

Draft (Report)

on

**Impact of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment
Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) on Development of
Scheduled Caste Lands: A Study in Karnataka**

T.Brahmanandam

**Centre for Multi-Disciplinary Development Research (CMDR)
Dr. Ambedkar Nagar, Yalakki Shettar Colony,
Dharwad – 580004**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank and acknowledge at personal level and on behalf of Centre for Multi Disciplinary Development Research (CMDR) for the support extended to me by the Indian Council for Social Science Research (ICSSR) for bestowing responsibility to conduct an individual cum sponsored research study on *Impact of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) on Development of Scheduled Caste Lands: A Study in Karnataka.*

Firstly, I personally indebted to *Prof. Sukhadeo Thorat*, Chairman, **Indian Council for Social Science Research** for his thought provoking Idea to create a special Sub-Plan budget within their total grant for the first time in the history of ICSSR and providing an opportunity to the marginalised section to carry out research studies.

I do express my sincere thanks and gratitude to the Prof. P.R.Panchamuki, the Chairman of CMDR, facilitated me to pursue my academic carries in this Institute. As one of the partner to this research, I am thankful to the State Rural Development Dept. for their pro active role in ensuring me to complete the field work in districts, Taluks and villages. As coordinator to this study, I sincerely thank all the district level officials of Belgaum, Gulberga and Tumukur. A special thanks to the supporting staff at lower level i.e., Project Directors at village level, Panchayati officials like computer operator, Village President and ward members in the villages and also the MGNREGs beneficiaries.

I wish to express my sincere thanks to the past and present Director of the CMDR for their timely concern and encouragement for the successful completion of this project.

I also express my gratitude to my colleagues in the institute and also the research team who have taken pain in completing the field work. I am thankful to the office staff like Mr Raichur, Hungund and other supporting staff in the office. I also express my gratitude to all

the library staff Mrs. Jayasri and Mrs. Meenaxi and Ramesh. I would also express my regards' to the computer centre staff.

I would be failing in my duties if I do not express my gratitude to my entire family members especially to my wife Smt. T.Jayasree who has patiently supported me in throughout this study. I also thank my children Master Roshan Anand and Kumari Manasa Anand.

Dr T.Brahmanandam
Project Director &
Associate Professor

Executive Summary

The National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS) – an important policy response of the ‘United Progressive Alliance’ government that promise to guarantee a minimum of hundred days’ employment at minimum wages every year to each adult member of rural household on demand . This act was launched in the form of NREGA which was guided by the success of the Maharashtra Employment Guarantee Act (MEGA). MEGA has been functioning in the state of Maharashtra since 1976. The debate began then and continued till date about the feasibility and utility of the NREGA came into force on September 7, 2005 and its implementation was notified in a phased manner. Though the scheme has been implemented in phased manner i.e., 1st phase, it was introduced in 200 most backward districts of the country on February 2, 2006. 130 districts were further included under NREGS in phase II with effect from April 1, 2007. The scheme was extended to the remaining 274 districts of India from April 1, 2008. The objective of the act is to increase the purchasing power of the rural poor, reduce distress migration and also to seeks to strengthen the natural resource base in order to enhance rural livelihood opportunities and create durable assets 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.

The primary objective of the Act is augmenting wage employment. Its auxiliary objective is strengthening natural resource management through works that address chronic poverty, drought, and so encourage sustainable development. In accordance of Section - I of the MGNREG Act, which lays emphasis on livelihood security, orders have been issued to align the MGNREGA wage employment creation with anti poverty strategy with a focus on sustainable livelihoods. It is also reiterated that the expenditure made under MGNREGS for creating employment shall also simultaneously improve the asset base of the rural poor so that they derive higher sustainable incomes and help in attaining livelihood security. In order

to ensure due compliance with the amendment notified by MORD vide Notification dated 22nd July 2009 and creation of durable assets and strengthening the livelihood resource base of the rural poor.

MGNREGs can be presumed that the programme has considerably brought an improvement in the living standard of SC& STs. However, there are hardly any studies on the impact of MGNREGS on development of Scheduled Castes and their land development. Land development of scheduled castes is crucial in enhancing the livelihood opportunities of these families. Hence, the present study is proposed to analyze the extent of land development taken up under MGNREGS and its impact on SC population.

Objectives of the study:

- a. To find out the number of land owing Scheduled Caste families covered under MGNREGS and the quality of their lands before & after.
- b. To Study the nature and cost of works taken up in the lands of SCs
- c. To examine & analyze the gap between requirement & assistance provided for land development of SCs under MGNREGS;
- d. To assess the nature & extent of participation and contribution from the beneficiary

Based on the above objectives, the study was conducted in three districts of Karnataka and the following observations were tapped from the study. The socioeconomic characteristics include social background, type of family, housing and household amenities, and availability and the benefit of the government housing scheme. This study covered 267 (41.1 per cent) households from Belgaum district, 160 (24.6 per cent) households from Gulbarga district and 223 (34.3 per cent) households from Tumkur district, which means that a total of 650 sample households were studied. This study found that male respondents (86.8 per cent) are much higher than the female (13.2 per cent) respondents in all the three districts. The average age of beneficiary is 47 years in the sample, with a maximum age of 85 years and a minimum age of 15 years. The marital status of the respondents reveals that almost 94

percent of them are married and 4.5 per cent are unmarried. The number of beneficiary households from SCs accounts 63 per cent of the total sample, followed by OC (22.8 per cent), STs (7.7 per cent) and OBCs (6.6 percent). Within the scheduled caste communities, Lambanis were the highest number of beneficiaries in the study. The level of awareness among the Lambanis was considerably good within the scheduled caste and availing the benefits from the government sponsored welfare programmes was also reasonably good by them. Within the sample they are around 17.5 per cent, followed by Lingayat (14.9 per cent) and Holer (11.4 per cent) communities. At the same time, some communities are not able to access the programme such as Adi Madha, Agasar, Balijiga, Bedar, Devang, Dhor, Ganiga, Iliger, Korava, Koravi, Korma, Kshatriya, Kumbar, Mali, Mang, Navi, Panchal, Parit, Statiga, Viswakarma and Vokkaliga.

In Belgaum district, the largest beneficiaries are Holer community (27 per cent), followed by Lingayat, Madar and Samagar. In Gulbarga district, Lambani, Holeya and Madiga communities are the highest beneficiary of the programme. They are altogether 86 per cent of the total sample. In Tumkur district, among the non-SC community Lingayats were the highest number who benefited from this programme, followed by Lambani, Adi Karnataka, Bhovi and Nayak communities. The above information clearly suggests that though the programme was launched for the benefit of all the sub- groups of SC community but it failed reach to them horizontally. The factors may be many like awareness level, land factor and political influence.

In terms of house structure, this study found that 65.2 per cent of beneficiaries are living in the pucca houses, while nearly 21 per cent and 13 per cent of beneficiaries are staying in the kutchra and semi-pucca houses respectively. The information of number of rooms in the houses depicts that 49 per cent of respondents are living in a single roomed houses. The average number of rooms in the houses of the respondents is 1.6. Moreover, 23 percent living in a two roomed house while 12.2 and 6 per cents enjoyed the three and four

roomed houses respectively. Interestingly, this study found that almost 10 per cent of respondents are living in a house with no rooms in which especially one-third of respondents are living in the Gulbarga district. Across the social groups, this study found that 12.2 per cent of SCs and 21 per cent of OBCs respondents are living in a house with no room, while 2 per cent of each STs and OCs respondents are staying in the same house.

Around 42 per cent of beneficiary households have availed government housing scheme while they were building their house. Out of this, 63.5 per cent of households have availed Indira Awas Yojana (IAY), while 16 and 4 per cent of households utilised the Basava yojana and Rajiv Awas Yojana (RAY) schemes. The SCs (67.3 per cent) and ST households (75 per cent) have mostly used the IAY schemes than OBC (33.3 per cent) and OCs (48.6 per cent). Under the housing scheme, 96.3 per cent of households received money and 2.2 per cent received building materials and 1.5 per cent received both money and materials.

In terms of possession of ration cards, it is found that 96.3 per cent of households are possessed ration cards and the rest of them have no ration cards. Almost 98 per cent of SC/ST households have ration cards, while 92.6 and 96 per cent of OBC and OC households are possessed ration cards respectively. Out of total households that has ration cards, nearly 93 per cent of households have BPL cards, while 5.6 per cent holding APL cards and 1.6 per cent of households possessed Antyodaya cards. Self-employed in agriculture is the principal source of income for more than half of the households. Moreover, casual wage labour in both agriculture and no-agriculture is the second highest principal source of income of beneficiary households.

In the fourth chapter discusses on the ownership status of land, awareness and access to the employment guarantee programme and to improve their land status under this programme. Around 97.2 per cent of surveyed households have owned land, while only 2.8 per cent of households do not own land. Across social groups, 95.8 per cent of SC households owned land, while 98 per cent of ST households possess land. In OBC and OC community,

all the surveyed households owned land. The average land holding size of sample households is found to be 4 acres. While households belong to OBC (5 acres) and OC (4.5 acres) communities reported higher land sizes per households, average land parcel is around 3.8 acres for SC households and 4 acres for ST households. The details on present status of land reveals that about 93 per cent of households reported that they are cultivating their land, while 7 per cent of households have not used their land for cultivation or given for lease. Across social groups, it is observed that 90.3 per cent of SC households are currently cultivating their land while 96 per cent of ST households do the same. Similarly, the percentage of households cultivating their land is higher among OC community (100 per cent) than OBC community (93 per cent).

Around 84 per cent of SC households reported that their lands need improvement while 90 per cent of ST households reported the same. In SC community, 42.2 per cent of households stated that their lands need levelling and water supply facility. Another 37 per cent of households reported that their lands need levelling and ploughing work. In ST community, a majority of households reported their lands required levelling work and water supply. In OBC community, a highest proportion of families reported that their lands required levelling and ploughing work. With regards to awareness about the programme, this study found that nearly 99.7 per cent of households aware about the programme. Across social groups, 0.5 per cent of SC households only reported that they were not aware about the programme. Apart from this, all surveyed households belong to ST, OBC and OC communities were aware about the scheme.

