, milk, oil, vegetables, fruits and non-vegetarian, whereas in non-food categories the main items taken are LPG, TV, medicine, education, electricity, liquor and petrol. Before the start of the MGNREGS the total expenditure on food items varies among the tribes. In Gond tribe it is Rs.152870/-, in Koya tribe it is Rs.138455/-, in Chenchu tribe it is Rs.36715/- and in Lambada tribe it is Rs.111670/- per month. Out of the total expenditure they made Gond tribe was making on rice at about 64.37 percent and remaining 36 percent on other food items. In case of non-food items this tribe respondents are making about Rs 24650/- per month, where liquor occupies the major share with Rs.16700/- which accounts for 67.75 percent, the other major head, education expenditure is Rs.3800/- which accounts for 15.42 percent of non-food expenditure. In case of Koya tribe, out of the total expenditure they are making on rice at about 74.37 percent and remaining 25.63 percent on other food items. In case of non-food items this tribe respondents are making about Rs.9200/- per month, where liquor occupies the major share with Rs.4300/- which accounts for 46.74 percent, the other major head, education expenditure is Rs.1300/- per month, which accounts for 14.13 percent of non-food expenditure.

In case of Chenchu tribe, out of the total expenditure they made it was making on rice at about 15.73 percent and remaining 84.27 percent on other food items where non-vegetarian occupies major share. In case of non-food items this tribe respondents are making about Rs.28000/- per month, where liquor occupies the total share with Rs.28000/- which accounts for 100 percent of non-food expenditure. In case of Lambada tribe, out of the total expenditure they made it was making on rice at about Rs.78800/- which accounts for 70.57 percent and remaining 29.43 percent on other food items. In case of non-food items this tribe respondents are making about Rs.79560/- per month, where children education occupies the major share with Rs.50500/- which accounts for 63.47 percent of non-food expenditure, followed by liquor with Rs.25080/-, which accounts for 31.52 percent of non-food expenditure.

After the start of the MGNREGS total expenditure on food items also varies among the tribes. In Gond tribe it is Rs.221795/-, in Koya tribe it is Rs.196030/-, in Chenchu tribe it is Rs.86475/- and in Lambada tribe it is Rs.169130/- per month. Out of the total expenditure they made Gond tribe was making on rice at about Rs98400/- which accounts for 44.37 percent and remaining 55.63 percent on other food items. In case of non-food items this tribe respondents are making about Rs.79870/- per month, where liquor occupies the major share with Rs.31050/- which accounts for 38.88 percent, the other major head, education expenditure is Rs.20400/- which accounts for 25.54 percent of non-food expenditure. In case of Koya tribe, out of the total expenditure they made it was making on rice at Rs.102970/- which accounts for about 52.53 percent and remaining 47.47 percent on other food items. In case of non-food items this tribe respondents are making about Rs.67290/- per month, where education occupies the major share with Rs.22050 /- which accounts for 32.77 percent, the other major head, liquor expenditure is Rs.9700/- per month, which accounts for 14.42 percent of non-food expenditure.

In case of Chenchu tribe, out of the total expenditure they made it was making on rice at about Rs.5775/- which accounts for 6.68 percent this is because of Rs.1/- per kg scheme of government of Telangana and other NGOs like RDT supplying food supplements at subsidised rates. And remaining 93.32 percent on other food items where non-vegetarian occupies major share at about 25.21 percent. In case of non-food items this tribe respondents are making about Rs.61840/- per month, where liquor occupies the major share with Rs.54000/- per month which accounts for 87.32 percent of non-food expenditure. In case of Lambada tribe, out of the total expenditure they made it was making on rice at about Rs.78800/- which accounts for 46.59 percent and remaining 53.41 percent on other food items like vegetables, fruits and non-vegetarian have almost equal share. In case of non-food items this tribe respondents are making about Rs.148010/- per month, where children education occupies the major share with Rs.61000/- which accounts for 41.21 percent of non-food expenditure, followed by liquor with Rs.54900/-, which accounts for 37.09 percent of non- food expenditure, and petrol expenditure is Rs.10000/- per month which accounts for 6.76 percent of total non-food expenditure.

Among the four tribes Gond, Koya, and Lambada are making a maximum expenditure on food items with more than 70 percent before the start of MGNREGS, but Chenchu tribe respondents are making about 16 percent, on non-food items all the tribes

are making maximum amount on liquor and wasting the incomes that they earn. In this non-food expenditure Chenchu tribe respondents are making maximum expenditure on liquor. Even after the start of the scheme also expenditure on food items slightly decreased at about 50 percent among all the tribes, but in case of non-food items like education share is increased among Gond, Koya, and Lambada tribes, but in case of Chenchu tribes it is also most same.

Table 6.15: Income and Expenditure during the Financial Year 2015-16

Monthly Income and Expenditure	Beharanguda and Kundelpahad (Gond)	Gummadidoddi (Koya)	Yerrapenta (Chenchu)	Ootai thanda (Lambada)
Before MGNREGS				
Food Expenditure	152870 (86.11)	138455 (93.77)	36715 (56.73)	111670 (58.40)
Non-food Expenditure	24650 (13.89)	9200 (6.23)	28000 (43.27)	79560 (41.60)
Total Expenditure	177520 (100)	147655 (100)	64715 (100)	191230 (100)
Income	124500	90000	79500	108500
Savings/ Borrowings	-53020	-57655	14785	-82730
After MGNREGS				
Food Expenditure	221795 (73.52)	196030 (74.45)	86475 (58.30)	169130 (53.33)
Non-food Expenditure	79870 (24.48)	67290 (25.55)	61840 (41.70)	148010 (46.67)
Total Expenditure	301665 (100)	263320 (100)	148315 (100)	317140 (100)
Income	373000	295000	162000	386000
Savings/ Borrowings	71335	31680	13685	68860

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16.

The above table elucidates the complete monthly income and expenditure analysis of the respondents of the selected tribes in the selected villages during the financial year 2015-16. Before the start of the MGNREGS the total monthly incomes varies among the tribes. In case of Gond respondents it is Rs.124500/- per month, Koya tribe respondents income is Rs.90000/- per month, Chenchu tribe respondents it is Rs.79500/- per month

and in case of Lambada tribe it is 108500/- per month. Total expenditure is also varies among the tribes like in case of Gond it is Rs.177520/- per month, in case of Koya tribe it is Rs.147655/- per month, in case of Chenchu tribe it is Rs.64715/- per month, and in case of Lambada tribe it is Rs.191230/- per month. Out of the total expenditure, the food expenditure in Gond tribe is major share with Rs.152870/-, which accounts for 86.11 percent, and remaining 13.89 percent is making on non- food items. In case of Koya tribe also the food expenditure is Rs.138455/- per month which accounts for 93.77 percent and making 6.23 percent on non-food items.

In case of Chenchu tribe, out of total expenditure they are using the amount Rs 36715/- per month in food items which accounts for 56.73 percent and remaining amount Rs.28000/- on non-food items which accounts for 43.27. In case of Lambada tribe the respondents in the village making an amount of Rs.111670/- on food items which accounts for 58.40 percent of total expenditure and on non-food items they are making an amount of Rs.79560/- per month on non- food items which accounts for 41.60 percent of total expenditure. The Gond and Koya tribe respondents are making more expenditure on food items at more than 90 percent per month, where in case of Chenchu and Lambada tribes are making use of their incomes on food items about 60 percent. If the savings and borrowings observed among the four tribes in the four villages except in Chenchu tribe all other tribes had registered a negative savings, which leads to borrowings.

After the start of the MGNREGS the total monthly incomes varies among the tribes. In case of Gond respondents it is Rs.37000/- per month, Koya tribe respondents income is Rs.295000/- per month, Chenchu tribe respondents it is Rs.162000/- per month and in case of Lambada tribe it is 386000/- per month. Total expenditure is also varies among the tribes like in case of Gond it is Rs 301665/- per month, in case of Koya tribe it is Rs.263320/- per month, in case of Chenchu tribe it is Rs.148315/- per month, and in case of Lambada tribe it is Rs.317140/- per month. Out of the total expenditure, the food expenditure in Gond tribe is major share with Rs.221795/- per month, which accounts for 73.52 percent, and remaining 24.58 percent is making on non- food items. In case of Koya tribe also the food expenditure is Rs.196030/- per month which accounts for 74.45 percent and making 25.55 percent on non-food items.

In case of Chenchu tribe, out of total expenditure they are using the amount Rs.86475/- per month on food items which accounts for 53.80 percent and remaining amount Rs.61840/- on non-food items which accounts for 41.70 percent. In case of Lambada tribe the respondents in the village making an amount of Rs.169130/- on food items which accounts for 53.33 percent of total expenditure and on non-food items they are making an amount of Rs.148010/- per month which accounts for 46.67 percent of total expenditure. Even after the start of the MGNREGS the Gond and Koya tribe respondents are making more expenditure on food items at more than 70 percent per month, where in case of Chenchu and Lambada tribes are making use of their incomes on food items about 60 percent. If the savings and borrowings observed among the four tribes in the four villages all the tribes have registered a positive savings with an amount of nearly Rs.70000/- per month by Gond and Lambada tribe respondents and roughly Rs30000/- per month by Koya and Chenchu tribe respondents in their villages. The MGNREGS has made the difference among the tribes to think over the savings and its importance.

Table.6.16: Agricultural Wage Rates Before and After MGNREGS

Agricultural Wage (Rs)	Beharanguda /Kundel Pahad (Gond)	Gummadidoddi (Koya)	Yerrapenta (Chenchu)	Ootai Thanda (Lambada)	Total
Before MGNREGA					
80	0	0	75	0	75
100	75	75	0	0	150
120	0	0	0	75	75
Total	75	75	75	75	300
After MGNREGA					
150	75	75	75	75	300
Total	75	75	75	75	300

Source: Field survey 2015-16.

Table 6.16 makes it clear that prevailed agricultural wage rate in the selected four tribal villages before and after the MGNREGA. If we look at before the start of the MGNREGA the agricultural wage rate differs from one village to another village. It was Rs.80 per day in Yerrapenta village for Chenchu tribe, it was Rs.100/- per day for both in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages of Gonds and in Gummadidoddi village of Koya tribe. However, in Ootai thanda it was Rs120/- per day per person for Lambada tribes.

Later on, it was enhanced to Rs.150/- per day per person after the start of MGNREGA scheme in all the villages for all the tribes. Agricultural wage rate increased at more than 50% in the span of 10 years, due to the outcome of MGNREGA created demand for labour in the rural villages.

Table.6.17: MGNREGS Wage Rates between 2006-2011 and 2011-16

Wage (Rs)	Beharanguda /Kundel Pahad (Gond)	Gummadidoddi (Koya)	Yerrapenta (Chenchu)	Ootai Thanda (Lambada)	Total
MGNREGA Wage Rate 2006-11					
50	0	2	0	0	2
60	27	28	6	0	61
70	44	17	66	75	202
80	4	9	2	0	15
90	0	7	1	0	8
100	0	12	0	0	12
Total	75	75	75	75	300
MGNREGA Wage Rate 2011-16.					
90	10	0	0	0	10
100	2	6	0	71	79
110	8	0	0	4	12
120	0	9	4	0	13
130	3	43	10	0	56
140	9	5	1	0	15
150	11	12	2	0	25
160	32	0	1	0	33
170	0	0	1	0	1
180	0	0	56	0	56
Total	75	75	75	75	300

Source: Field survey 2015-16.

