REVIEW OF LITERATURE

- The study “MNREGA Opportunities and Challenges (2008)” conducted by CSE, New Delhi found that MNREGA intervention has not been able to generate the kind of employment demand as expected. Irrational wage calculation formula has made productive assets creation less lucrative to local communities. The MNREGA transformed a labour surplus economy to a labour using economy. There is excitement over its state of implementation whenever local communities have been able to use MNREGA for development with direct impact on their livelihoods and disappointment whenever local bureaucracy is calling the shot in MNREGA implementation.

- The study conducted by IAMR, New Delhi M. R. Prasad, IAMR (2008), (2008) found that MNREGA had noticeable impact on arresting out migration. To some extent, it impacted positively on income, purchasing capacity and food-security and ownership of milk animals. Many job card holders neither get employment within stipulated period of 15 days nor get any unemployment allowance.

- Joshi Varsha, Surjit Singh, Joshi K. N. (Sept. 2008), conducted evaluation study in Rajasthan. They observed that after MNREGA’s intervention, the migration certainly decreased but not completely stopped. MNREGA augmented the purchasing power of family, offer better road connectivity to villages, helping in declining debt (marginally), increased agricultural production and thereby farm income.

- P. Ambasta, P. S. Vijay Shankar, Shah Mihir (2008), reveals that department is facing an acute shortage of manpower at the district, taluka and village levels which affecting the effective implementation of MNREGA. Most of the appointments are on contract basis. Many posts are vacant. Non appointment of a full time dedicated PO, who is pivotal to the successful implementations of MNREGA and giving the additional charge of PO to BDO/TDO’s, who were responsible for implementation of other many developmental schemes at the block level strikes at the root of the effective implementation and monitoring. Further, it appears that the existing bureaucratic machinery is just not willing to play ball with the strict provisions of MNREGA and are at time actively sabotaging its
implementation. Understaffing, lack of professionals, delay in administration etc. are other factors which affecting the effective implementation of MNREGA.

- The study conducted by Jaswal (IIM, Ahmedabad) and Ms. Paulomee Mistry (Disha, A’bad) found that there had been impact of MNREGA on the wages of Non-MNREGA works. The different ways of measuring the same work led to differing wage payment across villages. Job-cards often kept by Sarpanch or Talati and hence participants do not have direct information about their wage. Ruhi Tewari conducted study in Bhilwara district of Rajasthan. She found positive impact of MNREGA on economic lives of the rural poor and consequently it reduced the scale of out-migration.

- CAG (2007), CAG report on MNREGA (2007) noted that the lack of administrative and technical manpower at block and GP levels was the main deficiency and needs immediate rectification. It adversely affected the preparation of plans, scrutiny, approval, monitoring, measurement of works and maintenance of the stipulated records at block and GP levels. The quality of works undertaken was found uniformly poor. Only 3.2 percent of registered households have been provided work for 100 days. The process of social audits is unfortunately yet to be adopted with enthusiasm. The report also indicts state governments for effectively scuttling the payment of unemployment allowances.

- Siddhanta Priyadarshan (2010), the planning commission has found that only 14% of worker households have completed 100 days of work as mandated under the Act. It was observed that Gujarat and Kerala were able to provide average 22 days of work per households whereas W.B and Bihar provided 26 days of employment. These four states have the poorest record of fund utilization of MNREGA. In the absence of full time dedicated technical staff for programme execution, only 39 percent of works taken under MNREGA were completed. There were instances both of elite capture of job cards, fake muster rolls resulting in leakages of vested interest. MTA also pointed out that workers had to travel long distance to withdraw their wages deposited in banks. MTA suggested states to promote social audits of MNREGA works to plug leakages and if possible arrangement of home delivery of wages by bank/post office.
Chakravarthy Anupam, Tewari (July, 2010), headed by Amita Sharma, joint secretary in-charge of MNREGA in the ministry, found that funds of MNREGA was diverted by Gujarat State Government to the Department of Forest for their own works. The panel also found general delay of 3 to 6 months in wage payment to MNREGA beneficiaries. In some Gram Panchayats workers were asked to pay Rs.50 for the photograph. In many cases, Sarpanch or Talati are the custodians of the job cards rather than workers. In many job cards, entries of work allocations and payment made were lacking.

Vanik Anish (2008), In his research paper found that employment generation in Hazaribagh (Jharkhand) has been quite low. There were delays of 40 to 50 days in wage payment. Hence, workers choose to leave MNREGA worksites for immediate payment when alternative employment available. No new works were taken up in the summer when work is most needed.