About 93 per cent of households reported panchayat offices is the main source of information, followed by news paper (3.4 per cent) and wall writings (3.2 per cent). Though having a wider reach TV/Radio, very few households identified it as an important source of information. About 56.2 per cent of households approached ward member to know more about the provision to develop land under the scheme. Likewise, 14.5, 18.6 and 10.8 per cent

of households approached panchayat president, panchayat office and MGNREGA official respectively to know the provisions of MGNREGA programme. Around 88.3 per cent of households reported their response was good, while 6.3 per cent of households stated their response was co-operative. Almost 3 per cent of households stated there was no response from the concerned authority when they approached.

Around 44 per cent of households reported more than 1 lakh sanctioned for the land development work under the MGNREGA programme. Another 22.5 per cent of households stated between INR 70,000-100,000 was sanction for land development work. Likewise, 13.8 and 19.6 per cent of families reported between 40,000-70,000 and 10,000-40,000 sanctioned respectively. In SC community, 39.3 per cent of households reported more than 1 lakh was sanction for the land development work while 26.6 per cent of households reported INR 70000-100000 was sanctioned. Another 19.3 and 14.8 per cent SC households stated 10,000-40000 and 40000-70000 was sanctioned for their land development work under the scheme.

Almost 58.6 per cent of households performed trenching and banding activities with MGNREGA money, while 30.8 per cent of households have undertaken levelling and ploughing activities in their land. Another 7 per cent of households used the money to make shed for their cattle. Nearly 90.6 per cent of the respondents reported their land is transferred into cultivable conditions by the MGNREGA activity. Around 93.3, 85.6 and 91 per cent of the respondents stated their land can be cultivable now in Belgaum, Gulbarga and Tumkur districts respectively. The study also discusses about whether family members contributed in the land development activity. Around 94.5 per cent of respondents reported their family members helped to develop their land.

The fifth chapter mainly discusses on different developmental work on land under the MGNREGA programme and its impact on cropping patterns, agriculture investments, out-migration, children's education, household expenditure patterns, housing, participation in Self Help Groups (SHGs) and local elections. This study found that, in the kharif seasons, the

proportion of households cultivating corn, sugarcane, chick pea, soya and wheat have increased significantly after the land development work. Particularly, the percentage of households cultivating sugarcane has increased from 3 per cent to 9 per cent after the land development work. When it comes to rabi seasons, the proportion of households which cultivated sugarcane, chick pea, paddy, soya, tobacco and wheat have increased after the land development work in the study area. Especially, there has been an 5.6 per cent increase in each paddy and wheat cultivating households after the land development work. At the same time, the number of households which cultivated daal, groundnut, Jowar and millet have decreased after the land development work in both the seasons. The agriculture expenditure of beneficiary households has sharply increased after the land development programme in both seasons. In the kharif seasons, the households farming expenditure has increased from INR 13,390 to INR 16,418, while it increased from INR 6335 to 9460 in the rabi seasons.

Nearly 46 per cent of households reported their economic status has improved after the land development programme, while 38.2 per cent reported the same before implementing the programme. In SC community, 42.3 per cent of households said their economic status has improved after the land development programme under MGNREGA, while 34.2 per cent of households stated the same before the land development programme. Around 46, 40 and 57.4 per cent of households reported their economic condition has improved after the land development programme in ST, OBC and OC community respectively. Before implementing the MGNREGA programme, the average annual income of the beneficiary family was INR 10,744 which increased to INR 25,461 showing an increase of 42.2 per cent immediately after the implementation of land development work under the MGNREGA programme. Before joining the MGNREGA programme only 8.6 per cent of the beneficiary households could repay their loans, but it increased to 13.1 per cent after joining this programme in study area.

In case of children's education, as compared to before implementing the scheme, children currently attending school has declined after the implementation of MGNREGA scheme. The fall in the number of children going to school could be due to decline in fertility rates. At the same time, the proportion of households reported their children going to English medium private schools has increased substantially in the study areas. Overall, before joining this scheme, the proportion of households reporting their children going to English medium schools was 3.9 per cent which increased to 5.2 per cent after joining the scheme.

In terms of migration, around 18.2 per cent of households reported that their adult members migrated for employment. In SC community, 21 per cent of households reported to be migrant households, while 23.3 per cent of OBC households reported the same. Around 8 and 12.2 per cent households reported to be migrant households in ST and OC households respectively. The majority of households reported their adult members are migrating to town within the state (53 per cent), followed by other states (35 per cent) and nearest village (7.7 per cent). The annual average earning of the migrants is INR 2769 with a maximum earning of INR 150,000 and minimum earning of INR 2000. Migration in the surveyed districts has been increasing even after MGNREGA's intervention. Before the MGNREGA programme, 12.3 per cent of households reported their family member migrated out for employment, but it further slightly increased to 13 per cent after the implementation the scheme. Out-migration has increased after the land development programme among SC and OC households compared to ST and OBC.

The expenditure pattern of beneficiary households on certain items between before and after the scheme documents no significant improvement in this study. For instance, when compared to before joining the scheme, a small proportion of households only reported that they bought cycle, bullock, tractor and radio after joining the programme. At the same time, there is a substantial improvement reported in purchasing of motorcycle, television, cable connection, dish after joining the MGNREGA programme. After joining the scheme, the

proportion of households made repairing work, constructing new room and separate water tap facility have not increased much, whereas construction of toilet and shed for livestock by the beneficiary households has increased largely.

Participation of women in SHGs has not improved between before and after the implementation of the scheme. The proportion of households taken loan from SHGs have increased from 15.7 per cent to 17.2 per cent between before and after implementing the scheme. In SC community, it increased slightly from 15 per cent to 16.4 per cent. As compared to before joining the scheme, the proportion of households taken loan from SHGs to start dairy, small retail shop and for children's education have increased substantially after joining the programme.

Almost 69 per cent of the beneficiary households had bank accounts before joining the programme whereas only 6.8 per cent of the beneficiary households opened account in banks after joining the scheme. In terms of saving money in bank and post office, it is found that the proportion of households making savings in banks and post office have been increased largely during the period between before and after implementing the MGNREGA programme. Participation of beneficiary households in local elections is mainly dominated by OBC and OC households in the study area. At ward level, SC households are more likely to participate in elections, whereas their participation is low at the panchayat president level in both before and after joining the MGNREGA programme.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgement	2
Executive summary	4
Table of Contents	13
Chapter 1. Introduction	
1.1 Importance of MGNREGA Programme in India	14
1.2 Literature review	23
1.3 Objectives of the study	29
1.4 Data and Methodology	29
Chapter 2. Profile of the study area	
2.1 Geography of Karnataka	33
2.2 Demographic characteristics	33
2.3 MGNREGA in Karnataka	34
2.4 Performance of MGNREGA in Karnataka	34
2.5 Profile of the surveyed districts	
Chapter 3. Socioeconomic conditions of the respondents	
3.1 Household characteristics	36
3.2 Participation of SC households in the programme	38
3.3 Housing conditions	41
3.4 Access to government housing scheme	43
3.5 Major source of income	47
Chapter 4. Landholding status among SC in the study area	
4.1 Landholding status by different social groups	51
4.2 Development activities needed for land	56
4.3 Awareness and Participation in MGNREGS Programme	57
4.4 Present status of land	
Chapter 5. Impact of MGNREGA on land development activities among SC households	
5.1 MGNREGA and crop cultivation	67
5.2 Whether their economic status improved after the programme	71
5.3 Effect of MGNREGA on children's education	73
5.4 MGNREGA and out-migration	75
5.5 Is MGNREGA increased household expenditure patterns	77
5.6 Women's participation in SHGs	80
5.7 Political participation of beneficiary households	83
Chapter 6. Conclusion and Policy suggestions	86
References	89
Appendix	

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Importance of MGNREGA Programme in India

Worldwide more particularly in developing countries, state machinery has actively involved in launching different works or job oriented programs in their respective territories to provide an employment to the unskilled persons with an objective to increase the income levels and also to reduce to the economic inequality in the country. Moreover its intention was to create sustainable livelihood and also create an asset which can protects them from negative shocks like natural disasters, droughts, macro- economic problems etc. India has been tradition of employment generation programmes stretching back thousands of years. Historically, such programmes were used to provide relief during the periods of famine. The doctrine of *Arthashastra* advises a good king to ‘institute the building of forts or water-works with the grant of food’ which provides a relief to the people at the time of a famine. Post independent India very often they launched these kind of programs to mitigate negative shocks like droughts and floods on one side. On the other, the country is known for chronic poverty in rural India because majority of the rural population depends on agriculture and allied sectors for their livelihood which only remunerate irregular wages because of their unskilled nature of work.

Efforts were also made by the government to launch development cum employment intensive programmes with special focus on wages until sixth five year plan. All these programmes were unsuccessful due number of factors like defective planning, lack of co-ordination and support among the government departments and also resources constraints including the food for work programme of 1977-80, were also not different.

The genesis of this act is linked to the Employment Guarantee Scheme (EGS), which was first initiated in Maharashtra way back in 1973. The sole logic of this scheme was to create a guaranteed employment to the rural poor in Maharashtra through piece-rate wage

labor. The EGS was an important intervention for poverty alleviation and drought mitigation in the state at that point of time. It approximately Rs.10, 000 crores (100 billion) has been spent on this program since its inception. The programme could generated nearly 3700 million man-days of employment since its beginning, making it one of the largest public works programmes in the world. Later the same scheme was replicated to the whole nation with changed nomenclature expanded to the whole country as the *National Rural Employment Program (NREP)* by the Government in 1977. Subsequently the *Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Program (RLEGP)* came into force in mid- 1980s with an objective to provide *employment access to landless poor*. During the late 1980s, two more programmes were introduced to arrest the unemployment both in rural as well as in urban areas. The programmes were Nehru Rojgar Yojana (which addresses wage employment issues in urban areas) and Employment Assurance Scheme (which provides wage employment in resource poor areas) was merged to form the Jawahar Rojgar Yojana (JRY). It was essentially planned for *Food for Work Program* till the early 2000s.

