WOMEN LABOURERS AND MNREGA -WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO MYSORE DISTRICT

Dr.R.H.Pavithra

Assistant Professor, Department of Economics Karnataka State Open University, Muktha Gangotri, Mysore, Karnataka, India

Abstract: India is soon after freedom from colonial rule, took major initiatives to transform it's stagnate economy into developed economy. Economic planning system was adopted to realize the dreams of transforming economy into developed one and self reliant. Unemployment, poverty, inequalities, inflation increased gradually during last six decades of planned economic development. Fruits of development did not reach to all sections of people in all regions. This experience made ruling elite to rethink of development strategy and to introduce parallel strategy which will directly target the problems. India in general and Karnataka in particular have predominating number of workers in the unorganised sector. The workers in the unorganised sector are denied of basic social security measures such as health facility, income, employment etc. Against this backdrop, the MGNREGA is a refuge for employment source which is ploughed to make significant difference for providing livelihood security in rural areas especially rural poor. The MGNREGA was introduced in Karnataka since 2006 as an additional source of wage employment to eradicate poverty and unemployment. Rural areas of Karnataka have two-pronged issues i.e., poverty and unemployment, marred by low wages, seasonal agricultural employment and informal nature of work. However, it has been observed that the performance under MGNREGA in Karnataka is not inconsonance with the rate of poverty and unemployment in the State.

Introduction: The impact of the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Schemes (MNREGS) on rural poverty depends on a number of factors such as the outreach of the programme, participation of the poor (days of work) in the MNREGS as supplementary employment, wage earnings as well as the effect of MNREGA on the rise in market wages in agriculture and non agricultural employment. For instance the capacity of small and marginal farmer households in rain fed areas to absorb the burden of wage rise needs to be reckoned since their proportion in these areas is higher than in others. The effect of MNREGS would be positive for these farm households if the community and individual works undertaken under the scheme help in productivity enhancement of agriculture. Field evidence needs to be systematically analyzed before drawing conclusions of the programme impact. If we accept the official poverty line of Rs 816 per capita per month for rural areas for 2011-12, a typical five member household would have to earn at least Rs 48,960 per annum to be considered as non-poor. If the household participates in MNREGS for 100 days, it would earn Rs 11,354 (at the average wage paid), which works out to about 23.2 per cent of the poverty line. It is obvious that if the household is moderate poor (i.e., with an income between 75 to 100 per cent of the poverty line) it can move out of the poverty for that year if it is provided 100 days (transient poverty) of work. However, if the year happens to be an agriculturally bad year then the chances of such households crossing the poverty line even after fully participating in the scheme would diminish. The chances of getting more than 100 days of employment in the scheme and in particular, in periods of crisis depend upon the commitment of the state to poverty reduction. For the other (ultra) poor, 100 days of work in MNREGS would certainly reduce the intensity of poverty but they would remain in poverty Thus, several conditions have to be fulfilled for MNREGS to make a lasting impact on poverty. When poverty alleviation is the main objective of the rural development programmes and the core concern of the states, why should there be a ceiling on employment days? Of late, the upper limit on working days has been relaxed to 150 in drought hit and LWE areas. Another welcome sign is that more and more states are willing to provide more than 100 days. As per available data, during 2012-13 about 7.3 per cent of the participating households were provided more than 100 days of work and their share in total employment was almost one-fifth. States should be pro-poor in extending such benefits to the chronic poor even in periods of normalcy.

Objectives:

- To study the impact of MNREG programme on social conditions of rural households in study area
- To explain the impact of MNREG programme on income and savings pattern among rural households in study area.

Methodology: The present study is on empirical investigation based on sample interview of women dairy in Mysore district. Mysore district consists of 7 taluks viz, Mysore, K.R.Nagar, Hunsur, Periyapatna, H.D.Kote, Nanajanagud, T.Narasipur. 10 women respondents from each (05) taluk has taken, totally 50 women respondents are considered. The present study is based on both primary and secondary data and a systematic random sampling method has been adopted for survey. The primary data has collected from 5 taluks by excluding the advanced taluk i,e Mysore taluk and less advanced taluk i,e H.D.Kote taluk. The survey has been conducted by taking 50 beneficiaries of MGNREG Programme of case study on random basis. Simple table percentage method used to analyse the results and the results have been depicted by simple bar graph and pie chart.

Review of Literature:

Ghosh (2008) stated that MGNREGA will prove to be an extremely cost-effective way of increasing employment directly and indirectly, reviving the rural economy, providing basic consumption stability to poor households and improving the bargaining power of rural workers.

Dinesh (2012): The paper examines the India's MGNREGA it impact on women participation. The analysis brings the notice that MGNREGA has positive impact on employment pattern of women. The women have benefited both individual and community, here gained benefits of women as community can be understood by presence in the Gramsabha, but the poor implementation across the nation (lack of child care facility, illegal presence of contractors, etc) accured the gender sensitiveness of this act mainly in north eastern states.

Gowhar Bashir Ahangar (2014): paper analyzed the women participation in MGNREGA special reference to Anantnag districts in Jammu & Kashmir. The study examine that 90% of the surveyed respondents believe after joining in MGNREGA their socio economic status is improved and the participation of women in Gram Saba"s is also increased Result are interpreted with using the primary and secondary sources of data for overcoming with the specified findings.

Kartika K.T (2015): "Impact of MGNREGA on socio-economic development and women empowerment". The paper finds the major issue that panchayats successfully implemented to this programme in the study area and most of the workers are women (95%). This scheme improves the communication, participation, decision making among women workers and most of the workers are savings their money in the form of saving account, insurance etc.