Table 6.17 gives the complete analysis of the wage rate given in the MGNREGA scheme for two different periods divided in to 2006 to 2011 and 2011 to 2016 among the selected tribes in selected villages. In the starting five years period 2006 to 2011 the wage rates given in the selected villages are different from village to village from Rs.50 per day to Rs.100/- per day. In this Rs.50/- was given among the tribe Koya tribe only. Rs.60/- per day was given for the three tribes like Gond, Koya and Chenchu with 61 respondents were received this wage rate in the scheme during the period of 2006 to 2011. Rs.70/- was

received by a majority of respondents from the four villages four tribes a total of 202 respondents received this wage. Later on Rs.80/- was received by 15 respondents. Rs.90/- was received by 8 respondents and Rs.100/- received by 12 respondents for the said period. If we observe tribe wise the average wage received the all the tribes was Rs.70/- per day per person, and remaining 98 respondents received more or less to Rs.70 /- per day.

As against this the second period 2011-16 the wage rates received by the respondents from the MGNREGA scheme in all the four villages in between from Rs.90/- to Rs.180/- per day per person. Out of 300 respondents all the households received different wage rates. The majority of respondents received the wage rate of Rs.100/- received by 79 respondents among the four tribes. The Lambada tribe respondents benefit more in this wage rate with 71 respondents. The next highest number of respondents received the wage rate is Rs.130/- by 56 respondents and tribe tops in this wage rate is Koya with 43 respondents. The next highest received wage rate received is Rs.180/- per day and the tribe most benefited with wage rate is Chenchu with 56 respondents and no other tribe is included in this wage rate and even not nearest to this wage rate. On over all the Chenchu tribe was received highest wage rate on par with market wage rate.

Table.6.18: Number of Person Involved in MGNREGS

HHs Persons Involved	Beharanguda /KundelPahad (Gond)	Gummadidodi (Koya)	Yerrapenta (Chenchu)	Ootai Thanda (Lambada)	Total
1 Person	15	17	16	8	56
2 Persons	48	44	52	60	204
3 Persons	10	12	6	6	34
4 Persons	2	2	1	1	6
Total	75	75	75	75	300

Source: Field survey 2015-16.

Table 6.18 gives the complete information about the number of persons involved in the family under the MGNEGA scheme among the selected tribes in selected villages during the financial year 2015-16. In every household generally all the adult members can participate in the MGNREGA scheme not exceeding 100 days of employment per

household in a financial year. Among the selected four tribes more than 200 households involved two persons in the scheme. There are 56 households involved single person families among the four tribes; mostly these are female respondents who are widowed households. There are 34 households who involved 3 members in the scheme and there are only 6 households who involved 4 persons in the scheme.

Table.6.19: Number of Person days (Working days) of Employment Created under MGNREGS during the Financial Year 2015-16

Number of Days Worked	Beharanguda /Kundel Pahad (Gond)	Gummadidoddi (Koya)	Yerrapenta (Chenchu)	Ootai Thanda (Lambada)	Total
20-50	16	58	0	14	88
51-100	59	17	2	61	139
101-150	0	0	13	0	13
151-200	0	0	12	0	12
201-250	0	0	16	0	16
251-300	0	0	23	0	23
301-350	0	0	3	0	3
351-400	0	0	4	0	4
401-500	0	0	2	0	2
Total	75	75	75	75	300

Source: Field survey 2015-16.

The above table 6.19 gives the complete picture about the number of person days of employment created among the selected tribes in selected villages during the financial year 2015-16. The number of days provided and participated by the tribes is classified into class intervals starting from 20-50 days to 401-500 days per year. Majority of the tribes participated in the first and second range of class intervals and remained scattered in to different class intervals. 88 respondents participated in the first range of day's from 20-50 days of employment, and next range of working days 51-100 days there are 139 respondents who take part in the scheme. The Gond, Koya, and Lambada tribes respondents are limited to the below 100 days of employment as per the act. But Chenchu tribe respondents participated beyond 100 days of employment yearly. Only 2 respondents who worked below 100 days of employment from Chenchu tribe and remaining 73 respondents scattered for different number of days. The highest number of

respondents who participated in the scheme is 23 who worked between the 251-300 days of employment during the year 2015-16. There are few respondents who participated in the scheme more than 300 days and even more than 400 days of working days during the financial year 2015-16. This table makes it clear that the Chenchu tribe got benefited much from the MGNREGA scheme than other three selected tribes in selected villages.

Table.6.20: Durable Assets Created Under MGNREGS up to 2015-16

Durable Assets Created	Beharanguda /Kundel Pahad (Gond)	Gummadidoddi (Koya)	Yerrapenta (Chenchu)	Ootai Thanda (Lambada)	Total
	No. of assets	No. of assets	No. of assets	No. of assets	
IHHL	19	05	45	10	79
Roads	11	02	03	06	22
Farm Ponds	20	07	02	04	33
Sinking Pits	150	20	20	261	451
Band Plantation	600	70	50	30	750
Deepening of Tanks	02	05	03	02	12
Total	802	109	123	313	1347

Source: Field survey 2015-16.

Table 6.20 gives the details about the durable assets created among the selected four tribal villages during the financial year 2015-16. There are different assets related works have taken up among the four villages and some assets were taken up more in some villages and some assets very less in some villages. The assets are created in the four villages are construction of Individual Household Latrines (IHHL), construction of roads, farm ponds, sinking pits band plantation and deepening of tanks etc. IHHLs are constructed at about 79 in four villages, out of which 45 were constructed in Yerrapenta village only, 19 in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages, 5 in Gummadidoddi village and 10 in Ootai thanda village of Lambada tribe. In Yerrapenta village the Chenchu tribe come forward to build the latrines is because of the initiative taken up by ITDA. Roads are constructed in four villages are 22 out of which 11 roads in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages for Gonds tribe, 2 roads in Gummadidoddi village of Koya tribe, 3 roads were constructed in Yerrapenta village for Chenchu tribe and 6 roads for Lambada tribe in Ootai thanda. Farm ponds were constructed nearly 33 in four villages, out of which 20 farm ponds in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages, for Gonds. 7 in case of

Koya tribe in Gummadidoddi village, 2 ponds in Yerrapenta village for Chenchu tribe and 4 were constructed in Ootai thana for Lambada tribe. In this farm ponds construction Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages take the lead among the four villages. There are about 451 sinking pits were taken up in the four villages, out which 150 pits in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages, 20 pits in Gummadidoddi village for Koya tribe, 20 pits in Yerrapenta village for Chenchu tribe and 261 pits in Ootai thana for Lambada tribe were constructed among the four villages. These sinking pits will really helpful for increasing the ground water levels in the villages. The Ootai thana is constructed more pits with 261.

Band plantation was taken up very extensively in all most all the villages at about 750 plants were issued and planted in the four villages. Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages are top in the plantation and planted at about 600 plants in the villages which include teakwood, mango, mulberry plants etc. In Gummadidoddi village the people planted at about 70 plants, which includes teakwood and in Yerrapeta village of Chenchu tribe, they planted 50 in the village which includes coconut, teakwood plants and in Ootai thana village of Lambada tribe they planted only 30 plants in the village mainly teakwood. Deepening of tanks was taken up extensively in all most all the villages about 12 tanks were deepened in four villages, out of which 2 tanks in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages, 5 tanks in Gummadidoddi village, 3 tanks in Yerrapenta village and 2 tanks in Ootai thana village. All these tanks are very much useful to the people and domestic animals.

Table 6.21 gives the complete comparative analysis of private agricultural and non- agricultural works taken up in the selected four tribal villages and their benefits to the tribes during the financial year 2015-16. The works taken up are land levelling, bush clearance, gattula nirmanam, and stone clearance. The benefits of these private agricultural and non-agricultural works are measured in terms of money from Rs.3000/- to Rs.8000/- per work done in the agricultural fields of the respondents in the four villages. The land levelling benefit received by the respondents differ to tribe to tribe and from village to village. This benefit was categorized from Rs.3000/- to Rs.8000/- per work, and there are about 389 works were undertaken in the four villages, out of which 90 works were taken up in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages of Gond tribe, 119 works in Gummadidoddi village of Koya tribe, 50 works in Yerrapenta village of Chenchu tribe

and 130 works in Ootai thanda of Lambada tribe village. Majority of works were under taken in the benefit of amount of Rs.4000/- and Rs.5000/- per works. The respondents who utilized these opportunities are benefited and reduced the cost of cultivation and increased the production.

Table.6.21: Private Agricultural and Non-Agricultural Works Taken up (Category - 1)

Private Agricultural And Non- agricultural works	Beharanguda /Kundel Pahad (Gond)	Gummadidoddi (Koya)	Yerrapenta (Chenchu)	Ootai Thanda (Lambada)	Total
	No of Beneficiaries	No of Beneficiaries	No of Beneficiaries	No of Beneficiaries	
Land Levelling Benefit					
Rs.3000	10	35	11	20	76
Rs.4000	32	47	23	46	148
Rs.5000	26	8	8	20	62
Rs.6000	12	9	4	31	56
Rs.7000	5	8	4	10	27
Rs.8000	5	12	--	3	20
Total	90	119	50	130	389
Bush Clearance Benefit					
Rs.3000	2	9	12	1	24
Rs.4000	4	15	9	1	29
Rs 5000	3	34	14	--	51
Rs 6000	3	17	--	--	20
Total	12	75	35	02	124
Gattu Nirmana Benefit					
Rs 3000	--	--	--	5	5
Rs 4000	--	--	--	7	7
Rs 5000	--	--	--	8	8
Rs 6000	--	--	4	--	4
Total	===	---	04	20	24
Stone Clearance Benefit					
Rs 3000	3	4	--	--	7
Rs 4000	6	7	3	--	16
Rs 5000	7	9	2	01	19
Rs 6000	4	5	--	01	10
Total	20	25	05	02	52

Source: Field survey 2015-16.

The bush clearance works are also taken up in the four tribal villages at about 124 works completed, out of which 12 beneficiaries from Gond tribe, 75 beneficiaries from Koya tribe, 35 beneficiaries from Chenchu tribe and 2 from Lambabada tribe. The

benefited amount wise Rs.3000/- benefited by 24 respondents, Rs.4000/- by 29 respondents, Rs.5000/- by 51 respondents and Rs6000/- amount benefited by 20 respondents. In this category Rs.5000/- beneficiaries are more with 51 numbers, followed by Rs.4000/- with 29 numbers.

In case of gattu nirmana works only 24 works taken up in all the four villages. The Lambada tribe has benefited with 20 respondents and Chenchu tribe with 4 respondents got the benefit from the MGNREGA scheme. Amount wise beneficiaries Rs.3000/- benefited by 5 respondents, Rs.4000/- benefited by 7 respondents, Rs.5000/- benefited by 8 respondents from Lambada tribe only and Rs.6000/- benefited by 4 respondents from Chenchu tribe.

