ROLE OF MGNREGA ON RURAL EMPOWERMENT: THE SOCIAL ECOLOGY IN AGRARIAN BENGAL

B. Bhattacharya[1] and S.K. Acharya[2] R. Malakar[3]

[1]Director of Farms, BCKV
[2]Dept of Argil. Extension and Former Director, DEE, BCKV
[3]P.G. Scholar, Dept of Agril. Extension, BCKV
E-mail: 1biswajitbckv05@gmail.com, 2acharya09sankar@gmail.com

Abstract—*The simmering problem unemployment is not only prevalent in Indian economy but also across the world. As per ICAR report, 42% of the farmers are ready to quit agricultural operation given an alternative occupation are appearing in their agrarian eco-system. Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act.(MGNREGA) is a breakthrough to combat rural unemployment. Even with all these facts, MGNREGA is not only a happy story altogether, but also has some problem constraints. Keeping in view the preceding discussion, the following objective has been selected for the study 1. To study the socio-economic profile of the beneficiaries under MGNREGA Project. 2. To study the relationship between rural empowerment (consequent variable) and socio-economic status (antecedent variables) of the variables. 3. To study the impact of the programme with reference to income and employment generation. 4. To identify the important problems as perceived by the beneficiaries. The following variables, Education, Land Holding, House Type, Farm Power, Material Possession, and Annual Income have been found significantly correlated with the predicted variable, Monitoring and supervision of the Programme (Y). Generation of employment, especially in rural sector, should follow an inclusive growth having a natural consideration for gender, community, seasonality and policy as well. Employment generation again has got spatial ecology and economic characters along with gender mainstreaming.*

Keywords: *Empowerment, Education, Farm power, Land holding, Monitoring,*

1. INTRODUCTION

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

Amartya Sen considered employment is one which gives income to the employed, yields output and gives a person to recognition of being engaged in something worthwhile. (Sen, A. (1975). Employment in situation and technology some policy issues)

Singh opined that rural unemployment was in the nature of lack of full utilization of labour. Those could to tackle by the redistribution of land in proper way. (Singh, M.L. (1972). Unemployment in rural areas of Paleman distict (Bihar): A case study in Husaina bead block, Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics. Vol-4).

2. OBJECTIVES

As the study has been conducted in the light of the MGNREGA, the following specific objectives were taken into consideration for the present study.

- To study the socio-economic profile of the beneficiaries under MGNREGA.
- To study the relationship between rural empowerment (consequent variable)and socio-economic status (antecedent variables) of the variables.
- To study the impact of the programme with reference to income and employment generation.
- To identify the important problems as perceived by the beneficiaries.

Methodology : 100 respondents were selected from 4 GP areas of North 24 Pgs, WB.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In the present study 16 Independent variables (X1..........X16) have been correlated with 11 Dependent variables (Y1..........Y11) to find out whether there are relationship between dependent and independent variables. This is presented in the following Tables.

Table-1 presents the coefficient of correlation between Employment Opportunity (Y1) and 16 independent variables. It has revealed that Employment Opportunity (Y1) of the selected beneficiaries is positively and significantly correlated with their Caste (X3) at 1% level of significance.

Table 1: Correlation coefficient between the Independent variables and Employment Opportunity (Y1).

Variables	Correlation coefficient
Age (X_1)	0.047NS
Community Affiliation (X_2)	-0.527**
Caste (X_3)	0.287**
Family Type (X_4)	-0.041NS
Family Size (X_5)	0.098NS
Education (X_6)	0.237*
Land Holding (X_7)	0.079NS
House Type (X_8)	0.000NS
Farm Power (X_9)	-0.031NS
Material Possession (X_{10})	0.044NS
Primary Occupation (X_{11})	-0.083NS
Secondary Occupation (X_{12})	0.005NS
Sanitary Facility (X_{13})	-0.018NS
Access to Drinking Water (X_{14})	0.078NS
Annual Income (X_{15})	0.097NS
Social Participation (X_{16})	0.120NS

**Significant at 1% level of significance; *Significant at 5% level of significance; NS- Non Significance

Table 2: Correlation coefficient between the Independent variables and Awareness on MGNREGA (Y2).