Johnson (2009) reported that MGNREGA not only made money available to rural poor households but also facilitate them when they are in need of it. He suggested that if households are able to use MGNREGA as an ex-post substitute for formal weather insurance, then they may be able to shift away from investments in low-risk, low-return assets to higher-risk and higher-return assets.

Result and Discussion

Table 1: Age composition

| Age | Respondents | Percentage |
|----------|-------------|------------|
| 18-25 | 10 | 20 |
| 25-40 | 30 | 60 |
| 40-55 | 6 | 12 |
| Above 55 | 4 | 8 |
| Total | 50 | 100 |

Source: Field Survey

Table 1 shows that 10 respondents belong to the age group of 18 to 25 years, 30 respondents were under the age group of 25-40 years, 6 respondents were to the age group of 40 – 55 years and only 4 belong to the age group of above 55.

Table 2: Educational Status

| Educational Status | Respondents | Percentage |
|---------------------------|-------------|------------|
| Illiterate | 27 | 54 |
| Primary | 6 | 12 |
| Secondary | 13 | 26 |
| PUC | 4 | 8 |
| Total | 50 | 100 |

Source: Field Survey

Table 2 explains that 27 respondents are illiterates, 6 have their primary education, 13 are secondary educated and only 4 are PUC educated.

Table 3: Ration Card

| Card type | Respondents | Percentage |
|------------|-------------|------------|
| APL | 10 | 20 |
| BPL | 36 | 72 |
| Anthyodaya | 4 | 8 |
| Total | 50 | 100 |

Source: Field Survey

Table 3 shows that 36 respondents have BPL card, 10 have APL cards and only 4 of them had Anthodaya card that means around large majority (72 percent) of them belongs to below poverty line.

Table 4: Source of Income

| | After MNREGP | |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------|
| Source | Respondents | Percentage |
| Agriculture | 26 | 52 |
| Live-stock farming | 4 | 8 |
| Seasonal work | 12 | 24 |
| Daily wages | 8 | 16 |
| Total | 50 | 100 |

Source: Field Survey

Table 4 illustrates the sources of income where 26 respondents are working in agricultural sector, 4 in livestock farming, 12 in seasonal work and 8 as daily wage earners.

Table 5: Annual Income

| Income Level | Respondents | Percentage |
|------------------|-------------|------------|
| Less than 10,000 | 7 | 14 |
| 10,000 - 25000 | 25 | 50 |
| Above 25,000 | 18 | 36 |
| Total | 50 | 100 |

Source: Field Survey

Table 5 reveals that only 7 respondents' income is less than 10,000 per annum, around 25 of them have their income range between 10,000 – 25,000 and 18 respondents come under the range of above 25,000 of income per annum.

Table 6: Annual Savings

| Savings Pattern | Respondents | Percentage |
|-------------------|-------------|------------|
| Increased savings | 38 | 76 |
| Remains the same | 4 | 8 |
| No savings | 8 | 16 |
| Total | 50 | 100 |

Source: Field Survey

Table 6 explains that 38 respondents have opined that their savings have increased, only 4 said that their savings have remained the same, around 8 of them replied that they do not have any savings.

Findings:

- Majority of female respondents belong to the age group of 25-40 years because that age permits them to pursue hard labour and majority of women labourers were influenced mainly due to equal payment in par with men in this scheme.
- Majority of the respondents (54%) of them were illiterate because female literacy is very low in India, Karnataka and even in the case study area.
- Large number of respondents (72%) of them are BPL card holders which shows that they are still below poverty line.
- It is found that after the implementation of MNREG Act the sources of income is mainly from agricultural sector followed by seasonal work.
- Around 50 percent of respondents have their income between 11000 to 25000 per annum which shows the improvement in the economic condition of the female labourers after the implementation of MNREG act.
- 76 percent of respondents have opined that MNREGA have increased their savings by giving an employment opportunity.

Recommendations:

- The number of man days has to be enhanced throughout the year.
- Government and also some NGOs should make an attempt to create awareness about the benefits of this Act especially to the women and marginalized groups.
- Wage level has to be increased to improve the socio economic condition of working folk.
- Provident fund, ESI facalities has be given to the labourers of this scheme.

Conclusion: Large scale social security programmes like MGNREA are subjected to undergo several stumbling blocks. Government and NGOs must study the impact of MGNREGA in rural areas so as to ensure that this massive anti-poverty scheme is not getting diluted from its actual path and to see that the disparity in terms of socio-economic condition of women folk and marginalised groups in rural areas is reduced to considerable extend.

References:

- 1. All-India Report on Evaluation of NREGA A Survey of Twenty Districts, by Institute of Applied Manpower Research, (PEO) , Planning Commission.
- **2.** B.G. Harish, N. Nagaray, M.G. Chandrakanth (2011). Impacts and Implications of MGNREGA on labour supply and Income Generation for Agriculture in central Dry Zone of Karnataka.
- 3. Bhargava K. Anil (2013), The Impact of India's Rural employment Guarantee on Demand for Labour Saving Technology, University of California.
- 4. Disa Sjoblom and John Farrington (2008) Indian National Rural Employment Guarantee Act: Will it reduce poverty and boost economy? Oversees development institute
- 5. Shah Mihir, Shanker V. and Ambasta P. (2008). Two years of NREGA: The Road Ahed, Economic Political Weekly, Feb. 23.
- 6. The Hindu dated November 11, 2011 cover page article titled "another excuse to cut Government spending"
- 7. The New Indian Express dated 8th Dec, 2011- cover page titled "Pay Wages for Rural Job Scheme through Banks and POs accounts" Ramesh page No.6