In case of stone clearance works there are about 52 respondents who benefited from the MGNREGA scheme during the 21015-16 financial year in the four selected tribal villages. 20 respondents from Gond tribe, 25 respondents from Koya tribe, 5 respondents from Chenchu tribe and 2 respondents from Lambada tribe are benefited from the scheme. Out of which 7 respondents benefited from Rs.3000/- of amount, 16 respondents from Rs.000/- , 19 respondents from Rs5000/-and 10 respondents from Rs.6000/- of amounts are benefited.

Table.6.22: Private Agricultural and Non-Agricultural Works Taken up (Category - 2)

Private Agricultural and Non- agricultural works	Beharanguda /Kundel Pahad (Gond)	Gummadidoddi (Koya)	Yerrapenta (Chenchu)	Ootai Thanda (Lambada)	Total
	No of Beneficiaries	No of Beneficiaries	No of Beneficiaries	No of Beneficiaries	
Teakwood Plantation	04	--	--	90	94
Mango Plantation	05	--	--	10	15
Malbary Plantation	05	02	--	--	07
Coconut Plantation	--	--	50	--	50
Total	14	02	50	100	166

Source: Field survey 2015-16.

Table 6.22 gives the information about the private agricultural and non-agricultural works taken up in the selected four tribal villages during the financial year

2015-16. Among the four tribal villages about 166 works were taken up to benefit 166 respondent households in the four villages. The main works completed in the four villages are teakwood plantation, mango plantation, Malabar plantation and coconut plantation. Out of which teakwood plantation was initiated more in the with 94 beneficiaries among the four tribes. Here 90 Lambada tribe households come forward to grow 10 plants each at their agricultural fields. 4 Gond tribe respondents also come forward to grow the teakwood plants in their agricultural land. Mango plantation was taken up in the Beharanguda and Kudelpahad villages of Gond tribe with 5 respondents planted mango samples in their agricultural land one acre each, and in Lambada tribe, 10 respondents also started mango plantation in the fields of the respondents. Malbar plantation was extensively taken up in the Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages and benefited to 5 respondents in the villages. In Gummadidoddi village also 2 respondents are cultivating malbar. Coconut plantation was extensively taken up in the Yerrapenta village of Chenchu tribe at about 50 plants were given to 50 respondents and they are planted at their household premises.

Table.6.23: Details of Migration before and After MGNREGS

Details	Beharanguda /Kundel Pahad (Gond)		Gummadidoddi (Koya)		Yerrapenta (Chenchu)		Ootai Thanda (Lambada)	
	Before NREGA	After NREGA	Before NREGA	After NREGA	Before NREGA	After NREGA	Before NREGA	After NREGA
Male	35	15	5	4	23	3	50	20
Female	30	10	3	2	22	2	50	20
Total	65	25	8	6	45	5	100	40
Migration reduced	--	40	--	2	--	40	--	60
Places of Migration	1.Hyderabad 2.Mumbai		1.Chattisgarh 2. Mumbai.		1.Chennai 2.Rajasthan		1.Hyderabad 2.Maharashtra	

Source: Field survey 2015-16.

Table 6.23 gives the information about the migration details among the selected four tribes in selected villages. The total persons out migrated before the start of MGNREGA scheme from the four villages are 218, out of which 65 persons out migrated from Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages of Gond tribe, 8 persons from Gummadidoddi of Koya tribe, 45 persons from Yerrapenta village of Chenchu tribe and 100 persons from Ootai thanda village of Lambada tribe. Out of this 218 migrated persons

113 male persons and 105 are female persons. The lambada tribe respondents were used to go for out migration more among the four tribes with roughly 100 persons which includes 50 male and 50 female. But after the start of MGNREGA scheme this out migration has come down to 76 persons from all the four households. Some of the out migrated people have stopped to go outside of the village in search of employment because of the MGNREGA is providing 100 days of employment for rural household in a year at minimum wage rate. This made the tribal people to reduce out migration along with agricultural related works in their lands like land leveling, stone clearance, and bush clearance. Gattula nirmanam, band plantation etc. made indirect additional income. There are about 132 respondents who came back to villages from out migration from the four tribes. From Gond tribe about 40 respondents who came back from out migration, in Koya tribe this out migration is very less and 2 respondents who came back from, in case of Chenchu tribe this number is 40, both male and female respondents who came back from out migration, and in case of Lambada tribe the out migration is very high and it has come down in the same manner reduced from 100 persons to 40 persons witnessed 60 persons have come back to village from out migration. All these tribal people prefer to go for out migration to places like Hyderabad, Mumbai, predominantly and Chennai, Rajasthan, Chhattisgarh, Maharashtra.

Table.6.24: Direct Impacts of MGNREGS among Tribes

Direct Impacts – Purchased Items	Beharanguda / Kundel Pahad (Gond)	Gummadidoddi (Koya)	Yerrapenta (Chenchu)	Ootai Thanda (Lambada)	Total
IHHL	6	7	58	8	79
Fan	0	1	26	0	27
T V	5	2	23	14	44
L P G Stove	10	12	0	25	47
Kiranam items	42	58	66	45	211
Paid School / College Fee	0	1	0	0	1
Pesticides and Fertilizers	14	8	2	5	29
Others	43	12	0	0	55
Any 2 of these items	5	2	0	0	7
Any 3 of these items	7	1	0	0	8

Source: Field survey 2015-16.

Table 6.24 analyses the positive impacts of the MGNREGA scheme on the respondents of the selected tribes in selected villages from the starting of the scheme and up to the study period 2015-16. All the respondents from the selected four villages seemed to have the incomes that earned from the MGNREGA scheme for different purposes like purchasing of fan, TV, Gas stove, Kiranam items, payment of school and college fees for their children, fertilizers, pesticides, and other items of their choice. The main positive impact of the scheme and durable item that useful for long time is Individual Household Latrine (IHHLs) about 79 were constructed in the four villages and gained the financial assistance from the government Rs12000/-per one IHHL. The Chenchu tribe respondents got maximum benefit from the scheme and constructed 58 IHHLs out of 75 respondents. The other tribe respondents were managed to construct only 21 IHHLs in the three villages. There are about 27 ceiling fans and table fans were purchased by the respondents in the four villages. The Chenchu tribe managed to purchase 26 fans and 1 fan by Koya tribe. The other important item that the respondents purchased is television sets, which was purchased about 44 sets, out of which Chenchu tribe respondents purchased 23 TV sets and other tribes Gond respondents purchased 5 sets, Koya tribe respondents purchased 2 sets and Lambada tribe respondents purchased 14 sets. Among all the tribes Chenchu tribe has purchased more TV sets.

The next durable item that purchased by the respondents is Liquefied Petroleum Gas stoves about 47 were purchased by all the respondents in the four villages, out of which 25 LPG stoves were purchased by the Lambada tribe, 12 stoves by Koya tribe, and 10 stoves purchased by the Gond tribe respondents. The Chenchu tribe respondents are not interested to purchase the LPG stove because plenty of fire wood is available near to the village.

Majority of the respondents are using the income that earning from the MGNREGA scheme for purchasing of kiranam and general items of their daily use. At about 211 respondents are using their incomes for this purpose only. The Gond tribe 42 respondents answered that they are using the income first for this use only. In Koya tribe about 58 respondents are using this income for purchasing the kiranam items only as their first choice. In respect of Chenchu tribe, about 66 respondents are badly using this income for their necessities for life, and about 45 respondents of Lmabada tribe often use this income for purchasing the kiranam items.

Some of the respondents who worked in the scheme spent that income to purchase fertilizers and pesticides. About 29 respondents used the income for this purpose among the four tribes. Out of 29 respondents 14 respondents from Gond tribe, 8 from Koya tribe, 2 from Chenchu tribe and 5 from Lambada tribe utilized some of the income that they earned in the scheme. Only one respondent from Koya tribe paid the school fee of his child.

Out of all this category of positive impacts, not only single purchase was made by the respondents but as many as 55 respondents were used for other purposes and 7 respondents were used this income for more than one and 8 respondents said that the income was used for more than two needs. Male respondents do the other type of usage mainly to purchase alcohol.

Table.6.25: Negative Effects of MGNREGS among Tribes

Negative Impacts	Beharanguda / Kundel Pahad (Gond)	Gummadidoddi (Koya)	Yerrapenta (Chenchu)	Ootai Thanda (Lambada)	Total
Delay in Wage Payment	19	5	0	7	31
Un Even Land Levelling	26	6	0	5	37
works under taken when not in Need	9	4	3	3	19
Total	54	15	3	15	87

Source: Field survey 2015-16.

Table 6.25 reveals the negative effects of the MGNREGA scheme on the respondents' households. The respondents mainly faced the problems like delay in wage payments, uneven land leveling and employment was provided when the people are not needed. About 87 respondents from the four tribes come forward with their grievances. In Gond tribe villages Beharanguda and Kundel Pahad among 54 respondents 19 respondents expressed their views that delay in wage payment is taking place for a period of more than two months some times which is causing for the low level of participation in the scheme, and going for the other works, about 26 respondents in these villages said that land leveling is beneficial for the farmers but uneven land leveling is troubling more and force the farmers to do the same work again. Lastly about 9 respondents from Gond tribe

said that the officers are providing the works when the villagers are busy in their agricultural works which causing to absent in the scheme employment.

In Koya tribal village Gummadidoddi also about 15 respondents reacted negatively regarding the implementation of the scheme in the village. 5 respondents are clearly told that wages are paid more than 2 months in all the cases, 6 respondents fired about uneven landlevelling works in the scheme and caused huge amount of expenditure even after the land leveling work finished in the scheme, and finally 4 respondents from Koya tribe complained about works are provided when they are not needed.

In Chenchu tribal village Yerrapenta also a minor problem with respect to works under taking time, just 3 respondents had a different opinion about the works under taking time.

In case of Lambada tribe Ootai thanda about 15 respondents out of total 75 respondents in the village come out with different opinion. 7 respondents said that wage payment took long time even more than 3 months some times which causing to forget of number of days of work participated in the scheme, 5 respondents said that land leveling works undertaken in their land but of no use later on once again they undertaken the same work at the time of monsoons, and 3 respondents also not happy regarding provision of employment for the households that they are providing the employment when the people are busy with their agricultural activities which makes no use of providing the employment.

6.3. Impacts of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme On Selected tribes in Selected Villages :

As The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) is being implemented in the country for all most one decade since its inception. It has multiple impacts on the economy in general and job card holders in particular. The present study reveals about the impact on selected tribes in selected villages in Telangana state on the specified objectives. They are (i) Person days employed (ii) Durable assets created (iii) Migration, and (iv) Agricultural Wages. Let us discuss about them.