Employment scheme under MGNREGA - henceforth refer to as MGNREGS differs from previous employment programs as it is endorsed by a law enacted by the Indian Parliament in 2005. The Act (MGNREGA) requires every state government to formulate an employment guarantee scheme, for the purpose of giving effect to the guarantee in areas where it applies. The Act guarantees 100 days of wage employment in a financial year to any rural household whose adult members are willing to do unskilled manual work. In fact, the Act moves away from being a purely supply side intervention to a demand-driven wage employment intervention at individual/household level in rural areas.

In the colonial period, labour programmes again became popular as a means of famine relief. Administrators preferred employment guarantee programmes for their self-targeting properties. By the late nineteenth century, most famine codes expressed a preference for the 'labour test' over the provision of cooked food for relief. Another reason for their popularity

was that the demand for labour, and therefore the programme budget, could easily be controlled by adjusting the wage level.

‘Productive’ work eligible under the EGS was mainly road-building, soil conservation and irrigation. The pro-poor targeting of the EGS, while considered highly effective in the early years of the programme, steadily worsened as the government raised the wage rate to meet the minimum wage in 1988 (Gaiha 2000). Given that the minimum wage exceeded the agricultural market wage, the non-poor began to demand EGS jobs. As the budget soared, the poor were disproportionately excluded from the programme.

The most widely known precursor to MGNREGA in modern India, the Employment Guarantee Scheme (EGS), was initiated in 1972 to stave off deaths and deprivation from the severe famine that hit Maharashtra. The EGS was made an act in 1979. It gave rural dwellers the legal right to demand work from the state, as expressed in the popular slogan *magel tyala kaam* (whoever desires work shall get it). The EGS is reported to have provided jobs on a massive scale and up to one fifth of the rural population in many districts are said to have received cash for work (Drèze and Sen).

The economic reforms in the last two decades had brought faster growth to India particularly increasing the *Gross Domestic product* (GDP). However, this growth has failed to impact reducing the poverty level in corresponding to the growth. While faster growth is necessary, it is well recognized that the approach to reduction of poverty needs a multi-pronged strategy.

The country through industrialization and urbanization and, a majority of people in the world lives in rural areas and depend on the agriculture and allied activities for their livelihood. Out of the world India is a one of the developing country where out of the 121 core Indians, 83.3 cores live in rural areas said the 2011 census of India. Whereas a vast majority of people are poor and they are depend mainly on wages and earn through agriculture labour, unskilled labour, and casual labour. They had been often tried to enhance

their livelihood but their plans are failed. Even they are often on the threshold of development but they couldn't acquire chance. In India has 649481 villages and 30 percent peoples are lives in below poverty line. So that government of India has been initiated and implemented several programmers to develop the poor villager's life style and village economy. The wage employment programmes started in 1960 with Rural Manpower (RMP), *Crash Scheme for Rural Employment* (CSRE) in 1971, pilot intensive Rural Employment Programme (PIREP) 1972, Small Farmers Development Agency (SFDA), *Marginal Farmers & Agricultural Labour Scheme* (MFAL) *Jawahar Rozgar Yojana* (JRY) 1993, and *Jawahar Gram Samriddhi Yojana* (JGSY) 2000. Out of these Mahatma Gandhi Rural Employment Guarantee Act is one of the different. Because all programmes were only focusing on BPL families but the MGNREGA is a programme designed for both BPL and APL families. It was implemented by the central government of India which creates judiciable "right to work" to every rural poor people. Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act was lunched within intention to provide an employment to unskilled workers to sustain themselves on lean period. By which rural people could be able to improve their living condition. Through the MGNREGA rural people are likely to improve their village infrastructure, Community infrastructures and individual infrastructure specially small and poor farmers. Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act passed by Govt. of India on 23rd August 2005 and it notified on 7th September 2005. It was started with three phases, first phase started in 2nd February 2006 with 200 Back ward districts, second phase in 2007-08 with another 130 districts and final phase was notified all remaining districts. Now the act is under taken implementation in 644 districts in our country. NREGA was renamed from Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act to Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme by Govt. of India in 2nd October 2009. Actually this scheme was first proposed by former Prime Minister P.V. Narsimha Rao in 1991. It is one of the most important schemes. This scheme has been given hundred days employment with guarantee

wages to every unskilled manual worker in rural area whose adult members of their house. Not only wages it is also provide to equal opportunity to everyone. The scheme has been provided same wage rate for both rural men and women; the rural people are benefit directly and indirectly from the scheme. Besides wage the scheme also forecast land development works in the lands of SCs and STs Communities, Provision of irrigation facility to land owned by households who are the belonging SCs and STs, land leveling of house sites and drainage works under Indira Awas Yojana(IAY).

The Act aim is an eradication of poverty and making to villagers self-sustaining through productive asset creation.

This table explains various phases of MGNREGA from 2005 to 2013 and what are the Modifications made in MGNREGA by the Govt. of India.

Phase	During Time period		Modification
	Month	Year	
NREGA introduce by Govt. of India	25 th August	2005	NREGA was enacted by Central Govt. of India
First Phase	5 th and 7 th September	2005	It was declared with 200 backward districts
Second Phase	2 nd February	2006	It was functioning with 200 districts
Third Phase	1 st April	2007	Extend to 130 another districts
Fourth Phase	1 st April	2008	Extended to the remaining 274 districts of India.
Fifth Phase	October	2008	Start to pay through Bank Account or Post Office.
Sixth Phase	February	2009	MOU with postal Department has been signed
Seventh Phase	2 nd October	2009	NREGA was renamed to MGNREGA
Eighth Phase	10 th December	2010	SMS service was introduced
Ninth Phase	20 th April	2011	To submitted Report for Daily Expenditure
Tenth Phase	5 th July	2013	Worker Mobile Number can be added in data

Source: Various Report, MGNREGA

Objectives of MGNREGA:

- I. To enhance livelihood of rural people
- II. Development of rural infrastructure and rural economy
- III. To Provide guarantee employment to unemployment people

Features of MGNREGA:

1. Registering the names in Gram Panchayat (**GP**): Adult member of Rural Household, who is ready to do unskilled Manual Work. They could be register in written and orally to the local Gram Panchayat.
2. Issuing of Job Card to the adult members: After Registration the Gram Panchayat work is verify the registrations form and will issue the job card with Photograph on his/ her name for MGNREGA work and it is free of cost. Another important thing is the job card should be issued within 15 days of Registration.
3. To provide employment to job seeker by GP: Employment will be given within 15 days of registration for work, if it is not done then daily unemployment allowance as per the Act has to be paid and the liability of payment of unemployment allowance is of the States.
4. One third of beneficiary should be women: At least One third Beneficiary should be women who have registered and requested work under the MGNREGA.
5. Work should be provided within 5 km of radius: The MGNGREGA work should be provided within Five Kilometers. If the work is provided beyond 5 km then the extra wages of 10% are payable to meet additional transportation and living expenses.
6. Maintain equality between men and women: Wages are to be paid according to the Minimum Wages Act8.1948 for agricultural labourers in the State, unless the Centre notifies a wage rate which will not be less than Rs. 60/ per day. Equal wages will be provided to both men and women.
7. Minor facilities should be provided in the worksite: In the work site facilities such as crèche, drinking water, shed to be provided.
8. Fifty percent work will be executed by GP: At least 50% of works will be allotted to Gram Panchayat for execution.

9. Govt. of India to provide cost to everybody : The Central Government of India bears the 100 percent wage cost of unskilled manual labour and 75 percent of the material cost including the wages of skilled and semi-skilled workers.

10. Social Audit need to be conducted by GP: Social Audit has to be done by the Gram Sabha.

Funding arrangement:

Central Government Funding

The central Government bears 100 % wage of the unskilled manual work, 75% of material of cost and Payment with semi-skilled and skilled worker daily wages. Also central government bears administrative expenses include alia, salary, work site facility etc.

State Government Funding

The state government bears 25% cost of material with wages of semi-skilled and skilled workers. 100% of unemployment allowance by the state government. But it can't provide on time to workers. The state government also bears administrative expenses.

Last Five Year Financial Progress Report

Financial Progress	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Total central Release (in Cr)	32,746.2675	32,139.1	35,974.64	47,411.72	48,425.96
Total Availability (in Cr)	42,103.8825	37,588.03	43,380.72	57,386.67	56,025.58
Total Expenditure (in Cr)	38,552.62	36,025.04	44,002.59	58,525.2	49,263.2

The above table explains the Financial Progress of the MGNREGs. There are financial fluctuations in all the above mentioned years. Sometime the budget allocation is more and some other time it was low. However may be the allocations, the government never stopped allocating the budget. In the year 2013-14, they have allocated Rs/ 32, 746.2675

crore, and in 2017-18 48, 425.96 Crore. The Govt. of India has provided 55, 000 crore for Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act.

Current status of MGNREGA:

In 2017-18 Financial year (up to December 2017) the MGNREGA was provided 100 days wage employment to 12, 10, 773 poor people. Comparatively the current financial year has given less number of days than the previous year (2016-17, it created around 175.19 crore person-days of employment). The current financial year, the central government has released an amount of Rs 47,911.46 crore and total availability fund was 55,511.08 crore. Out of this 88.25% of funds were utilized in the form of material and wage paid to the workers. The programme has high work participation for marginalized groups like SC (22.16%) STs (16.81%) and Women (54%) in 2017-18. Total works undertaken were 167.17 lakh in the same period, of which 70.48% relates to Agriculture.