Variables	Correlation coefficient
Age (X_1)	0.016NS
Community Affiliation (X_2)	-0.225*
Caste (X_3)	0.067NS
Family Type (X_4)	0.107NS
Family Size (X_5)	-0.035NS
Education (X_6)	0.503**
Land Holding (X_7)	0.359**
House Type (X_8)	0.312**
Farm Power (X_9)	0.286**
Material Possession (X_{10})	0.393**
Primary Occupation (X_{11})	-0.111NS
Secondary Occupation (X_{12})	0.066NS
Sanitary Facility (X_{13})	0.080NS
Access to Drinking Water (X_{14})	0.140NS
Annual Income (X_{15})	0.307**
Social Participation (X_{16})	0.324**

**Significant at 1% level of significance; *Significant at 5% level of significance; NS- Non Significance

It has revealed that Employment Opportunity (Y1) of the selected beneficiaries is positively and significantly correlated with their Education (X6) at 5% level of significance. It has also revealed that Employment Opportunity (Y1) of the selected beneficiaries is negatively and significantly correlated with their Community Affiliation (X2) at 1% level of significance. It means that there exists high community affiliation of the selected beneficiaries irrespective of their community wise classification with employment opportunity. Individual identity has no role in MGNREGA for employment. Others 13 variables are found to be non significant.

Table-2 presents the coefficient of correlation between Awareness on MGNREGA (Y2) and 16 independent variables. It has revealed that Awareness on MGNREGA (Y2) of the selected beneficiaries is positively and highly correlated with their Education (X6), Land Holding (X7), House Type (X8), Farm Power (X9), Material Possession (X10), Annual Income (X15) and Social Participation (X16) at 1% level of significance. It has also revealed that Awareness on MGNREGA (Y2) of the selected beneficiaries is negatively and significantly correlated with their Community Affiliation (X2) at 5% level of significance. It means that there exists high Community Affiliation of the selected beneficiaries irrespective of their community wise classification with awareness on MGNREGA. Others 8 variables are found to be non significant.

Table 3: Correlation coefficient between the Independent variables and Participation in MGNREGA (Y3).

Variables	Correlation coefficient
Age (X₁)	-0.159NS
Community Affiliation (X₂)	-0.172NS
Caste (X₃)	0.083NS
Family Type (X₄)	0.023NS
Family Size (X₅)	0.067NS
Education (X₆)	0.525**
Land Holding (X₇)	0.238*
House Type (X₈)	0.285**
Farm Power (X₉)	0.118NS
Material Possession (X₁₀)	0.294**
Primary Occupation (X₁₁)	-0.177NS
Secondary Occupation (X₁₂)	0.261**
Sanitary Facility (X₁₃)	0.097NS
Access to Drinking Water (X₁₄)	0.009NS
Annual Income (X₁₅)	0.300**
Social Participation (X₁₆)	0.487**

**Significant at 1% level of significance; *Significant at 5% level of significance; NS- Non Significance

Table 4: Correlation coefficient between the Independent variables and Process of MGNREGA (Y4).

Variables	Correlation coefficient
Age (X₁)	-0.159NS
Community Affiliation (X₂)	-0.172NS
Caste (X₃)	0.083NS
Family Type (X₄)	0.023NS
Family Size (X₅)	0.067NS
Education (X₆)	0.525**
Land Holding (X₇)	0.238*
House Type (X₈)	0.285**
Farm Power (X₉)	0.118NS
Material Possession (X₁₀)	0.294**
Primary Occupation (X₁₁)	-0.177NS
Secondary Occupation (X₁₂)	0.261**
Sanitary Facility (X₁₃)	0.097NS
Access to Drinking Water (X₁₄)	0.009NS
Annual Income (X₁₅)	0.300**
Social Participation (X₁₆)	0.487**

**Significant at 1% level of significance; *Significant at 5% level of significance; NS- Non Significance

Table-3 presents the coefficient of correlation between Participation in MGNREGA (Y3) and 16 independent variables. It has revealed that Participation in MGNREGA (Y3) of the selected beneficiaries is positively and highly correlated with their Education (X6), House Type (X8), Material Possession (X10), Secondary Occupation (X12), Annual Income (X15) and Social Participation (X16) at 1% level of significance. It has also revealed that Participation in MGNREGA (Y3) of the selected beneficiaries is positively and significantly correlated with their Land Holding (X7) at 5% level of significance. Others 9 variables are found to be non significant.