6.3.1: Person Days Employed in a Year :

1. The Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages are two small hamlets of Gond tribe in Chintapally gram panchayat of Adilabad district in Telangana state. In these villages all the households are directly or indirectly dependent on agriculture for their livelihood as farmers as well as laborers. Generally their employment is dependent mostly on rainfall. About 50 percent of the cultivated land in the village is having irrigation facilities like water supply by canals of the Kadam project and rest of the lands possess the bore wells. The workers in the villages are engaged in the works like sowing, harvestation, spraying of pesticides, fertilizers, and other related works. Remaining days they were engaged in non-agricultural works like digging works, land development works, etc. If the monsoons delay or fail in a season the employment situation worsen the situation in the villages. During the last decade due to lack of proper rainfall both canal water stopped and bore wells become dry. The MGNREGS has been implemented in these villages from April 2006, and then onwards they are getting employment from the scheme. The average number of days of employment created in these villages is 80 days per annum. Majority of the job card holder's households worked more than 50 days yearly and a few job card holders households worked less than 50 days annually.
2. The Gummadidoddi village is a Koya tribe village in Khammam district of Telangana state. In this village all the households are directly or indirectly dependent on agriculture for their livelihood as a farmers as well as laborers. Generally their employment is dependent mostly on rainfall. About 90 percent of the cultivated land in the village is not having any irrigational facilities and completely dependent on rainfall. The workers in the village are engaged in the works like sowing, harvestation, spraying of pesticides, fertilizers, and other related works. Remaining days they were engaged in non-agricultural works like digging works, land development works, etc. If the monsoons delay or fail in a season the employment situation worsen the situation in the villages. During the pre- MGNREGS period the people suffered a lot for employment.

The MGNREGS has been implementing in this village from April 2006, and then onwards they are getting employment from the scheme. The average number of days

of employment created in the village is 70 days per annum. Majority of the job card holder's households worked more than 50 days yearly and a few job card holders households worked less than 50 days annually.

3. The Yerrapenta village is a Chenchu tribe village in Chennampally gram pachayat of Mahabubnagar district of Telangana state. In this village all the households are directly or indirectly dependent on agriculture for their livelihood as a farmers as well as laborers. Generally their employment is dependent mostly on rainfall. About 90 percent of the cultivated land in the village is not having any irrigational facilities and completely dependent on rainfall. The workers in the village are engaged in the works like sowing, harvestation, spraying of pesticides, fertilizers, and other related works. Remaining days they were engaged in non-agricultural works like digging works, land development works, etc. If the monsoons delay or fail in a season the employment situation worsen the situation in the villages. During the pre- MGNREGS period the people suffered a lot for employment. Some of households used to go for migration to cities like Chennai and Rajasthan in search of employment with yearly contract at meager wages.

The MGNREGS has been implementing in the village from April 2009, and then onwards they are getting employment from the scheme. The average number of days of employment created in the village is 300 days per household per annum. Majority of the job card holder's households worked more than 300 days yearly and a few job card holders households worked even more than 300 days annually. This is because of the special provision made by the Integrated Tribal Development Agency (ITDA) in this district provision of employment for 180 days in a year per person. With the efforts of ITDA the adivasi chenchu people are getting employment and income regularly and getting square meal a day in majority of days in a year.

4. The Ootai thanda is a big thanda of Ootai gram panchayat of Kothaguda mandal in Warangal district of Telangana state. In this village the Lambada tribe people used to live and all the households are directly or indirectly dependent on agriculture for their livelihood as farmers as well as laborers. Generally their employment is dependent mostly on rainfall. About 50 percent of the cultivated land in the village is having irrigation facilities like water supply by canals of the pakala pond, individual bore

wells. The workers in the villages are engaged in the works like sowing, harvestation, spraying of pesticides, fertilizers, and other related works. Remaining days they were engaged in non-agricultural works like digging works, land development works, etc. If the monsoons delay or fail in a season the employment situation worsen the situation in the village. During the last decade due to lack of proper rainfall both canal water stopped and bore wells become dry and led to unemployment situation in the village. During the drought the people prefer migration to Hyderabad in search of employment as hamali workers in construction field.

The MGNREGS has been implementing in the village from April 2006, and then onwards they are getting employment from the scheme. The average number of days of employment created in the village is 70 days per annum. Majority of the job card holder's households worked more than 50 days yearly and a few job card holders households worked less than 50 days annually. This is because of low wage rates and delay in the payment in the scheme.

6.3.2. Durable Assets Created :

The main objective of the MGNREGS is to provide productive employment to all the needy and eligible, people in the rural areas. But this work guarantee can also serve other objective of generating productive assets in the villages to enhance the living standards of the people and domestic animals in the villages.

1. The Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages are two small hamlets of Gond tribe in Chintapally gram panchayat of Adilabad district in Telangana state. The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) has been implemented in the villages since 2006. Since then about 19 Individual Household Latrines (IHHLs) constructed in the two villages, and they are making use of these latrines and very much useful in rainy season for female members in the villages. About 11 roads were constructed in the two hamlets for the past decade out of which they are useful for the villagers to move among the neighbour villages and roads leading to agricultural fields. Before the start of the MGNREGS construction and repair of roads take much delay after the demand of the people. About 20 farm ponds were constructed in the villages and villagers are making use of the water that stored in the

ponds for agricultural activities and for the domestic animals in the villages. The sinking pits that they were undertaken in the villages are 150 in number and are useful for the villagers. Band plantation was taken up around 600 plants in the two villages. The farmers who planted trees in the lands, they are getting fruits now like mango, mulberry in the form small income annually. Deepening of tanks were taken up in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages in 2 numbers and the water that stored in the tanks were useful for cultivation for the nearby lands in the situations of delay in rains.

2. The Gummadioddi village is a small gram panchayat of Khammam district in Telangana state. The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) has been implementing in the village since 2006. Since then about 5 Individual Household Latrines (IHHLs) constructed in the village, and they are making use of these latrines and very much useful in rainy season for female members in the village. About 2 roads were constructed in the village for the past decade, out of which they are useful for the villagers to move among the neighbouring villages and roads leading to agricultural fields. Before the start of the MGNREGS construction and repair of roads take much delay after the demand of the people. About 7 farm ponds were constructed in the village and villagers are making use of the water that stored in the ponds for agricultural activities and for the domestic animals in the village. The sinking pits that they were undertaken in the village are 20 in number and are useful for the villagers. Band plantation was taken up around 70 plants in the village. The farmers who planted trees in the lands, they are getting fruits now like mango, teakwood, and mulberry in the form small income annually. Deepening of tanks was taken up in village in 5 numbers and the water that stored in the tanks was useful for cultivation for the nearby lands in the situations of delay in rains.
3. The Yerrapenta village is a small hamlet of Chennampally gram panchayat of Mahabubnagar district in Telangana state. The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) has been implementing in the village since 2009. Since then about 45 Individual Household Latrines (IHHLs) constructed in the village, and they are making use of these latrines and very much useful in rainy season for female members in the village. About 3 roads were constructed in the

village for the past decade, out of which they are useful for the villagers to move among the neighbour villages and roads leading to agricultural fields. Before the start of the MGNREGS construction and repair of roads take much delay after the demand of the people. About 2 Farm ponds were constructed in the village and villagers are making use of the water that stored in the ponds for agricultural activities and for the domestic animals in the village. The sinking pits that they were undertaken in the village are 20 in number and are useful for the villagers. Band plantation was taken up around 50 plants in the village. The farmers who planted trees in the lands, they are getting fruits now like coconut, mulberry in the form small income annually. Deepening of tanks was taken up in village in 3 numbers and the water that stored in the tanks was useful for cultivation for the nearby lands in the situations of delay in rains.

4. The Ootai thanda is a small hamlet of Ootai gram panchayat of Warangal district in Telangana state. The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) has been implementing in the village since 2006. Since then about 10 Individual Household Latrines (IHHLs) constructed in the village, and they are making use of these latrines and very much useful in rainy season for female members in the village. About 6 roads were constructed in the village for the past decade, out of which they are useful for the villagers to move among the neighbouring villages and roads leading to agricultural fields. Before the start of the MGNREGS construction and repair of roads take much delay after the demand of the people. About 4 farm ponds were constructed in the village and villagers are making use of the water that stored in the ponds for agricultural activities and for the domestic animals in the village. The sinking pits that they were undertaken in the village are 261 in number and are useful for the villagers. Band plantation was taken up around 30 plants in the village. The farmers who planted trees in the lands, they are getting fruits now like mango teakwood and mulberry in the form small income annually. Deepening of tanks was taken up in village in 2 numbers and the water that stored in the tanks was useful for cultivation for the nearby lands in the situations of delay in rains.

6.3.3. Agricultural Wages :

Even though the main objective of the MGNREGS is to provide productive employment to all the needy and eligible people in the rural areas, but this employment guarantee must be backed by the minimum wage rate prevailed in the respective state. This minimum wage rate differs from state to state in the country. It ranges from Rs 60/- to Rs 190/- from the year 2006-07 to 2015-16 financial years in the country in the MGNREGS. Here we aimed at studying the impact of MGNREGS on agricultural wages in the selected villages in the state of Telangana.

- 1 The Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages are two small hamlets of Gond tribe in Chintapally gram panchayat of Adilabad district in Telangana state. The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) has been implementing in the villages since 2006. The average agricultural wage rate received by the labour respondents in the villages is Rs 80/- per day per person for female worker and Rs 100/- per day per person for male labour before the start of MGNREGS and it increased to Rs 100/- per day per female and Rs 150/- for male labour per day after the start of the MGNREGS and by the year 2015-16. The impact of MGNREGS on agricultural wages in these two Gond tribal villages is significant and increased by 25 percent on female wages and 50 percent on male wages.
- 2 In the Gummadioddi village of Koya tribe in Khammam district, The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) has been implementing in the village since 2006. The average agricultural wage rate received by the labour respondents in the village is Rs 80/- per day per for female worker and Rs 100/- per day for male worker before the start of MGNREGS and it increased to Rs 100/- per day per female and Rs 150/- for male labour per day after the start of the MGNREGS and by the year 2015-16. The impact of MGNREGS on agricultural wages in this tribal village is significant and increased by 25 percent on female wages and 50 percent on male wages.
- 3 In Yerrapenta village of Chenchu tribe in Mahabubnagar district, The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) has been implementing in the village since 2009. The average agricultural wage rate received

by the labour respondents in the village is Rs 80/- per day per for female worker and Rs 100/- per day for male worker before the start of MGNREGS and it increased to Rs 100/- per day per female and Rs 150/- for male worker per day after the start of the MGNREGS and by the year 2015-16. The impact of MGNREGS on agricultural wages in this tribal village is significant and increased by 25 percent on female wages and 50 percent on male wages.

- 4 In Ootai thanda village of Lambada tribe in Warangal district, The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) has been implementing in the village since 2006. The average agricultural wage rate received by the labour respondents in the village is Rs 80/- per day per for female worker and Rs 120/- per day for male worker before the start of MGNREGS and it increased to Rs 150/- per day per female and Rs 200/- for male worker per day after the start of the MGNREGS and by the year 2015-16. The impact of MGNREGS on agricultural wages in this tribal village is very significant and increased by all most 100 percent on female wages and 75 percent on male wages.

6.3.4. Migration :

The main objective of the MGNREGS is to provide productive employment to all the needy and eligible people in the rural areas. This work guarantee can also reduce the rural urban migration through the country. We can observe some of the facts in the selected villages regarding rural urban migration.

1. The Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages are two small hamlets of Gond tribe in Chintapally gram panchayat of Adilabad district in Telangana state. The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) has been implementing in the villages since 2006. The villagers used to go for work to Hyderabad and Mumbai in summer season. Before the start of the MGNREGS 65 persons both male and female workers migrate to cities in search of employment. This number has come down to 35 and reduced migration by 30 persons after the start of MGNREGS in the village by the study period. The people are able to find employment in the village itself by 100 days per year.