Negatives Impact of MGNREGA in India:

The MGNREGA is a world's largest anti-poverty flagship programme of the United Progressive Alliance (UPA) government. As per the Human development survey-II, out of 100% only 30% people getting the MGNREGA work and the remain 70% of the poor people were denied the work under this programme due to lack of resources and also the lack of public works demand. Under this act i.e., MGNREGA, 100 days employment should be provided to the unskilled job seekers by the rural development functionaries. However the act or programme guideline says it could only provided 45 days' work to the unskilled job seekers under MGNREGA. In Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal poor household received only 38 days' work through the MGNREGA. This Act promises to provide an employment to the household within 15 days of the issue of job card. But in reality only 40% household have got employment and wages in 15 days time. The Govt. of Odisha had extended the MGNREGA

work from 150 days to 200 days because there are 8 districts are having less than normal rainfall. In Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Karnataka and Rajasthan, MGNREGA wages are less than minimum wages. Due to this it failed to attract poor people in rural area. So youth are often preferred to migrate to urban areas rather than opting the MGNREGA.

Positives Impact of MGNREGA in India:

The government of India has been spending enormous amount of money towards this programme. This is the largest and highest important social security public work programme in the world. The MGNREGA have been giving wages to those who work in the public works in rural houses. Through this scheme rural poor people could get employment by which they could be able to improve their livelihood status, improve life style, and also they could use modern technology in agriculture by creating modern infrastructures in their locations.

There was a general perception among rural people in India that women is only for to work inside the house and they should not go out and seek employment. But now trend has changed and more than 30% of the work force in the MGNREGs belongs to women. According to IDHS2 Survey more than 38% women have get work through the MGNREGA. Kerala and Tamil Nadu both state have top position in 2015-16, In Kerala 92% and Tamil Nadu 82% worker are women.

In the earlier government of India programme called *Community Development Programme (CDP)* in 1952 was to overall improvement in the rural people particularly in agricultural production, minor irrigation, health, education, drinking water, road constructions and village industries. The intensive Agriculture Area programmer (ADP) was started in 1964 with Suitable agro climatic Conditions and high irrigations Potential. After that IADP started with green revolution the objective of these programmers were raise food

production and provision of an adequate economic base for more rapid development. Social-economic programme (SEP) implemented by the central social welfare board CSWB, this programme was started for women. Main goal is providing training and employment to women such as widows, deserted wives, economically back word and handicapped women.

Review of Literature:

T.Haque (2011) has dealt with issues like employment, household income, and social inclusion, participation of women and out migration in his paper. He says that the number of rural households were provided employment under MGNREGA progressively increased over period from 21.02 million in 2006–07 to 33.91 million in 2007–08, 45.12 million in 2008–09 and 52.59 million in 2009. In 2010–11 (up to December), the number of households covered by MGNREGA stood at 37.06 million. In 2009–10, when agricultural output and employment suffered heavily due to severe drought in various parts of the country, it was MGNREGA which provided relief to a vast number of rural labour households in the country. He also opines that the share of wage income from MGNREGS is higher than traditional and non-traditional income of the household. Example: 44.25 per cent of total household income in Adilabad (A.P.), 43.18 per cent in Khammam (A.P.), 36.52 per cent in Sonbhadra (U.P.), 28.28 per cent in Dang (Gujarat), 24.85 per cent in Cuddapah (A.P.), 23.7 per cent in Lalitpur (U.P.), 21.23 per cent in Gaya (Bihar), 18.5 per cent in East Singhbhum (Jharkhand), 15.13 per cent in Chitradurga (Karnataka), 14.61 per cent in West Medinipur (West Bengal) and 10.89 per cent in Banswara (Rajasthan). The SCs and STs employed under MGNREGA were disproportionately higher than their share in the total population of the country. The share of SC beneficiaries in MGNREGA employment in 2009–10 was about 22.9 per cent as against their share of 16.2 per cent in the total population. Similarly, the share of ST beneficiaries in total MGNREGA employment was nearly 33.2 per cent against their share of 8.1 per cent in the total population. The share of women's participation

in the total MGNREGA employment in the country has also increased from 40.65 per cent in 2006–07 to 48.80 per cent in 2009–10. In the year 2010–11 up to December), the share of women workers stood at 51.75 per cent. However the paper did express its apprehension on the impact with regard to migration of workers to other places.

T.Haque (2012): “MGNREGS and Its effects on agriculture exploring linkages”. This paper talks about how MGNREGS has changed the life of rural people and agriculture sectors? In pre- MGNREGS (1970-80) period agriculture in India was stagnating while the growth rate of GDP was also accelerating. There were some factors like soil erosion, technology fatigue, decline in farm profitability, decline in public investment by which agriculture sector reached stagnancy. With the launching of this scheme (MGNREGS) it has brought a change in rural poor people and also in agricultural productivity. The foremost objective of the MGNREGS is to improve the livelihood security of the poor households in rural areas by providing hundred days employment in every financial year in the country. In 2008-09, another important objective was added to this scheme was creation of community assets in rural areas. This would enhance agricultural productivity along with increase in the demand of labour. By which soil erosion, drought proofing, flood control, land development, irrigation etc. The above mentioned problems were addressed through MGNREGS. Between 2008-09 to 2010-11, 32.78% of irrigation problem was solved; 21.77 % of water conservation, 13.92 % of land development, 3.79% of flood control, 17.51 % of rural connectivity, 8.14% drought proofing and 1.99% of others. With these the agriculture production has increased and the wage rates also increased for both agriculture laborers and non-agriculture laborers even in peak and lean seasons. The concluding remarks in the paper were that the wage rates of agriculture laborers have substantially increased. The farm productivity and incomes of marginal farmers including the SC/ST households get benefited by MGNREGS.

Sourav Das (2013): *“Performance of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme with Special Reference to Hugli District Of West Bengal”*. In this paper the author wants to make an impact assessment in Hugli district in west Bengal. To make comparison the author has taken two financial years i.e., 2010-11 and 2012-13 and the number of person day’s employment generation. In 2010-11, it could provide as many as 113.27 lakh days however in 2012-13, the number of days has been raised to 170.70 lakhs. It not only increased number of person-days it could also increased the SC, ST and women person-days. In the financial year 2010-11 person days generation among SC counterpart were 60.32 lakhs ST counterpart were 11.29 lakhs and Women counterpart were 37.08 lakhs. In financial year of 2012-13 Person-days was increased to 85.29 lakhs, 16.33 lakhs and 61.93 lakhs. In Hugli District, the MGNREGA activity has given more emphasize on rural connectivity and Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies. Lastly he concludes that the level performance of MGNREGA in Hugli district is satisfactory. MGNREGA is not just employment but for sustainable solution to all major problems and it is bringing about a silent revolution in rural areas.

Suman Pamecha and Indu sharma (2015): This study on *“socio-economic impact of MGNREGA in 20 villages of Dungarpur district of Rajasthan”*. The findings of the study suggest that most of the people depend upon agriculture and allied works. The study identifies that most of the people live in *Kachha* houses and very few people are having *pucca* houses and their annual income also below the national average. Most important thing is 65 percent families are having their own agricultural land but the land holding is very small. This study also made an attempt on Migration, potable drinking water facility, electricity and cooking in rural areas. In this regarded they given some data of rural Dungarpur, out of 100 percent only 79.5 percent respondents were having mobile sets and 30 percent were possessing motor-cycles. Similarly 33.5 percent households have T.V. sets and

88.5 percent have electricity connection in their dwelling units. But the other side of the picture is not so good. The study reveals that 83 percent households do not have gas connection in their kitchen and 90 percent households do not have toilet facility in their dwelling units. It also found that a short duration of period people migrate to the other areas. Therefore there is a long way to improve their quality of life at village level.

Another study on “*Evaluation of NREGA wells in Jharkhand* by **Ankita Aggarwal, Aashis Gupta and Ankit kunur (2012)**: This study focus on the construction of wells in one block in Ranchi district of Jharkhand. National rural employment guarantee act is a silver bullet for eradicating rural poverty and unemployment. But here people are facing more problems than solution. NREGA wells are clearly useful assets for not only their owners, but also for others who use their water, free of cost. The wells are also a valuable source of water for drinking, bathing, washing, etc. Jharkhand is one of the worst implementer of MGNREGA in 2012. Because the completed wells are a source of joy for those who use them, the construction process is usually quite harrowing. The actual Well construction costs are much higher than the amount sanctioned, and the government rarely pays for the difference. The corruption level is so high in the state. Every well owner had to pay bribes at the various stages of construction process. Wage payments were delayed in throughout the district. for labourers constructing the NREGA wells tend to be delayed, making them turn to the well owners for interim payments. And most of poor rural people do not receives funds for the material costs on time.

According to the **Reetika Khera (2008)** Jagrut Adivasi Dalit Sangathan in M.P is most powerful and helpful organization for rural poor people. This organization has focused on creating awareness on the NREGA entitlements and process whereby people can claim these entitlements. According this study, 92 percent of the respondent had got work and

people were able to get their wage on time. Because of their awareness level wages were paid on time and there is no corruption.

B.G. Harish, et al., (2011) have analysed the impact of MGNREGA on income generation and labour supply in agriculture in Chikmagalur district of Karnataka. They found that the number of days worked in a year with the implementation of MGNREGA has significantly increased to 201 days, reflecting 16 per cent increase. Regression analysis has revealed that gender, education and family size of the workers are the significant factors that have influenced the worker's employment under the Program. The annual income of the workers has increased by 9.1 per cent with the implementation of the Program. In the total income, the contribution of agricultural income was highest (63%), followed by non-agricultural income (29%) and MGNREGA income (8%). Thus, MGNREGA has contributed enormously in increasing their income and the consumption expenditure and also reduce the debt burden.