Reetika Khera, Nayak Nandini (2009), large interstate variations in the participation of women have been observed. Women constitute more than two thirds of MNREGA workers in Kerala (71%), Rajasthan (69%) and Tamilnadu (82%) and less than stipulated one-third in Assam (31%), Bihar (27%), W.B (17%), UP (15%), Himachal Pradesh (30%) and Jarkhand (27%). They also show that the full potential of this Act is far from being realized. Two thirds of the female respondents reported having to face less hunger as a result of MNREGA employment. Overall, MNREGA was considered very important by 68% of the respondents. At majority worksites childcare facilities were lacking. MNREGA allowed workers to get work in their village, as a result of which scale of migration and hazardous works now reduced for many. The investigation carried out in 3 blocks of Mayurbhans district of Orissa found pre-absence of muster roll at worksites, fake names or inflated entries in muster suggesting siphoning of funds by middleman. Contractors who were banned in MNREGA were found at nearly half worksites. In some places, instead of account payee cheques, bearer’s cheques were issued.

Vanik, Anish and Siddhartha (2008), The investigation carried out in 3 blocks of Mayurbhans district of Orissa found pre-absence of muster roll at worksites, fake names or inflated entries in muster suggesting siphoning of funds by middleman.
Contractors who were banned in MNREGA were found at nearly half worksites. In some places, instead of account payee cheques, bearer’s cheques were issued.

- Hiral Dave (2010), The article reveals large scale duplication of job cards in kotda village of kutiyana block of porbandar district of Gujarat. The number of job cards issued there is at least three times of the total number of voters. The persons who died at least two years ago are the holder of job cards and payment has been made to them. A family having 10 members has no less than 20 cards issued on his family members names.

- Annual Report Ministry of Rural Development (April 2006 - March 2007) reported that in case of choice of work under NREGA, highest priority that is 54% was given to water conservation followed by providing irrigation facility to the land owned by SC/ST 10% land development 11%, rural connectivity 21% and any other activity 4% in 2006-2007 etc.

- Dr. R. Prasad Singh (April 2008), The All India Report on Evaluation of NREGA (2008), a survey of twenty districts, observed that eighty percent of household expressed that they did not get the work within the stipulated 15 days time; neither were they paid the unemployment allowance. The survey revealed that the number of families spending less on food has come down drastically where as there is a rise in number of families who are spending more on food and non food items.

- Mathur, Lalit (2008), “Employment guarantee progress so far” depicted in the finding that MGNREGA could act as a great agent of socio-economic up-liftment and providing livelihood security of poorest of the poor in India if implemented earnestly. The employment and the earning under MGNREGA should be treated as additional avenue for such households.

- Jaswal Anshuman and Mistry Paulomee" s (2007) study summary reported on “will MGNREGA ensure security against hunger” in Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Maharashtra concluded that 42% of the cases creation of new ponds and depending or cleaning of existing once was undertaken 26% of cases, work related to road construction and maintenance was provided, check-dam related work formed 16% of the case, rest of
the cases comprised of work like canal maintenance and mud–work (digging and carrying) hence it is clear that the emphasis is on creation of assets which form a part of the basic infrastructure for the community.

- Anil Kumar Kute, Dr. P.M. Honnakeri (2012) examined very interesting case in Gulbarga district in Karnataka state, and observed that 63 percent of respondents stated that the migration has decreased after MGNREGA implementation. They also found that the scheme has helped workers in their food security management.

- (Roy, 2007). As per the Census 2001, there are 54008069 rural households in all 27 states where The MGNREGA scheme is being currently implemented, out of which an estimated 16570504 families are living below the poverty line. Hence, a scheme like MGNREGA is the need of the hour to address the economic constraints of such a huge population in a sustainable manner.

- (Ghosh, 2004). Employment generation schemes, if creatively visualized and properly implemented, can have very large effects in terms of creating environment for much higher levels of economic activity and therefore growth, especially in the rural areas. Wage employment will give money in the hands of rural workers who will therefore able to spend on basic consumer items which will play an important role in reviving local markets and rural industries. Since the entire rural economy is in severe depression, such a positive effect is very important, since it will create conditions for the further expansion of private economic activity in rural India. Ultimately, the MGNREGA is a major move in the right direction. It can provide much-needed employment for the rural poor and can become the basis for the necessary regeneration of the rural economy, without which sustainable aggregate growth is not possible.

- "Life was hell with the Ghaggar flooding our homes and fields every monsoon. The need to restrict the river was there for long. But we lacked consensus. Rich landowners don't suffer because they have an embankment on their side of the river. Only small time farmers and the landless have suffered," says Mandan Lal Panihari, a 38-year-old resident of Panihari village (Singh, 2008).