2. The Gummadioddi village is in Khammam district in Telangana state. The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) has been implementing in the village since 2006. In this village migration is very less because majority of the villagers are having land of their own and are busy with agricultural works. Even though a very small number of persons went to migration to Mumbai and Chhattisgarh. Before the start of the MGNREGS this number is 8 both male and female workers and this has come down to 6 after the start of MGNREGS in the village.
3. The Yerrapenta village is a Chenchu tribal village Mahabubnagar district of Telangana state. The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) has been implementing in the village since 2009. In this village the people used to go for migration to Chennai and Rajasthan in search of employment throughout the year with an agreement at very less wages both for male and female workers. This is a drought and hill area with forest surrounded locality and very less rainfall not only in the village but also in the district. Before the start of MGNREGS the people migrated from the village is 45 and it has reduced to 5 after the start of MGNREGS by the year 2015-16. The people returned from migration due to the effect of the MGNREGS are 40 which are very high in a small village.
4. The Ootai thanda is a Lambada tribal villagin the Warangal district of Telangana state. The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) has been implementing in the village since 2006. In this village the people used to go for migration to Hyderabad and Maharastra in search of employment during the summer season and some people go for the whole year. Before the start of the MGNREGS in the village there are about 100 persons used to for migration and it has come down to 40 persons who include both male and females. With implementation of the MGNREGS in the village people are able to get employment in the village itself for 80 days in a year and which makes them to look after their agricultural works in the village. As a result almost 60 persons have stopped to go for migration in the village by the study period of 2015-16.

6.4. Conclusion :

At the village level the programme has been implementing in a mixed way. The Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages of Gond tribe are doing well in the district level, whereas Gummadidoddi village of Koya tribe and Ootai thanda of Lambada villages are far behind the other villages in their districts. On the other hand Yerrapenta village of Chenchu tribe is doing extremely well than the other three tribes in terms of person days, wage rate per day per person. The involvement and special provisions of ITDA in Yerrapenta village of Chenchu tribe they are able to get 180 days of employment per year per person, which is a quite different and unique feature of the act where we cannot find. The wage rate is also higher than agricultural wage in the village. The durable, agricultural and non-agricultural works are better undertaken in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages of Gond tribe. Migration has come down significantly in Yerrapenta village of Chenchu tribe, and Ootai thanda of Lambada village. The agricultural wages are increased almost same in all the villages. The payment of wages are much delayed in all most all the villages beyond the two months after the works completed, except in the Yerrapenta village of Chenchu tribe due to the involvement of ITDA. The overall conclusion of the study on the scheme is Chenchu tribe is benefited more among selected four tribes, next to this Gond tribe respondents and their villages got benefited and rest of the two tribes Koya and Lambada tribes' people and their villages are far behind.

CHAPTER – 07

Summary and Conclusions

7.1. Summary and Conclusion:

The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act 2005 is one of the largest public programmes launched for the benefit of the rural poor, which confer the right to guaranteed employment up to 100 days in a year to every eligible and poor household in rural areas of the country. If the programme is implemented according to act, it has the potential to provide significant empowerment of the large number of the rural poor and those who are living below poverty line. The MGNREGS seems to offer the safety net and employment that many rural households needs due to the seasonal and fluctuated nature of employment opportunities. The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) is a targeted public works programme planned to provide a minimum safety net to the rural poor in India, started in 2006 and it is currently the largest public works programme in India.

From the first five year plan onwards there has been so many similar attempts to provide a minimum level of security of livelihood and to prevent against famines and other adverse shocks. Against the backdrop of growing and chronic agricultural distress, farmers' suicides, rising malnutrition, trickle down failure, continuous raising in migration and rural distress this act the pre-existing wage employment programmes the National Food for Work Programme (NFFPW), and the Sampoorna Grameena Rozgar Yojana (SGRY) were merged and introduced a new scheme is National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS) by National Rural Employment Guarantee Act which was passed by Indian Parliament on 23rd August 2005. From 3rd November 2014, onwards it was renamed as Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS). The act was seen as a landmark in ensuring minimum level of living and security to incomes in rural households, especially in lean agricultural seasons, and was the outcome of a long and sustained effort by activists, political leaders from across the country. The scheme has designed to counter the weaknesses of the earlier programs through several features in its design.

The MGNREGS guarantee provision of work within 15 days of demand for work. The proposed Act goes beyond poverty alleviation and recognizes employment as a legal right. It is not only increase the income of the poor, but the asset creation through the process of employment would generate a much-needed productive infrastructure for poverty alleviation on a permanent basis.

The scheme provides a legal guarantee for one hundred days of employment in every financial year to adult members of any rural household willing to do unskilled manual work at the respective state's minimum wage rate. The employment is for casual and manual works on public works provided within 15 days of application and located within five kilometres distance of the village. If the work is not provided to a person within 15 days of time period, the person will be paid an unemployment allowance to that will be at least 1/3rd of the minimum wage. The state is obligated to ensure certain worksite facilities such as drinking water, shade, medical aid, and crèche if there are more than five children below the age of six years. Social audit and transparency are built into the Act, promoting accountability to stakeholders.

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

- Water conservation and water harvesting
- Drought proofing (including a forestation and tree plantation
- Irrigation canals including micro and minor irrigation works
- Provision of irrigational facilities to land owned by the SCs and STs
- Renovation of traditional water bodies
- Land development
- Flood control and protection works including drainage in water logged areas
- Rural connectivity to provide all-weather access and
- Any other works notified by the central and the state governments.

The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act 2005 came into force from 1st April 2006 in 200 districts of most backward in India as a first phase and added another 130 districts from 1st April 2007 in its second phase and all the remaining districts in the country were covered from 1st April 2008 onwards. During the financial year, 2015-16 all India level provision of employment per household was about 1290.266

lacks of cumulative households were issued the job cards in the country, out of which SCs are 274.672 lacks, STs are 174.797 lacks and others are 840.797 lacks. The total no of households actively working was 481.324 lacks out of which SCs are 109.287 lacks, STs are 81.172 lacks, and Others are 290.86 lacks. Out of the total working households in the country women workers are participating at about 363.67 lacks. Out of 1290.266 lacks of job card holders there are about 481.324 lacks of households are actively participating in the scheme, out of which SCs 109.287 lacks, STs 81.172 lacks, Others 290.86 lacks of job card holders are actively involved in the scheme during the financial year 2015-16. At all India level women workers are participated in the scheme was about 363.67 lacks during the financial year 2015-16. If we look at the households who completed 100 days of employment during the financial year 2015-16 SCs 10.441 lacks, STs 9.70 lacks, Others 28.34 lacks and together 48.48 lacks of households completed 100 days of employment. The states like West Bengal (12.7 lacks), Tamil Nadu (12.57 lacks), Uttar Pradesh (11.29 Lacks), Rajasthan (8.77 lacks) and Andhra Pradesh (7.49 lacks) are the top 5 performing states in the country, as against to these, the states like Goa (0.012 lacks), Sikkim (0.136 lacks) Haryana (0.35 lacks), Arunachal Pradesh (0.377lacks), and Mizoram (0.395 lacks) are bottom level performance states in the country.

In Telangana state the MGNREGA scheme has been implementing since 2006 in 9 districts, out of which four districts, Adilabad is selected for Gond tribe, Khammam for Koya tribe, Mahabubnagar district selected for Chenchu tribe and Warangal district selected for Lambada tribe. In the state there are about 5682579 households were issued job cards until the year 2016. Out of which 2490956 households are actively participating in the scheme, which accounts for 43.83 percent of total issued job cards. SCs constitutes for 598181 households (24.01 %), STs 431535 (17.32%), BCs 1314167 (52.76%), 147073 (5.90%) of total households in the state. Performance wise the districts like Nizamabad 275456 households (57.06 %), Adilabad with 306728 households (53.22%) are the top performing districts in the state, and the districts like Mahabubnagar with 332700 households (36.17 %), Nalgonda with 317581 (36.18 %) are bottom level involving in the state.

Among the districts, Adilabad district is selected for Gond tribe. In this district there 52 mandals and MGNREGS has been implementing in the district since 2006. The total households are given job cards are 576338, out of which 306728 households were

actively involved in the scheme until the financial year 2015-16, which accounts for 53.22 percent of total issued cards. SCs 70891 households (23.11%), STs 91962 households (29.98%), BCs 132693 households (43.26%), and Others 11182 households (3.64%) of households are actively involving in the scheme in the district. In the mandal wise performance there are 5 mandals in top like Nennal mandal with 76.45 %, Vemanpalle mandal with 74.16 %, Kotapalle mandal with 73.77 %, Dahegaon mandal with 73.63 %, and Sirpur (U) mandal with 66.69 % are the top mandals in the district in provision of employment during the financial year 2015-16. As against to these there are 5 mandals who are doing low level of performance in the district. The mandals like Mancherial with 38 % of households, Bela mandal with 38.66 % of households, Mudhole mandal with 39.53 % of households, Nirmal mandal with 40.13 % of households, and Talamadugu mandal with 42 % of households are actively participated in the scheme in the financial year 2015-16. Khammam district is selected for Koya tribe, in this district there are 41 mandals and MGNREGS has been implementing in the district since 2006. The total households are given job cards are 554442, out of which 217409 households were actively involved in the scheme until the financial year 2015-16, which accounts for 39.21 percent of total issued cards. SCs 44507 households (20.47%), STs 84469 households (38.85%), BCs 73087 households (33.62%), and Others 15346 households (7.059%) of households are actively involving in the scheme in the district. In the mandal wise performance there are 5 mandals in top like Dummugudem mandal with 57.08 % of households, Nelakondapalle mandal with 52.49 % of households, Bonakal mandal with 52.07 % of households, Tekulapalle mandal with 50.83 % households, and Palwancha mandal with 50.52 % of households are the top mandals in the district in provision of employment during the financial year 2015-16. As against to these there are 5 mandals who are doing low level of performance in the district. The mandals like Bhadrachalam mandal with 8.36 % of households, Kamepalle mandal with 20.90 % of households, Kothagudem mandal with 20.91 % of households, Burgampadu mandal with 26.34 % of households, and Bayyaram mandal with 28.22 % of households are only actively participated in the scheme in the financial year 2015-16.

Mahabubnagar district is selected for Chenchu tribe, in this district there are 64 mandals and MGNREGS has been implementing in the district since 2009. The total households are given job cards are 919778, out of which 332700 households were actively involved in the scheme until the financial year 2015-16, which accounts for 36.17

percent of total issued cards. SCs 74285 households (22.33%), STs 28012 households (8.42%), BCs 210688 households (63.33%), and Others 19715 households (5.92%) of households are actively involving in the scheme in the district. BCs are more involved in the scheme in the district. In the mandal wise performance there are 5 mandals in top like Pebbair mandal with 63.37 % of households, Midjil mandal with 53.65 % of households, Peddamandadi mandal with 49.43 % of households, Bhoothpur mandal with 48.63 % of households, and Wanaparthi mandal with 47.85 % of households are the top mandals in the district in provision of employment during the financial year 2015-16. As against to these there are 5 mandals who are doing low level of performance in the district. The mandals like Kothur with 4.96 % of households, Farooqnagar mandal with 20.43 % of households, Mahabubnagar mandal with 21.70 % of households, Lingal mandal with 23.00 % of households, and Amrabad mandal with 23.16 % of households are actively participated in the scheme in the financial year 2015-16.