Murthy et al., (2013) have examined the economic impact of MGNREGA in the most disadvantaged districts (*Chitradurga and Davanagere*) and the better endowed district (*Shimoga*) of Karnataka. They found that wage differential between MGNREGA and market wage 12 to 39% lower for male labour and 16 to 40 per cent higher for female labour was deterring male workers from MGNREGA work, while encouraging female workers to participate. Real per capita income of participants increased between 10 and 20 per cent, resulting in reduction in labour migration between 13 and 55 per cent. Employment provided to weaker sections of the community under MGNREGA covered women and downtrodden sections adequately. The highest proportion of MGNREGA expenditure (50 to 75%) has been on water conservation and use.

Channaveer et al (2011) have studied the effect of MGNREGA in two set of villages in the Gulbarga district of Karnataka, one which have utilized 75 per cent of allocated funds

and the other which have utilized less the 25 per cent of allocated funds under MGNREGA. The study is based on primary data obtained from 120 sample farmers belonging to five village panchayats. This study found a significant difference in the use of machine power between fully- and partially implemented MGNREGA villages due to higher wage rates in the former category of villages. Not much difference has been observed in the use of material inputs and labour in redgram and *rabi and jowar*. The cost of cultivation has been found higher for both the crops in the fully-implemented MGNREGA villages due to significantly higher cost on labour. The labour productivity for both male and female has been observed lower in fully-implemented MGNREGA villages in both the crops for all the operations in comparison with that in partially-implemented MGNREGA villages. The wage rates (both male and female) in fully-implemented villages were considerably higher in fully-implemented than partially-implemented MGNREGA villages.

Vani et al (2015) have examined the participation of male and female workers, marginalized sections of the society and workers of different age groups in MGNREGA programme in Markabbinahalli village of Bijapur district in Karnataka. Their study has found no bias of cast, gender and age in providing employment to the participants of programme. The female workers received gainful employment in the programme. The higher non-farm wage rates constrained MGNREGP in reducing migration of workers to urban centres in the study village. The programme empowered the women workers, at least on a modest scale.

Ahuja et al., (2011) have investigated the impact of implementation of MGNREGA in two districts of Haryana — one agriculturally-advanced (Karnal) and the other agriculturally backward (Mewat). They found a significant difference has been found in the extent of employment under MGNREGA works in agriculturally-advanced Karnal (13.7%) and agriculturally-backward Mewat (24.6%) districts. The study has observed that despite being a source of employment, MGNREGA has not been able to check the migration from the developed region because of higher market wage rates at destinations. The study has

concluded that farmers owning large size of landholdings and more number of animals are not much interested in participating in MGNREGA works.

All the above studies are directly related to MGNREGS. However some are dealing with issues of migration, cropping pattern and cropping intensity, productivity levels, and conservation of natural resources. But it may be noted that all these studies have not fully addressed the issues relating to improvements in livelihoods of SCs & STs. Now this study would certainly examine the livelihood issues of SC and the development of their land in rural areas. If one stretches the argument further, we can note that significant investment has been made under MGNREGS on the lands of SC&STs; it is presumed that there could be considerable opportunity to improve the living standard of SC& STs. However, there are hardly any studies on the impact of MGNREGS on development of Scheduled Castes and their land development. Land development of scheduled castes is crucial in enhancing the livelihood opportunities of these families. Hence, the present study is proposed to analyze the extent of land development taken up under MGNREGS and its impact on SC population.

Objectives of the study:

- a. To find out the number of land owing Scheduled Caste families covered under MGNREGS and the quality of their lands before & after.
- b. To Study the nature and cost of works taken up in the lands of SCs
- c. To examine & analyze the gap between requirement & assistance provided for land development of SCs under MGNREGS;
- d. To assess the nature & extent of participation and contribution from the beneficiary
- e. To find out possible corrective measures in this regard for the effective implementation of the program for the ultimate benefit of SC populations.

Data and Methodology

The proposed study needs both primary & secondary data for understanding the ground realities. While the primary data can be collected from the beneficiary households through purposefully designed structured schedule spread across different Districts, Taluks

and Villages and the secondary data can be collected from official records of Gram panchayati office, taluka panchayati office and Zilla panchayat office and also from various institutions associated with this scheme.

Sample Frame

The selection of districts would be made based on the Human development index (developed, moderately developed and backward districts) and also with highest rural scheduled caste population and their socio-economic background. The study would be covered in three districts. As per the Karnataka Human development Report 2005, these districts were chosen:

S.NO	District	SC Population	HDI Rank
1	Belgaum	3, 68,289 (15%)	8 TH
2	Tumukur	4, 11,747 (19.9%)	15 TH
3	Gulgurg	2, 69,287 (25%)	26 TH

In each district two taluks were chosen for primary study. A total of six taluks were selected. Developed and underdeveloped and also highest rural scheduled caste population criteria have taken in selecting the taluks. These were the taluks:

S.NO	District	taluks	SC population
1	Belgaum	Athni	70,506
2		Chikodi	60,335
3	Gulbarga	Chinchodi	70,023
4		Gulbarga	73,669
5	Tumukur	Pavagada	61,979
6		Tumukur	55,414

Selection of villages in each taluk based on the highest rural scheduled caste population and also the highest coverage of scheduled caste families under MGNREGS. The cluster of villages will be selected in each taluk to collect the primary data. In each district 300 samples households would be covered for primary survey and the total sample size will be 900. Besides that focus group discussions (FGD) also will be held with beneficiaries and non-beneficiary households to capture their attitude and impressions towards the initiatives under MGNREGS in general and development of scheduled caste's land in particular. The

data in respect of pre-coded & post-coded questions will be computerized using an appropriate statistical tool such as SPSS package.

Each objective will be studied under the following broad categories i.e.,

Status of lands before & after MGNREGS,

Nature of works taken up in the lands of SCs,

Changes in employment and income,

Actual requirements of the land owning SCs family and the gap between their need and the assistance provided under MGNREGS,

Crops grown before & after MGNREGS,

Duration & investment on each activity & number of days of wage employment accrued to the beneficiary,

Expenditure on non-food items like radio, cycle, Television and other comforts,

Access to bank credit, kisan cards.

Chapter 2 **Profile of the study area**

In India, Karnataka is the fast growing state in India in terms of Gross Domestic Product. The reasons for higher growth are the Agriculture, highly developed Industry and good Education systems. The combination of beauty and brain is called Karnataka, is derived from two Canada words “*Karu*” and “*Nadu*” which means evaluated land. This state was formed on 1th Nov. 1956 name by Mysore but later in 1973 it was changed to Karnataka. It also called name of the land of goddess Bhuvaneshwari. Who has been blessed all people from all over the world. Where is replete of natural prettily and natural resources. Karnataka is a one of the forerunner of the information technology revolution in the country. The state has been changed of nature of Indian business and put it in the front line of the international. Karnataka not only best of the business and industry it is also best of agriculture and education in our country. Whereas unique educational environment in the country with largest number of professional colleges. There are 15 universities in the state with reputed outstanding institute. That’s way large number of outside students are coming for higher study. Overall 75.36% is a literacy rate of Karnataka.

Agriculture is the main sector of Gross State Domestic Product (GSDP). According to the 2011 census 56.6% of the population in engaged in agriculture and allied activities. It provides 17% to the country’s gross value added. Agriculture provides 13% the GDP of the Karnataka state. Total of 123.100 km² of the lands cultivated out of 191.791 sq. km in Karnataka people heavily depend on the southwest monsoon. They are also practice three agriculture seasons one is Kharif (April to September), Rabi (October to December) and summer (January to march), Rice, Ragi, jowar, and pulses these are main crops grown here. Not only these here they are harvesting oilseeds and cash crops. For floriculture Karnataka occupies second position in India. All over India silk industries headquarter is Karnataka. Our study Focus on full picture of the Mahatma Gandhi national rural employment guarantee

scheme of Karnataka, How MGNREGA impact to schedule caste land in Karnataka. Mainly this study based on 3 Districts (Belgaum, Gulbarga, and Tumkur) and 6 Taluks (Athani, chokodi, chincholi, pavagada, Gulbarga, and Tumkur). These Districts are semi-Rural area but all taluks are rural areas where most of people are depend on agriculture and day workers.

2.1 Geography of Karnataka:

Karnataka state is a blessed land of goddess whereas holy rivers like as Cauvery, Sharavathi, Tungabhadra and Ghataprapha with Arabian Sea is towards the west, Maharashtra and Goa is towards the North, Kerala and Tamil Nadu towards the south and Andhra Pradesh is towards the East. Generally Karnataka was divided into four regions: This region largely includes the Deccan Trap with four districts Belgaum, Bijapur, Bidar and Gulbarga. The general elevation ranging of Northern Region is between 300 m to 600 m from sea level. The Southern Region Bangalore, Hassan, Kodagu, Bangalore Rural, Mandya, Mysore, Kolar and Tumkur come under Southern Region. This region is very closed in western and southern part of the Western Ghats. The generally Elevation ranging of southern region is between 600m to 900m from sea level. Central Region: The Central region of Karnataka encompass by the districts of Dharwad, Shimoga, Raichur, Chitradurga, Chikmagalur, and Bellary. Central region is an elevation between 400m to 700m from sea level. Coastal Region: It is important part of the Karnataka state. It covers Western Ghats, edge of Karnataka plateau Uttara Kannada districts and Dakshina Khand Districts.

Demography of the Karnataka:

According to the 2011 census 6, 11, 30, 704 total population of Karnataka state out of these 3, 10, 57, and 742(50.9%) are males and 3, 00, 72, 962 (49.1%) are Females. The population density is 275.6 per square km. the sex ratio is 964 females per 1000 males. According to the 2011 census the Karnataka state literacy rate is 75.36%. Out of which the

male literacy is 82.47% and the female literacy is 66.01%. Out of total population of Karnataka 23.5% people belongs to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.