Table-4 presents the coefficient of correlation between Process of MGNREGA (Y4) and 16 independent variables. It has revealed that the Process of MGNREGA (Y4) is positively and highly correlated with their Education (X6), Material Possession (X10), Sanitary Facility (X13) and Annual Income (X15) at 1% level of significance. It has also revealed that Process of MGNREGA (Y4) is positively and significantly correlated with their Family Type (X4), Land Holding (X7), House Type (X8) and Farm Power (X9) at 5% level of significance. It has revealed that Process of MGNREGA (Y4) is negatively and significantly correlated with their Community Affiliation (X2) at 1% level of significance. It means that there exists high Community Affiliation of the selected beneficiaries irrespective of their community wise classification with Process of MGNREGA. Others 7 variables are found to be non significant.

Table 5: Correlation coefficient between the Independent variables and Monitoring and Supervision of the programme (Y5).

Variables	Correlation coefficient
Age (X_1)	0.076NS
Community Affiliation (X_2)	-0.098NS
Caste (X_3)	0.093NS
Family Type (X_4)	-0.087NS
Family Size (X_5)	-0.152NS
Education (X_6)	0.266**
Land Holding (X_7)	0.145NS
House Type (X_8)	0.259**
Farm Power (X_9)	0.222*
Material Possession (X_{10})	0.182NS
Primary Occupation (X_{11})	0.139NS
Secondary Occupation (X_{12})	-0.117NS
Sanitary Facility (X_{13})	0.020NS
Access to Drinking Water ($X14$)	0.084NS
Annual Income (X_{15})	0.137NS
Social Participation (X_{16})	0.137NS

**Significant at 1% level of significance; *Significant at 5% level of significance; NS- Non Significance

Table 6: Correlation coefficient between the Independent variables and Payment of Wage (Y6).

Variables	Correlation coefficient
Age (X_1)	0.029NS
Community Affiliation (X_2)	-0.122NS
Caste (X_3)	0.061NS
Family Type (X_4)	0.124NS
Family Size (X_5)	0.115NS
Education (X_6)	0.364**
Land (X_7)	0.257**
House Type (X_8)	0.299**
Farm Power (X_9)	0.173NS
Material Possession (X_{10})	0.301**
Primary Occupation (X_{11})	0.167NS
Secondary Occupation (X_{12})	-0.025NS
Sanitary Facility (X_{13})	0.238*
Access to Drinking Water ($X14$)	0.089NS
Annual Income (X_{15})	0.292**
Social Participation (X_{16})	0.242*

**Significant at 1% level of significance; *Significant at 5% level of significance; NS- Non Significance

Table-5 presents the coefficient of correlation between Monitoring and Supervision of the programme (Y5) and 16 independent variables. It has revealed that Monitoring and Supervision (Y5) of the programme is positively and highly correlated with their Education (X6) and House Type (X8) at 1% level of significance. It has also revealed that Monitoring and Supervision (Y5) of the programme is positively and significantly correlated with their Farm Power (X9) at 5% level of significance. Rest 13 variables are found to be non significant.

Table-6 presents the coefficient of correlation between Payment of Wage (Y6) and 16 independent variables. It has revealed that Payment of Wage (Y6) of the programme is positively and highly correlated with their Education (X6), Land Holding (X7), House Type (X8), Material Possession (X10) and Annual Income (X15) at 1% level of significance. It has also revealed that Payment of Wage (Y6) of the programme is positively and significantly correlated with their Sanitary Facility (X13) and Social Participation (X16) at 5% level of significance. Rest 9 variables are found to be non significant.

4. CONCLUSION

The study was undertaken to understand the effectiveness of the MGNREGA for empowering the rural people in the light of employment vis-à-vis income generation. After scanning the data using the appropriate statistical tools, the following conclusions have been emerged. In most of the cases (within sampling frames) the programmes have achieved success. The MGNREGA has been successfully implemented in the study

block with proper guidance of government. The programme has generated additional employment to the tune of 57 days in a year observed in the study area. The average annual income of the beneficiary house hold has been enhanced (16%) and improves their socio-economic status. The beneficiary households have developed their self esteem and self confidence through this job scheme. After independence this scheme has made significant achievement by providing employment opportunity especially in lean season than any other scheme, created social safety net for the vulnerable segments of population. MGNREGA has checked migration to a great extent. The migration of rural population from their home ecosystem in search of food and money and also has triggered off the process of resource generation. Besides, success of the programme some lacunae have also been identified in which the most important problem was delay in paying the wages to the beneficiaries.