Warangal district is selected for Lambada tribe, in this district there 50 mandals and MGNREGS has been implementing in the district since 2006. The total households given job cards are 714242, out of which 329974 households were actively involved in the scheme until the financial year 2015-16, which accounts for 46.20 percent of total issued cards. SCs 67305 households (20.40%), STs 71692 households (21.73%), BCs 175252 households (53.11%), and Others 15725 households (4.76%) of households are actively involving in the scheme in the district. BCs are more involved in the scheme in the district. In the mandal wise performance there are 5 mandals in top like Duggondi mandal with 70.42 % of households, Devaruppula mandal with 61.02 % of households, Gudur mandal with 58.70 % of households, Nekkonda mandal with 58.51 % of households, and Maddur mandal with 58.19 % of households are the top mandals in the district in provision of employment during the financial year 2015-16. As against to these there are 5 mandals who are doing low level of performance in the district. The mandals like Hanamkonda with 6.19 % of households, Hasanparthy mandal with 18.53 % of households, Geesugonda mandal with 22.21 % of households, Parkal mandal with 36.37 % of households, and Ganapur mandal with 37.68 % of households are actively participated in the scheme in the financial year 2015-16.

7.2. Findings from the Study :

1. The MGNREGS has been implementing since 2006 in the three villages Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages of Gond tribe, Gummadidoddi village of Koya tribe and Ootai thanda village of Lambada tribe, but in Yerrapenta village of Chenchu tribe the scheme has been implementing from 2009 onwards.
2. The MGNREGS has the unique feature of 100 days of employment to a household in financial year for those who come forward to do unskilled manual work in the rural areas, but in the villages the the job card holders are not provided 100 days of employment in a year, except in Yerrapenta village of Chenchu tribe.
3. In the three villages like Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages of Gond tribe, Gummadidoddi village of Koya tribe and Ootai thanda village of Lambada tribe, 88 respondents were got employment below 50 days in a year, and around 139 respondents worked below 100 days i.e. upto 80 days on an average. In Gummadidoddi village 58 respondents out of 75, got employment upto 50 days and in the Gond and Lambada tribes roughly 60 respondents got employment upto 80 days in a year. As against to thses three tribes Chenchu tribe respondents in Yerrapenta village 73 out of 75, got employment more than 100 days i.e. 101 days to up to 500 days. This was materialised by the involvement of Integrated Tribal Development Agency (ITDA), which gave special permission to provide 180 days of employment per person per year.
4. The MGNREGS wage rates received by the respondents in the selected four tribal villages are also differ from one village to another. This was categorised for two periods like 2006-2011 and 2011-16. In the first 5 year term it was ranged from Rs.50/- to Rs.100/-. The average wage rate received by the majority of the respondents was Rs.70/- per day per person in the first 5 year period of time.
5. In the second term of 5 years from 2011 to 2016 the average wage rate received by the four tribes ranged from Rs.90/- to Rs.180/- per day per person. In Gond tribe 75 respondents received a variety of wages from 90 to 160/- , in Koya tribe majority

received Rs.130/-, the Lambada tribe respondents received Rs.100/- and finally majority of the Chenchu tribe respondents received Rs.180/- per day per person.

6. The agricultural wage rates in the selected four tribal villages have influenced by the MGNREGS to increase up to a marginal level. The wage rate in the Yerrapenta village of Chenchu tribe has increased from Rs.80/- to Rs.150/- , in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages of Gond tribe and Gummadidoddi village of Koya tribe it was Rs.100/- and increased to Rs.150/- per day per person. And in Ootai thana of Lambada tribe the agricultural wage rate before the MGNREGS it was Rs.100/- and it has increased to Rs.150/- per day per person after the start of MGNREGS. In the Yerrapenta village of Chenchu tribe it was almost doubled. In Gond and Koya tribal villages it was increased up to 50 percent.
7. The durable assets created among in the four tribal villages are almost same in nature and their usages. The assets are individual household latrines (IHHL), construction of roads, farm ponds, sinking pits, band plantation, deepening of tanks etc. The number may vary from village to village but the works are same.
8. The villagers were benefited from the IHHLs especially by Chenchu tribe in Yerrapenta village and built up to 45 IHHLs, out of 75 respondents, Gonds with 19 IHHLs. Roads which include internal and external roads especially in rainy seasons for their agricultural activities, road connectivity to neighbouring villages and farm ponds, deepening of tanks were also very much useful for the farmers as well as for domestic animals.
9. The private agricultural and non-agricultural works that were taken up in all the four tribal villages are like land levelling, bush clearance, gattu nirmana works, stone clearance teakwood plantation, mango plantation, malbary plantation, and govt school plantation. The number of beneficiaries may differ from village to village. The majority of the respondents benefited from this agricultural works is from land levelling, next to this is teakwood plantation.
10. Migration, one of the main objective of the MGNREGS to curb it in the country, it is reduced to some extent in some tribal villages and it has no impact on some tribes. In

Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages of Gond tribe migration has come down from 65 persons before the start of MGNREGS to 30 persons after the start of the MGNREGS, which makes it clear that 30 persons stopped to go for work outside the village. In Gummadidoddi village of Koya tribe it has no impact or little impact that only 2 persons come back from the migration.

In Yerrapenta village of Chenchu tribe 20 persons come back from migration and still some more people are also want to come back after their agreement is over with the employer. In Ootai thanda of Lambada tribe also migration has come down drastically from 100 persons to 40 persons makes it clear that 60 persons come back from migration due to MGNREGS. Among all the four tribes a total of 112 households out of 300 households have come back from migration up to the financial year 2015-16.

11. Positive impacts of the MGNREGS can be seen on the four tribes in different way. The respondents who purchased different consumer durable items with the incomes that they earned from the MGNREGS like IHHL, fans, T.V, LPG stoves, pesticides and fertilisers, and majority of the respondents used the money for purchase of kiranam and general items for daily usage.
12. There are some negative impacts also noticed in the four villages like delay in wage payments after 15 days of work finished, un-even land levelling in the works caused the farmers to repeat the works and the main defect of the scheme in the some of the villages is works were undertaken when the people are busy with their agricultural activities and which makes them to absent in the scheme works.
13. The job card holders are not demanding the works for a period of 100 days in a year as these people don't have knowledge about the act.
14. In no village the unemployment allowance is paid, even though the time gap occurred more than 15 days between registration of applications and employment provision.
15. The works undertaken in the four tribal villages are mostly private agricultural and non-agricultural works like land levelling, bush clearance, stone clearance, band

plantation, teakwood plantation, and public works like farm ponds, deepening of tanks, etc.

16. Wages received under the programme are found to be below the minimum wage rates in many cases and it ranges between Rs.70 to 130/- which is much below than the market wage rates. But in Yerrapenta village of Chenchu tribe they received a moderate wage rate of Rs.180/- per day per person.
17. There is difference in the wage rates between men and women.
18. There are no proper facilities at work site except drinking water, as there is no demand from the workers.
19. There was no proper maintenance and supervision conducted at the work site for the distribution of works and taking measurements and allocation of labour for the works. The mate system is good in all the four villages.
20. The field assistants are role is good in Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages of Gond tribe and he received the best field assistant shield in the Adilabad district for the year 2015, and also in Yerrapenta village of Chenchu tribe field assistant role is good.
21. Social audit takes place regularly but not up to the mark to consider the problems of the workers.
22. The teakwood plantations, mango plantations will give fruits in the near future for those who undertaken.
23. Individual Household Latrines were built in Yerrapenta village up to 45 out of 91 households until the year 2015-16, and there is scope for 100 percent, free from open defecation.

7.3. Policy Suggestions :

1. The study observes that Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme has the potentiality to provide employment and needs to be continued with allotment of more funds especially in tribal agency areas.

2. The study observes that the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme is very much useful for tribes and should be continued with the help of Integrated Tribal Development Agency (ITDA) in all the agency areas of the state in particular and at the national level in general.
3. A majority of the respondents from the tribes like Koya, and Lambada were received very less wages when compared with tribes like Gond and Chenchu. This is to be regulated.
4. Majority of the respondents from Gond, Koya, and Lambada opined that works were undertaken when they are busy with their agricultural works, which nullifies the aim of the act and people from these villages asked for the provision of works when they are in need.
5. The wages paid in all the tribal villages except in Yerrapenta of Chenchu tribe, more than two months of the works completed, which caused for less participation of job card holders. This needs to be corrected.
6. The wage calculation is indeed problematic. Work measurements should be revised by the nature of the work, then only they able to get minimum wage rate.
7. The agricultural works undertaken like land levelling with un-even levels troubled some farmers, which caused them to undertake, the same work second time.
8. The main objective of the Act was to arrest the rural urban migration. These works should also be provided at the time of their migration along with minimum wages.
9. The wages paid in the villages are low and not attractive to stop the migration. To stop the rural urban migration wages are to be paid in attractive on par with the market wages for both men and women.
10. The private agricultural and non-agricultural works like land levelling bush clearance, stone clearance, teakwood plantations, gattu nirmana works are undertaken only in the lands of people who can influence and having rapport with the implementing

agencies. This needs to regulate and preference will be given to all the job card holders on rotation basis irrespective of the size of land holdings.

However, MGNREGS strongly contributed a major role in the provision of employment to the people. But it has some problems and weaknesses in the implementation of the programme, due to this it is becoming ineffectiveness in practice.

APPENDICES

A 1:1 State wise Poverty Details:

**Number and Percentage of Population below Poverty line by State Wise 2004-05
(Based on MRP-Consumption)**

State/ UTs	Rural		Urban		Combined	
	% of Persons	No of Persons (Lakhs)	% of Persons	No of Persons (Lakhs)	% of Persons	No of Persons (Lakhs)
Andhra Pradesh	7.5	43.21	20.7	45.5	11.1	88.71
Arunachal Pradesh	17	1.47	2.4	0.07	13.4	1.54
Assam	17	41.46	2.4	0.93	15	42.39
Bihar	32.9	262.92	28.9	27.09	32.5	290.01
Chhattisgarh	31.2	54.72	34.7	16.39	32	71.11
Goa	1.9	0.13	20.9	1.62	12	1.74
Gujarat	13.9	46.25	10.1	21.18	12.5	67.43
Haryana	9.2	14.57	11.3	7.99	9.9	22.56
Himachal Pradesh	7.2	4.1	2.6	0.17	6.7	4.27
Jammu And Kashmir	2.7	2.2	8.5	2.34	4.2	4.54
Jharkhand	40.2	89.76	16.3	10.63	34.8	100.39
Karnataka	12	43.33	27.2	53.28	17.4	96.6
Kerala	9.6	23.59	16.4	13.92	11.4	37.51
Madhya Pradesh	29.8	141.99	39.3	68.97	32.4	210.97
Maharashtra	22.2	128.43	29	131.4	25.2	259.83
Manipur	17	2.86	2.4	0.14	13.2	3.0
Meghalaya	17	3.32	2.4	0.12	14.1	3.43
Mizoram	17	0.78	2.4	0.11	9.5	0.89
Nagaland	17	2.94	2.4	0.09	14.5	3.03
Odisha	39.8	129.29	40.3	24.3	39.9	153.59
Punjab	5.9	9.78	3.8	3.52	5.2	13.3
Rajasthan	14.3	66.69	28.1	40.5	17.5	107.18
Sikkim	17	0.85	2.4	0.02	15.2	0.87
Tamil Nadu	16.9	56.51	18.8	58.59	17.8	115.1
Tripura	17	4.7	2.4	0.14	14.4	4.85
Uttar Pradesh	25.3	357.68	26.3	100.47	25.5	458.15
Uttarakhand	31.7	21.11	7.75	7.75	31.8	28.86
West Bengal	24.2	146.59	11.2	26.64	20.6	173.23
Andaman & Nicobar	16.9	0.44	18.8	0.27	17.6	0.71
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	36	0.62	19.2	0.16	30.6	0.77
Daman & Diu	1.9	0.03	20.8	0.14	8.0	0.16
Lakshadweep	9.6	0.04	16.4	0.05	12.3	0.09
Puducherry	16.9	0.58	18.8	1.34	18.2	1.92
All-India	21.8	1702.94	21.7	655.81	21.8	2369.13

Source: Compiled from statistics released by Press Information Bureau, Government of India, New Delhi, March 2007.