MGNREGA in Karnataka:

In Karnataka MGNREGA was implemented since 2nd Feb 2006, Now-a-days it covers all 30 districts of Karnataka state with enhance of livelihood and food security by providing unskilled work to rural Karnataka. Firstly it was started with Bidar, Raichur, Gulbarga, Davanagere and Chitradurga district of Karnataka state in 2006 and after one year means 2007 this programme was extended with Belgaum, Bellary, Chikmagalur, Hasan, Shimoga, and Kodagudistricts. In 2008 MGNREGA universalized by covered all the remaining districts of Karnataka. Now it covered all 30 districts with 176 Taluk and 6,024 villages in Karnataka. 134.68 lakh workers are working but 62.71 workers are active workers. Out of total workers percentage 16.54% are SC and 9.68% are ST workers in 2017-2018. The most important think is women workers Number are slowly increased. In 2018 out of total workers, women workers percentage is 47.18%.

Performance of MGNREGA in Karnataka last five financial years:

The last five financial years Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act has been given Satisfactory Performance in Karnataka State. Through the MGNREGA in rural Karnataka People get more benefit in Agriculture, Land Development, Rural Connectivity, Rural Infrastructure, and living styles. In Current Financial Year MGNREGA has generated person-day 683.45 Lakh but compare to previous financial year it has decrease because the last financial years person-days were 914.12 Lakh. Similarly Average days of employment provided per Household 41.25 in 2017-18 financial year but in 2013-14 financial years was 49.56 and 2016-17financial years was 50.27. In the financial year 2013-14, person-days generation among SC, ST and women counterpart were 15.89%, 7.94%

and 46.59% respectively. But in the financial year 2017-18, the Person-days Generation Among SC,ST and Women counterpart is 16.49% , 9.52% and 47.1% respectively. It is showing that the enhancement rate in the case of women person-days generation is the highest in comparison to SC and ST people in the Karnataka State. The rate of enhancement of person-days generation in case of the ST people is the lowest in this regard. In 2013-14 Financial Year Total Number of Work taken by MGNREGA is 8.79 Lakh. Both financial year of 2014-15 and 2015-16 the total Number of Works are approximately same. But the current financial year in 2017-18, the total Number of work taken by MGNREGA is 10.58 Lakh.

Chapter 3

Socio-Economic Conditions of the Respondents

(Field work Observations)

This chapter deal with the socio-economic characteristics of sample households of the study area. It is an attempt to asses and understand various characteristics of sample respondents in the study area. A detailed sketch of the respondents and their societal pattern has been presented in this chapter. The societal aspect includes social background, type of family, housing and household amenities, and availability and the benefit of the government housing scheme. A total of 800 questionnaires were covered and some of them were incomplete with some data. Due to this the analysis were drawn only for 650 questionnaires only. Respondents in each village, each taluk in the study districts were chosen in such way that they represent as far as possible and it also covered all the geographical locations (*fertile, semi-fertile and dry area*) of the state.

The scheduled castes in the state are not homogeneous group. There are many sub-categories within the scheduled castes. In fact, certain sub-categories have been left out from the government sponsored privileges even today in the state because lack of awareness. The most and interesting fact among the scheduled caste sub-categories is that they internally fight among themselves for the government benefits. However may be the programmes and policies the conditions of the scheduled castes are remain the same with low rate of development. In this study almost all the sub-categories have been covered. Another important point in the study is that it also covered non-scheduled castes to make comparative impact among the scheduled castes and non-scheduled castes.

3.1 Household characteristics

In the present study, the analysis are drawn from 267 (41.1 per cent) households from Belgaum district, 160 (24.6 per cent) households from Gulbarga district and 223 (34.3 per cent) households from Tumkur district, which means that a total of 650 sample households were studied. The table 3.1 below illustrate that male respondents (86.8 per cent) are much higher than the female (13.2 per cent) respondents in all the three districts. The women participation in public affairs is always counted with their literacy level and it is more particular in the case of scheduled caste. Since the women literacy level is low and their participation in the family affairs also low. On the other hand, the males of course are more easily available for articulating their views though there is less gender bias in scheduled caste homes. In fact, the woman is valued both for her person and labour. In some villages, it is the women who keep the family going since several men consume alcohol. Despite of these odds, the women participation rather higher in Tumkur district in comparison to Gulbarga and Belgaum districts, in which one-fifth of them belongs to woman respondents.

The average age of beneficiary is 47 years in the sample, with a maximum age of 85 years and a minimum age of 15 years. The distribution of beneficiary by age group reveals that the 45-64 age group represented the largest, accounting for 48 per cent of the population. This was followed by the 25-44 age group which constituted 37.1 per cent, the above 65 age group comprising of 12.5 per cent, the 20-24 age group constituted almost 2 per cent and 15-19 age group consisting of 0.6 per cent of the total population. While, in both Gulbarga and Tumkur districts, majority of beneficiaries fell in the age group of 45-64 years, in Belgaum district, most beneficiaries are in the age group of 25-44 years.

3.1. Distribution of sample respondents by individual characteristics

	Belgaum	Gulbarga	Tumkur	Total
Gender				
Male	238 (89.1)	148 (92.5)	178 (79.8)	564 (86.8)
Female	29 (10.9)	12 (7.5)	45(20.2)	86 (13.2)
Age groups				
15-19	4 (1.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	4 (0.6)
20-24	8 (3.0)	3 (1.9)	1 (0.5)	12 (1.9)
25-44	137 (51.3)	43 (26.9)	61 (27.4)	241 (37.1)
45-64	88 (33.0)	87 (54.4)	137 (61.4)	312 (48.0)
Above 65	30 (11.2)	27 (16.9)	24 (10.8)	81 (12.5)
Marital status				
Married	243 (91.0)	153 (95.6)	213 (95.5)	609 (93.7)
Unmarried	23 (8.6)	2 (1.3)	4 (1.8)	29 (4.5)
Others	1 (0.4)	5 (3.1)	6 (2.7)	12 (1.9)
Total	267 (41.1)	160 (24.6)	223 (34.3)	650 (100.0)

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

Even the marital status of the respondents of the sample, it is found that almost 94 percent of them are married and 4.5 per cent are unmarried. Moreover, more males are unmarried than females in the sample population. We observed a similar pattern across the districts as well.

3.2 Education level of adult male and female in the sample households

Education level	Adult Male		Adult female	
	number	percentage	number	percentage
Illiterate	291	36.8	415	53.9
Primary	93	11.8	83	10.8
high school	205	25.9	182	23.6
PU college	116	14.7	56	7.3
above degree	85	10.8	34	4.4
Total	790	100.0	770	100.0

The education level of adult male and female members of the beneficiary households reveals that males are having better education level than females (table 3.2). For instance, a highest proportion of females (54 per cent) are illiterate compared to male (36.8 per cent). While almost 26 and 14.7 per cent of males are completed high school and PU College respectively, only 23.6 and 7.3 per cent of females are completed the same. In case of higher

education, male those who are completed above degree is more than two time higher than their female counterparts.

3.2 Participation of SC households in the programme

3.3. Distribution of sample respondents by different social groups

Social groups	Belgaum	Gulbarga	Tumkur	Total
Social group				
SC	150 (56.2)	144 (90.0)	115 (51.6)	409 (62.9)
ST	16 (6.0)	0 (0.0)	34 (15.3)	50 (7.7)
OBC	12 (4.5)	13 (8.1)	18 (8.1)	43 (6.6)
OC	89 (33.3)	3 (1.9)	56 (25.1)	148 (22.8)
Sub-caste within SC				
Adi Dravida	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	8 (3.6)	8 (1.2)
Adi Karnataka	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	33 (14.8)	33 (5.1)
Bhovi	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	30 (13.5)	30 (4.6)
Golla	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	9 (4.0)	9 (1.4)
Hanabar	18 (6.7)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	18 (2.8)
Holer	72 (27.0)	2 (1.3)	0 (0.0)	74 (11.4)
Holeya	0 (0.0)	44 (27.5)	0 (0.0)	44 (6.8)
Idiga	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	5 (2.2)	5 (0.8)
Jain	4 (1.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	4 (0.6)
Kuruba	23 (8.6)	2 (1.3)	8 (3.6)	33 (5.1)
Lambani	0 (0.0)	74 (46.3)	40 (17.9)	114 (17.5)
Lingayat	45 (16.9)	5 (3.1)	47 (21.1)	97 (14.9)
Madar	26 (9.7)	1 (0.6)	0 (0.0)	27 (4.2)
Madiga	1 (0.4)	20 (12.5)	3 (1.4)	24 (3.7)
Madiwal	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	4 (1.8)	4 (0.6)
Mahar	10 (3.8)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	10 (1.5)
Maratha	15 (5.6)	4 (2.5)	0 (0.0)	19 (2.9)
Muslim	8 (3.0)	2 (1.3)	0 (0.0)	10 (1.5)
Nayak	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	29 (13.0)	29 (4.5)
Samagar	24 (9.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	24 (3.7)
Waddar	4 (1.5)	2 (1.3)	0 (0.0)	6 (0.9)
Others	17 (6.4)	4 (2.5)	7 (3.1)	28 (4.3)
Total	267 (41.1)	160 (24.6)	223 (34.3)	650 (100.0)

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

The social class of beneficiary is crucial for the research study like MGNREGS to know which community has derived maximum number of benefits from this programme. Keeping this in mind, the study also made an attempt to classify the data according to each social category of beneficiary in all the three districts and the information is presented in table 3.3. As the study on impact of MGNREG and development of scheduled castes lands a special focus was made to cover maximum number of samples from this community to assess their situation at ground level. Due to this, the study tried to concentrate more number of beneficiary households from this category i.e., SCs which accounts 63 per cent of the total sample, followed by OC (22.8 per cent), STs (7.7 per cent) and OBCs (6.6 per cent). The reason behind to take non-scheduled caste communities in the sample was to draw a comparison between SC and non-SCs on each indicator and identify their impact of the programme. More over the study wanted to see the landholding pattern among different scheduled caste sub-groups in all the districts of the study area.