A 1:2 Poverty Rate in India: (1999-2000 to 2011-12):

Poverty Rate (in percent)	1999-2000	2004-05	2011-12
Rural	27.1	21.8	25.7
Urban	23.6	21.7	13.7
Overall-India	26.1	37.2	21.9

Source: Planning Commission (NITI Aayog), 2011-12.

A 1:3 Work Participation Rate (WPR)

Year	Rural	Urban	Total
1983	44.5	34.0	42.0
1993-94	44.4	34.7	42.0
2004-05	43.9	36.5	42.0
2011-12	40.6	36.7	39.5

Source: NSS Employment and Unemployment Survey 2011-12.

A 1:4 Growths and Elasticity of Employment in India:

Growth Period	India			
	Rural	Urban	All	EE
1983 to 2004-05	1.73	3.07	2.04	0.361
1983 to 1993-94	2.03	3.03	2.25	0.431
1993-94 to 2004-05	1.44	3.11	1.84	0.314
1993-94 to 1999-2000	0.62	2.28	1.02	0.159
1999-2000 to 2004-05	2.43	4.12	2.83	0.495

Source: Computed based on various rounds of NSS Employment and Unemployment Survey Data: DES & CSO for GDP

- Note:** 1. Usual status – Principle and Subsidiary status;
 2. Growth is CAGR and presented in percentage;
 3. EE-Elasticity of Employment (with respect to growth of GDP)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Action for Food Production (AFPRO) (2009). “Infrastructure Development and Beyond; Exploring the scope for sustainable Livelihood support under MGNREGA”. Report submitted to the Ministry of Rural Development / UNDP, New Delhi.
- Administration staff college of India (2009). “Quick Appraisal of MGNREGA in Andhra Pradesh” Report submitted to the Ministry of Rural Development, Hyderabad.
- Amarender, Reddy A. (2013). “Trends in rural wage rates; Whether India reached Lewis Turning Point”, The Indian Economic Journal, Special Issue, December 2013.
- Ambasta, P. P.S. Vijay Shankar and M.Shah (2008) two years of MGNREGA: The Road Ahead; Economic and Political weekly, Vol. 43 no. 8, 23 February, 2008.
- B G Harish, N. Nagaraj et al (2011) “Impacts and Implications of MGNREGA on labour supply and income generation for Agriculture in Central Dry Zone of Karnataka”; Agricultural Economics Research Review, Vol.24 (Conference number) PP 485 – 494.
- Babu, S et al (2011). “Impact of MGNREGS on Agriculture and Rural Labour Markets: A Study of West Bengal, India, NIRD, Hyderabad.
- Banneker, K et al (2012), “MGNREGA Implementation; A cross state comparison”; Woodrow Wilson School, New Jersey, Princeton University.
- Berg et al (2012). “ Can Rural Public works affect Agriculture Wages”; Evidence from India, WPS 2012 – 5, Oxford, Centre for the study of African working papers – 2012.
- Reddy, D N et al (2010). “National Rural Employment Guarantee as a Social Protection”; Blackwell publishing, Oxford Ox 4 2DQ, UK and 350 Main Street, Malden, MA02148, USA.
- Das Gupta, S and Sudershan (2011) “Issues in Labour Market inequality and Women’s Participation in India’s National Rural Employment Guarantee Act” working paper no. 98, Geneva.
- Dheeraja C and H. Rao (2010 “Changing Gender Relation; A Study of MGNREGS across different states”, National Institute of Rural Development. Hyderabad.
- Dr. Prasad, K V S (2012). “Performance of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA)” An over view International Journal of Management & Business studies (IJMBS) Vol.2, Issue 4 Oct-Dec, 2012.
- Dr. P.M. Honnakeri et al (2012) “The Impact of MGNREGA scheme on Rural – Urban Migration in Rural Economy with special reference to Gulbarg District in Karnataka State”. Indian streams Research Journal, Vol.2, and Issue 1/Feb.

- Engler, M. and S. Ravi (2012) “Workfare as an effective way to Fight Poverty: The case of India’s MGNREGS Social Science Research Network; <http://ssrm.com> paper=1336837, accessed on 14th June, 2012.
- G. Sudarshan and V. Srinivasa Rao (2009); “Social Inclusion strategies and the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme” *Indian Journal of Public Administration* Volume LV.No.4 October – December 2009.
- Ghosh, J (2009) “Equity and inclusion through public expenditure. The potential of the MGNREGS” paper presented at the International conference on MGNREGA, New Delhi, 21-22 January 2009.
- Govind Kelkar (2009) “Gender and productive Assets: Implications of National Rural Employment Guarantee for women’s agency and productivity’ FAO – IFAD- ILO workshop on gap, trends and current research in gender dimensions of agricultural and rural employment. Different path ways out of poverty, 31 March – 2 April 2009.
- IFMR foundation Chakraborty, P (2007) “Implementation of National Employment Guarantee Act in India, Spatial Dimensions and Fiscal Implications” *National Institution of Public Finance and Policy*, working paper.
- IIM (Ahmedabad) (2009) “A Quick Appraisal of MGNREGA strategies for the next level report submitted to the Ministry of Rural Development, Ahmedabad Indian Institute of Management.
- Indira, H (2006). “Enhancing Livelihood Security through the National Employment Guarantee Act towards effective implementation of the Act” workin Paper no. 437, Centre for Development Alternatives, Ahmadabad, India.
- Institute for Development of Youth Women and Child (IDYWC) (2010), “Impact Assessment of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme on sustainable Asset creation and livelihood”. Report submitted to Ministry of Rural Development / UNDP – Chindwara.
- Institute to Rural Management Anand (IRMA) (2010), “An impact Assessment study of the usefulness and sustainability of the Assets created under Mahatma Gandhi Rural Employment Guarantee Act in Sikkim, Anand, IRMA.
- Jean Dredge and Reetika Khera (2009) “The Battle for Employment Guarantee” *Front line*, Vol.26 Jan 03-06.
- K. Karemulla et al, Srinivasa Reddy K et al (2009), “Soil and Water conservation works through MGNREGS in Andhra Pradesh – An Analysis of livelihood impact: Agricultural Economics Research Review, Vol.22 (Conference number) PP 443 – 450.
- Khera, R (2008). “Employment Guarantee Act” *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.43 no 35, 30 August, 2008.

- Krishna, Ranvir (2007). “An overview of the features of the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005”.
- Kumar, A.A. (2010) “Effectiveness and ownership of irrigation assets created under MGNREGA and Labour market dynamics in Bihar” MTS Report, Anand, Institute of Rural Management.
- Kumar, P and I. Maruthi (2011). “Impact of MGNREGA on wage rate, food security and rural migration in Karnataka” Report submitted to the Ministry of Agriculture, Bangalore. Agriculture Development and Rural Transformation centre, Institute for Social and Economic change, Bangalore.
- Sunder R M and Laxmana R B (2011). “Implementations of MGNREGS in the Narasannapeta Mandal of Srikakulam District of A.P.” Serial Publications, New Delhi, India PP (81-90).
- M V Rao, et al (2010). “States Report on convergence” initiatives of MGNREGA in India” National Institute for Rural Development, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad – 30.
- Merin’s et al (2012) “Impact of MGNREGS on Labour supply to Agricultural sector of Wyanad Districts in Kerala”. Agriculture Economics Research Review, Vol.25 (No.11) January – June 2012, PP 151 – 155.
- Ministry of Rural Development (MoRD) and National Council of Applied Economic Research (NCAER) – Report August, 2015 – MGNREGA Sameeksha for 2006 – 2012.
- National Federation for India Women (NFIW) (2008) “Socio Economic Empowerment of women under MGNREGA report submitted to the Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India, New Delhi.
- National Rural Employment Guarantee Act 2005 (MGNREGA)”. Ministry of Rural Development Government of India, New Delhi Report (2007).
- P. Tara Kumari and CH. Masenamma (2013), “Impact of MGNREGS on the Economic status of Rural women”; (A study of MGNREGS workers in Visakhapatnam District); The Indian Economic Journal, December 2013; Special Issue.
- Pankaj, A and Tankha (2010). “Effects of the MGNREGS on Women workers: A study in Four states” Economic and political weekly Vol.45, no.30, 24 July.
- Papola, T S (2005). “A Universal Programme is Feasible” Economic and Potential weekly February 12, 2005.
- Pulak Misra, Gagirath Behra et al 2010. “A Development Delivery Institution for the tribal communities; Experience of the MGNREGA in India”. Blackwell publishing, Oxford, OXL2SQ and 350 Mam Street, Malden, MAO2148, USA.