Within the scheduled caste communities, Lambanis were the highest number of beneficiaries in the study. The level of awareness among the Lambanis was considerably good within the scheduled caste and availing the benefits from the government sponsored welfare programmes was also reasonably good by them. Within the sample, the also covered non-scheduled caste groups like are around 17.5 per cent, followed by Lingayat (14.9 per cent) and Holer (11.4 per cent) communities. At the same time, some communities are not able to access the programme such as Adi Madha, Agasar, Balijiga, Bedar, Devang, Dhor, Ganiga, Iliger, Korava, Koravi, Korma, Kshatriya, Kumbar, Mali, Mang, Navi, Panchal, Parit, Statiga, Viswakarma and Vokkaliga.

In Belgaum district, the largest beneficiaries are Holer community (27 per cent), followed by Lingayat, Madar and Samagar. In Gulbarga district, Lambani, Holey and

Madiga communities are the highest beneficiary of the programme. They are altogether 86 per cent of the total sample. In Tumkur district, among the non-SC community Lingayats were the highest number who benefited from this programme, followed by Lambani, Adi Karnataka, Bhovi and Nayak communities. The above information clearly suggests that though the programme was launched for the benefit of all the sub- groups of SC communitit but it failed reach to them horizontally. The factors may be many like awarenesslevel, land factor and political influence. Previous studies on the implementation of MGNREGS in Karnataka districts found that lack of awareness on MGNREGS is an important factor that influences the flow of benefits to SC communities (Manjula and Rajashekar, 2015). Rural households are having only general awareness or only just heard the scheme. They did not have any precise idea on the entitlements, nature and type of work that can be taken up under the programme.

3.4 Distribution of sample respondents by type of family

	Belgaum	Gulbarga	Tumkur	Total
<i>Type of the family</i>				
Nuclear	153 (57.3)	133 (83.1)	217 (97.3)	503 (77.4)
Joint	114 (42.7)	27 (16.9)	6 (2.7)	147 (22.6)

Table 3.4 shows the distribution of sample respondents belong to type of family. It is found that 77.4 per cent of the beneficiaries belong to nuclear family whereas 22.6 per cent of the beneficiaries belong to joint family. It is because of modernization people would prefer to live in nuclear family for the sake of close contact and to satisfy the basic needs. The respondents may have felt it would be easy to look after small family than the large family. Though a similar trend is observed in all the three districts, in Tumkur district, the majority of beneficiaries (97.3 per cent) belong to nuclear family.

3.3 Housing conditions

3.5 Distribution of sample respondents by type of house

	Belgaum	Gulbarga	Tumkur	Total
<i>Do you possess a house?</i>				
Yes	266 (99.6)	158 (98.8)	220 (98.7)	644 (99.1)
No	1 (0.4)	2 (1.3)	3 (1.4)	6 (0.9)
<i>Type of house</i>				
Pucca	226 (84.6)	36 (22.5)	162 (72.7)	424 (65.2)
Kutchha	14 (5.2)	64 (40.0)	58 (26.0)	136 (20.9)
Semi-pucca	26 (9.7)	59 (36.9)	0 (0.0)	85 (13.1)
<i>Number of rooms available in the house</i>				
One	148 (55.4)	62 (38.8)	109 (48.9)	319 (49.1)
Two	56 (21.0)	15 (9.4)	79 (35.4)	150 (23.1)
Three	40(15.0)	13 (8.1)	26 (11.7)	79 (12.2)
Four	17 (6.4)	16 (10.0)	6 (2.7)	39 (6.0)
No room	6 (2.3)	54 (33.8)	3 (1.4)	63 (9.7)
<i>Is your house has electricity connection?</i>				
Yes	239 (89.5)	155 (96.9)	209 (93.7)	603 (92.8)
No	28 (10.5)	5 (3.1)	14 (6.3)	47 (7.2)

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

Housing status of sample households is very important to know about the living standards in the rural areas. Due care has been taken in generating this information to assess whether the sample households are staying in owned house or not and further an attempt has been made to verify whether they are confined to pucca or kutchha housing structures and the number of rooms available in the house. Table 3.5 depicts about the housing status of sample households in the surveyed districts. Overall, it can be noticed that 99.1 per cent of the beneficiaries are staying in their own house, while only less than 1 per cent of them are not possessing own house. We also observed a similar pattern among different social groups in all the three districts. In terms of house structure, this study found that 65.2 per cent of beneficiaries are living in the pucca houses, while nearly 21 per cent and 13 per cent of beneficiaries are staying in the kutchha and semi-pucca houses respectively. While the majority of beneficiaries are living in the pucca houses in both Belgaum and Tumkur districts, in Gulbarga district, 40 per cent and 37 percent of them are staying in the katcha and semi-pucca houses respectively. The house structure among different social groups reveals

that 61.6, 70, 60.5 and 75 per cent of beneficiaries in SCs, STs, OBCs and OC categories are staying in the pucca houses respectively.

The information of number of rooms in the houses depicts that 49 per cent of respondents are living in a single roomed houses. The average number of rooms in the houses of the respondents is 1.6. Moreover, 23 percent living in a two roomed house while 12.2 and 6 per cents enjoyed the three and four roomed houses respectively. Across the districts, this study found that almost 39 per cent of respondents in Gulbarga district are staying in single roomed houses while 55.4 and 49 per cents of respondents in Belgaum and Tumkur districts are living in the same house respectively. Interestingly, this study found that almost 10 per cent of respondents are living in a house with no rooms in which especially one-third of respondents are living in the Gulbarga district. Across the social groups, this study found that 12.2 per cent of SCs and 21 per cent of OBCs respondents are living in a house with no room, while only 2 per cent of STs and OCs respondents are staying in the same house. Moreover, 51 per cent of each SCs and OC respondents reported that they are living in a single roomed house, while 42 and 28 per cent of STs and OBCs, respectively, reported the same. According to the Census 2011, the average household size in rural Karnataka is 4.7. It is hard to imagine how the families of the respondents can manage to survive within such limited space particularly those living in single roomed houses and houses with no rooms. The details of luxurious houses (houses with four rooms) across social groups shows that nearly 10 per cent of OBCs and OCs are living in four roomed house, while only 4.7 and 2 per cent of SCs and STs are staying in the same house respectively.

Access to electricity connection has been considered as a driver of social and economic development. A growing body of literature shows that low access to and poor quality of electricity affect households living standards and social welfare (Chakravorty et al., 2014; Samad and Zhang, 2016). This study found that almost 93 per cent of beneficiaries' houses have electricity connection. A similar pattern is observed across different social groups in all

the three districts. Moreover, as we expected, more STs (12 per cent) and SCs (7.6 per cent) households have no electricity connection compared to OBCs ((4.7 per cent) and OCs (5.4 per cent) households.

3.4 Access to government housing scheme

This survey included the data on whether households have availed any government housing scheme. If they received, which scheme and what are the items they got from the government. The survey results depict that 42 per cent of beneficiary households have availed government housing scheme while they were building their house (Table 3.6). In Belgaum district, 48.3 per cent of beneficiaries received housing scheme, while 30 and 43 per cent of beneficiaries have access the government housing scheme in Gulbarga and Tumkur respectively. Across the social groups, it is found that more SCs households (51 per cent) have availed the housing scheme compared to STs (32 per cent), OBCs (35 per cent) and OCs (23 per cent).

3.6 Distribution of sample households accessed any government housing scheme

	Belgaum	Gulbarga	Tumkur	Total
<i>While building your house, have you availed any government housing scheme?</i>				
Yes	129 (48.3)	48 (30.0)	96 (43.0)	273 (42.0)
No	138 (51.7)	112 (70.0)	127 (57.0)	377 (58.0)
<i>If yes, which government housing scheme?</i>				
IAY	86 (67.7)	32 (65.3)	54 (56.8)	172 (63.5)
RAY	3 (2.4)	8 (16.3)	0 (0.0)	11 (4.1)
Basava yojana	24 (18.9)	4 (8.2)	15 (15.8)	43 (15.9)
Others	14 (11)	5 (10.2)	26 (27.4)	45 (16.5)
<i>What are the items given?</i>				
Money	128 (99.2)	39 (81.3)	96 (100.0)	263 (96.3)
Material	1 (0.8)	5 (10.4)	0 (0.0)	6 (2.2)
Both	0 (0.0)	4 (8.3)	0 (0.0)	4 (1.5)
<i>If money, how much?</i>				
Less than 20000	7 (5.6)	7 (14.6)	14 (14.6)	28 (10.4)
20,001-40,000	25 (19.8)	29 (60.4)	26 (27.1)	80 (29.6)
40,001-60,000	25 (19.8)	2 (4.2)	6 (6.3)	33 (12.2)
60,001-80,000	46 (36.5)	9 (18.8)	22 (22.9)	77 (28.5)
More than 80000	23 (18.3)	1 (2.1)	28 (29.2)	52 (19.3)

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

Out of total households that received housing scheme, 63.5 per cent of households have availed Indira Awas Yojana (IAY), while 16 and 4 per cent of households utilised the Basava yojana and Rajiv Awas Yojana (RAY) schemes. The SCs (67.3 per cent) and ST households (75 per cent) have mostly used the IAY schemes than OBC (33.3 per cent) and OCs (48.6 per cent). Under the housing scheme, 96.3 per cent of households received money and 2.2 per cent received building materials and 1.5 per cent received both money and materials.

On an average, households have received INR 26,109 under the housing scheme while constructing their houses. SCs (INR 30,320) and OBCs households (INR 23,070) have received more money than STs (INR 22,400) and OC households (INR 16,608). In terms of housing material, respondents from both Belgaum and Tumkur districts reported that they have not received any housing material under the scheme, while very few households (16 households) from Gulbarga district have received materials (bricks, sand, cements and iron) under the scheme.