- Raghavendra Jha, Sumit Bhattacharya et al (2009) “Capture of anti-poverty programmes Analysis of the National Rural Employment Guarantee programme in India”. Journals of Asian Economics, 20, PP; 456 – 464.
- Ratan, P et al (2010) “Planning and Implementation of National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme, Bihar” National Institute for Rural Development, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad.
- Rishab, Khosla. (2011). “Caste Politics and Public Good Distribution in India: Evidence from MGNREGS in Andhra Pradesh”. Economic and Political weekly. Vol. XVI No. 12: March 19. 2011.
- Ritesh Sing and Vutukuru V (2008) “Enhancing Accountability in Public Service Delivery through social audits: A case study of Andhra Pradesh, India” Second Year policy analysis Mehotra, S (2008) MGNREGA two years in; where do we go from here?” Economic and Political weekly August 2-8, 2008.
- S. Krishnan and A. Bala Krishnan (2012) “The Impact of watershed works of MGNREGA on poverty alleviation. A micro level study”; Indian Streams Research Journal Vol. 2, issue 8, Sept 2012.
- S. Subramanyam et al (2010) “Planning and Implementation of National Rural Employment Scheme in Orissa” NIRD, Ministry of Rural Development, Govt. of India, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad.
- Samarthan report (2010), “Impact Assessment of MGNREGA in Madhya Pradesh” submitted to poverty monitoring and policy support unit Madhya Pradesh, State planning Commissioner.
- Shah, V.D. and M. Makwana (2011) “Impact of MGNREGA on wages rates, Food security and Rural Urban Migration in Gujarat, Vallabh Vidhyanagar; Agra-Economic Research Centre, Sardar Patel University.
- Shilip Verma and Tushar Shah (2012), A Water Policy Research – Beyond Digging and Filling Holes” IWMI - Tata Water policy programme C/o: INREM Foundation.
- Shylashri Shankar, Raghav Gaiha & Raghavendra Jha (2011) “Information, Access and Targeting: The National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme in India”. Oxford Development studies, Vol. 39, No.1, March, 2011.
- Sony Pellissery & Sumit Kumar Jalam (2011) “Towards transformation of social protection. A Gendered analysis of the employment guarantee act of India (MGNREGA), Routledge Informa Ltd. Registered in England and Wales, Reg. office Mortimer House 37-41, Mortimer Street, London, U.K.
- Srinivas Rao, Didde and P. Muthaiyan (2013). Employment Generation under MGNREGA in Tribal areas in Andhra Pradesh – Testimony of five years”. Los R Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (IOSR - JHSS) Vol. 19, Issue 4 (Mar – Apr. 2013) PP55-64.

- Sudershan, R M (2011). "India's National Rural Employment Guarantee Act: Women's participation and impacts in Himachal Pradesh, Kerala and Rajasthan, Institute of Development studies.
- V.Preetha and D.Moorthy (2011). "Mahatma Gandhi Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme and Trends in Women Empowerment" Serial publications, New Delhi, India.
- Vaidya, C S and R, Singh (2011). "Impact of MGNREGA on wage Rate, Food Security and Rural Urban Migration in Himachal, Shimla: Agro Economic Research Centre. Report submitted to the Ministry of Agriculture.
- Vijaya, S P et al (2006). "Government Schedule of Rates, working against Rural Labour" Economic and political weekly, April 29.
- Yamini Aiyar & Salimah Sanji (2009). "Transparency and Accountability in MGNREGA; A case study of Andhra Pradesh" Centre for policy research. All working paper no. 1 February, 2009.

QUESTIONNAIRE

Impact of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme on different tribes in Telangana

(A Comparative analysis among Gond, Koya, Chenchu and Lambada Tribes in Selected Villages.)

Interview Schedule Used in field survey

Annexure-I

1. Name of the Village :
2. Name of the Gram Panchayat :
3. Name of the Mandal :
4. Name of the District :
5. Starting Date of MGNREGA :
6. Total No of Households in Village:
7. No of Households having Job Cards:
8. No of persons having job cards :
9. No of persons not having job cards:
Total No of Workers (7+8) -----
10. Reasons for not having job cards : -----

	Persons	Own Farming	Study	Migration	Others()
Males					
Females					
Others					
Total					

11. Demographic Profile of the Village:

Category	Population (percentage)
STs	
SCs	
BCs	
Muslims	
OCs	
Total	

12. Labor Profile of the Village :

Age Group	No of Labor	% of Labor
15-18		
19-35		
35-60		
60 above		
Total		

13. Land details of the Village :

Land	Hectares	Percentage of total land
Dry land		
Wet land		
Other Land *		
Total		

Note: * includes waste land, fallow land and others.

14. MGNREGA work Evaluation :

1. Selection of the Works: (A) Gram Sabah (B) Other Means
2. Work site Facilities : 1 Water, 2 Creech, 3Shade ()
3. Mode of Payment : 1.P. O 2.Bank. 3. Cash ()
4. Social Audit 1. Regular 2.Irregular ()

15. Employment details :(During 2015-2016):

(A)

No of persons demanding work	
No of persons registered for work	
No of job cards issued	
No of persons dropped out who are having job cards	
No of persons provided employment	
No of days employment created	
No of persons completed 100 days employment	

B). Employment Status: (During 2015-2016)

Occupation	Before MGNREGA		After MGNREGA	
	No of Days	Wage Rate	No of Days	Wage Rate
1.Causal Labor				
2.Agricultural Labor				
3.Landed Farmer				
4.Landed Agricultural Worker				
5.Professional Worker				
6.From Migration				

16. Person days:

No of person days created under MGNREGA						
	No of Households	No of Persons involved		Person Days		Total
		Male	Female	Male	Female	
ST						
SC						
BC						
Muslims						
Others						
Total						

17. Wage rate.

	MEN	WOMEN
Agricultural wage		
MGNREGA wage		
Difference		
Impact on agriculture/ Reason		

18. (A) Durable assets created and benefits from MGNREGA.

Durable assets created	No	Community benefits
1		
2		
3		
4		

(B) Private Agricultural and Non-Agricultural Works.

Name of Works	No	Beneficiaries
1		
2		
3		
4		

19. Migration situation:

No of persons migrated from village			
	Before MGNREGA	After MGNREGA	Place of migration
Male			
Female			
Total			
Any other reasons			

20. No of migrated labor come back after MGNREGA:

21. Administrative structure at village level:

Panchayat Secretary.

Sarpanch :

Field assistant :

22. Name and Designation of the Respondent:

1. Village Panchayat Secretary :

2. Village Sarpanch :

3. Field Assistant :

4. Govt Employee of the Village:

5. Opposition Party Leader :

6. Non-Job Card Holder :

Impact of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme on different scheduled tribes in Telangana

(A Comparative analysis among Gond, Koya, Chenchu and Lambada Tribes in Selected Villages.)

Annexure- II

1. Name of the respondent :
 2. Gender :
 3. Age :
 4. Education :
 5. Community : ()

1.Gond	2.Koya	3.Chenchu	4.Lambada

6. Occupation : ()

1.labor	2. Farmer	3.Agl Labor	4.Artisan	5.Landed agl labor	6.Others
---------	-----------	-------------	-----------	--------------------	----------

7. Family details :

Name of the Family member (1)	Age(2)	Education (3)	Sex (4)	Marital Status(5)	Relation with Head of the family(6)	Occupation (7)
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						

Q 3= 1.illeterate 2.Upto10 th 3.Inter 4.Degree. 5. PG 6. Professional Degree 7. Others ;
 Q:4=1.Male,2:Female; Q 5: 1: Married, 2: Unmarried .; Q:6 : 1=Wife, 2=Husband .3=Son
 .4=Daughter, 5=Daughter –in-Law ; 6=Parents ; Q:7 7=Student ;8=Unemployed

8. Type of Beneficiary:

	From	Benefit
Ration card holder 1.White. 2.Pink ()		
Pension holders		
Farm loan weaver		
Indira awas yojana		
Ps.25 interest scheme		
Others schemes		

9. House Structure : ()

1.Hut	2.Tiled (Penkutillu)	3.Shed	4.Pakka House	5.Building (others)

10. Toilet Facilities :

Source of Toilets	Before MGNREGA ()	After MGNREGA ()
1.Open Deification		
2.Common Toilets		
3.Individual Latrine		

11. Source of Drinking Water: ()

1.Well	2.Nalla	3.Bore	4.Mineral	5.Others

12. Cooking Fuel Source : () ()

Before MGNREGA		After MGNREGA	
1.Fire Wood		1.Fire Wood	
2.Kerosene Stove		2.Kerosrne Stove	
3.LPG		3.LPG	
4.Others		4.Others	

13. Electricity Facilities : (A) Power Connection: () ()

Before MGNREGA		After MGNREGA	
1. YES	2. NO	1. YES	2. NO

: (B) Electrical Appliances / Consumer Durables

Before MGNREGA		After MGNREGA	
1. Fan		1. Fan	
2. T V		2. T V	
3. Refrigerator		3. Refrigerator	
4. Mobile Phone		4. Mobile Phone	
5. Cooler		5. Cooler	
6. Mixer Grinder		6. Mixer Grinder	
7. Motor Cycle		7. Motor Cycle	
8.		8.	

1. Yes 2.No

14. Details of Family Expenditure :

Monthly Items of Expenditure	Before MGNREGA			After MGNREGA		
	Price	Quantity Purchased	Amount	Price	Quantity Purchased	Amount
1.Rice						
2. Sugar						
3.Oil						
4.Milk						
5.Vegetables						
6. Fruits						
7.Non- Vegetarian						
8.LPG						
9.Dish T V						
10.Medicines						
11.School/ college Fees						
12.Petrol/Diesel						
13.Electricity Bill						
14.Others						

Total.						
--------	--	--	--	--	--	--

15.Details of Family Income Source :

Source of Income (1)	Income Earned (2)	Location (3)	Frequency of Income –Daily/ Weekly / Monthly (4)
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

1=Daily 2=Weekly 3=Monthly

16.Details of Savings and Borrowings : Do you have Savings and Debt : 1.Yes 2.No

Before MGNREGA				
Saving Agency	Amount (Rs)	Frequency	Borrowings (Amount Rs)	From whom/ interest

After MGNREGA				

17. Economic status:

(A) Family Assets:

Name of the Asset	Before MGNREGA		After MGNREGA	
	Number	Value	Number	Value
1.Land				
2.Building				
3.Buffalos				
4.Bullocks				
5.Cows				
6.Goat / Sheep				
7.Others				

Total				
-------	--	--	--	--

(B) If Landed;

Land Type	Before MGNREGA			After MGNREGA		
	Area Owned	Leasing in Extent	Leasing Out Extent	Area Owned	Leasing in Extent	Leasing Out Extent
1.Irrigated by Canal						
2.Irrigated by Tank						
3.Irrigated by Well/Bore						
4.Un-Irrigated/ Rain fed						
Total Area						

(C) Cropping Pattern: 1.Food Grains 2.Commercial Crops () + ()

If food grains; 1.Self Consumption 2.Sale () + ()

If Commercial Crops:

Production Name	Quantity Yielded	Price per Unit	Value (Rs)
1			
2			
3			
4			

18. Wage Rates in the Village:

	Before MGNREGA	After MGNREGA	Difference
General Wage			
Agricultural Wage			
Artisans Wage			
MGNREGA Wage	2006-11=	2011-16=	
Impact on Agricultural Wage			

19. Employment generated under MGNREGA. (During 2015-2016)

	Persons	1	2	3	4	Total
1.No of Persons involved in MGNREGA						
1.No of Days Worked						
2.Average Wage Rate per Day						
Total						

20. Details of Migration :

Name of Migrated Person	Duration of Migration (days)	Period of Migration (karif,Rabi, Summer, whole year)	Place of Migration	Type of Work engaged upon migration	Wage rate received upon migration	After MGNREGA Migration Reduced or Not	Reasons for Not Reduced
1.							
2.							
3.							
4.							

21. Durable Assets created under MGNREGA for Your Family.

Name of the Durable Asset	Benefits for Family	Agricultural and Other works	Benefits for Family
1		1	
2		2	
3		3	
4		4	

22. Impacts of MGNREGA (Household):

Positive impacts	Negative impacts
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4

23. Issuance of Job card :

24. Job card Number :

25. Unemployment Allowance Paid if any:

26. Delay in Payment :

27. Mobile No :