Surveyed households were asked whether they possessed ration card, and if so, of what kind: the *Antyodaya* ration card meant for the ultra-poor, the BPL card for Below Poverty Line households and the APL card for Above Poverty Line households. The responses, as tabulated for all the three districts, are shown in Table 3.7 below.

3.7 Distribution of sample households by type of ration card

	Belgaum	Gulbarga	Tumkur	Total
<i>Do you have ration card</i>				
Yes	257 (96.3)	157 (98.1)	212 (95.1)	626 (96.3)
No	10 (3.8)	3 (1.9)	11 (4.9)	24 (3.7)
<i>Type of ration card</i>				
APL	16 (6.2)	9 (5.7)	10 (4.7)	35 (5.6)
Antyodaya	0 (0.0)	10 (6.4)	0 (0.0)	10 (1.6)
BPL	242 (93.8)	138 (87.9)	202 (95.3)	582 (92.8)
<i>What are the items you are taking?</i>				
Rice & wheat	0 (0.0)	5 (3.2)	3 (1.4)	8 (1.3)
Kerosene & oil	6 (2.4)	5 (3.2)	4 (1.9)	15 (2.4)
Everything (rice, wheat & oil)	245 (97.6)	145 (93.5)	202 (96.7)	592 (96.3)

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

On the whole, it is found that 96.3 per cent of households are possessed ration cards and the rest of them have no ration cards. Almost 98 per cent of SC/ST households have ration cards, while 92.6 and 96 per cent of OBC and OC households are possessed ration cards respectively. Out of total households that has ration cards, nearly 93 per cent of households have BPL cards, while 5.6 per cent holding APL cards and 1.6 per cent of households possessed Antyodaya cards. We could see a similar pattern across the three districts too. Across the social groups, however, it is the OBC community (97.5 per cent) which has the highest percentage of households holding BPL cards, followed by SC (94 per cent), ST (93.9 per cent) and OC (87.6 per cent) communities. The proportion of households having APL cards is 11.7 per cent for OC, about 6.1 per cent for STs and 3.7 per cent for SCs and 2.5 per cent for OBC community. About 2.2 per cent SC households are only holding the Antyodaya cards.

Through the Public Distribution System (PDS), four commodities have been provided to the households in India such as rice, wheat/*atta*, sugar and kerosene. This study found that about 96.3 per cent of households received all the four commodities, while 2.4 per cent of households received only kerosene and oil. Another 1.3 per cent of households received rice and wheat. Nearly 93 per cent of each SC and ST households received all the four commodities, while 86 per cent of each OBC and OC households received the same. On the other hand, nearly 99 per cent of households holding BPL cards have obtained all the four goods while only 20 per cent of APL cardholders have got the same. However, 37 per cent of APL cardholders received kerosene and oil, while 11.4 per cent of the same group have received rice and wheat from PDS.

3.8 Distribution of households by primary source of energy used for cooking

<i>Fuel for cooking</i>	Belgaum	Gulbarga	Tumkur	Total
LPG	177 (66.3)	11 (6.9)	79 (35.4)	267 (41.1)
Firewood & Crop residue	21 (7.9)	4 (2.5)	16 (7.2)	41 (6.3)
Cow dung & kerosene	58 (21.7)	139 (86.9)	124 (55.6)	321 (49.4)
No arrangement	11 (4.1)	6 (3.8)	4 (1.8)	21 (3.2)

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

3.9 Distribution of households using fuel for cooking by different social groups and ration cards

	No arrangement	LPG	Firewood & Crop residue	Cow dung	Total
<i>Type of ration card</i>					
APL	0.0	82.9	2.9	14.3	100.0
Antyodaya	0.0	20.0	0.0	80.0	100.0
BPL	3.1	39.0	6.9	51.0	100.0
<i>Social groups</i>					
SC	2.9	37.2	5.9	54.0	100.0
ST	8.0	44.0	6.0	42.0	100.0
OBC	7.0	41.9	2.3	48.8	100.0
OC	1.4	50.7	8.8	39.2	100.0

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

The data on fuel used for cooking indicates that cow-dung cake and kerosene (49.4 per cent) used as the principal source of energy for cooking by almost half of the sample households, LPG by 41 per cent, firewood and crop residue by 6.3 per cent of households (Table 3.8). About 3.2 per cent of households did not have any arrangement for cooking. The majority of households in Belgaum district (66.3 per cent) are mainly depending on LPG for cooking, while cow-dung cake is the major fuel for cooking in 87 per cent and 55.6 per cent of households in Gulbarga and Tumkur districts respectively. Almost 4 per cent of households in each Belgaum and Gulbarga districts have reported that they do not have any arrangement for cooking.

The use of cooking fuel is sharply associated with socio-economic class as the use of cow-dung cake for cooking is highest among the BPL and Antyodaya ration cardholders and lowest among the ABP cardholders. Similarly, the incidence of dependence on LPG for cooking is higher among APL cardholders than BPL households in the sampled districts. The fuel used for cooking across the social groups reveals that cow-dung cake and kerosene are mainly used by 54 per cent of SC households, 42 per cent of ST households, 49 per cent of OBC households and 39.2 per cent of OC households. Use of LPG is higher among OC households, followed by ST, OBC and SC households. The study also found that higher proportion of ST (8 per cent) and OBC (7 per cent) households have no cooking arrangement

compared to SC (3 per cent) and OC (1.4 per cent) households. On an average, households spent INR 331 for cooking per month. The monthly expenditure for cooking is higher for OC households (INR 397), followed by ST (INR 376), SC (310) and OBC (INR 298) households.

3.10 Distribution of sample households by primary source of income

<i>Primary source of income</i>	Belgaum	Gulbarga	Tumkur	Total
Agriculture	134 (50.2)	86 (53.8)	139 (62.3)	359 (55.2)
Wage labour	122 (45.7)	63 (39.4)	49 (22.0)	234 (36.0)
Petty business	7 (2.6)	1 (0.6)	23 (10.3)	31 (4.8)
No income source	0 (0.0)	6 (3.8)	0 (0.0)	6 (0.9)
Others	4 (1.5)	4 (2.5)	12 (5.4)	20 (3.1)
Total	267 (41.1)	160 (24.6)	223 (34.3)	650 (100.0)

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

3.5 Major source of income

The principal source of income of the household is the source which yielded maximum income among various sources from which the household received any income during the last one year prior to the date of survey. The major sources are agricultural activities, casual wage labour, small petty business and other activities. On the whole, this study found that self-employed in agriculture is the principal source of income for more than half of the households. It can also be seen that the proportion of households involved in casual wage labour in both agriculture and no-agriculture is the second highest reported principal source of income. Almost 5 per cent of households are involved in small petty business. We also observed a similar pattern across the districts. Across the social groups, self-employed in agriculture is the principal source of income for 73 per cent of OC households, 63 per cent OBC households, 60 per cent of ST households and 47.4 per cent of SC households. Casual wage labour is reported as the second principal source of income by 44, 26, 23 and 21 per cent of SC, ST, OBC and OC households respectively. With regards to petty business, OBC households are mostly involved in petty business compared to others.

Summary

This chapter analysed the socio-economic characteristics of sample households of the study area. A detailed sketch of the respondents and their societal pattern has been presented in this chapter. This chapter mainly found that the majority of the respondents were male. The number of beneficiary households from SCs accounts 63 per cent of the total sample, followed by OC (22.8 per cent), STs (7.7 per cent) and OBCs (6.6 percent). Though the land development programme was launched for the benefit of all the sub-groups of SC community, it failed to reach them horizontally. The factors may be many like awareness level, land factor and political influence. Previous studies on the implementation of MGNREGS in Karnataka districts found that lack of awareness on MGNREGS is an important factor that influences the flow of benefits to SC communities (Manjula and Rajashekar, 2015). Rural households are having only general awareness or only just heard the scheme. They did not have any precise idea on the entitlements, nature and type of work that can be taken up under the programme. In terms of housing, a substantial proportion of households were living in a house without room. This indicates that the government welfare programmes, especially housing scheme, have not reached to people who really needed.

Appendix

Do you possess a house?

House	SC	ST	OBC	OC	Total
Yes	406	48	43	147	644
No	3	2	0	1	6
Total	409	50	43	148	650

In per cent

house	SC	ST	OBC	OC	Total
Yes	99.3	96.0	100.0	99.3	99.1
No	0.7	4.0	0.0	0.7	0.9
Total	62.9	7.7	6.6	22.8	100.0

Type of house

	SC	ST	OBC	OC	Total
0	2	2	0	1	5
Pucca	252	35	26	111	424
Kacha	84	11	14	27	136
Semi-Pacca	71	2	3	9	85
Total	409	50	43	148	650
In percent					
0	0.5	4.0	0.0	0.7	0.8
Pucca	61.6	70.0	60.5	75.0	65.2
Kacha	20.5	22.0	32.6	18.2	20.9
Semi-Pacca	17.4	4.0	7.0	6.1	13.1
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Number of rooms vs. Social group

rooms	SC	ST	OBC	OC	Total
0	50	1	9	3	63
1	211	21	12	75	319
2	78	23	15	34	150
3	51	4	3	21	79
4	19	1	4	15	39
Total	409	50	43	148	650
In %					
0	12.2	2.0	20.9	2.0	9.7
1	51.6	42.0	27.9	50.7	49.1
2	19.1	46.0	34.9	23.0	23.1
3	12.5	8.0	7.0	14.2	12.2
4	4.7	2.0	9.3	10.1	6.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100

While building your house, have you availed any government housing scheme?

Scheme	SC	ST	OBC	OC	Total
yes	208	16	15	34	273
no	201	34	28	114	377
Total	409	50	43	148	650
In %					
1	50.9	32.0	34.9	23.0	42.0
2	49.1	68.0	65.1	77.0	58.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100

If yes, which government housing scheme? (in %)

	SC	ST	OBC	OC
IAY	138	12	5	17
RAY	8	0	1	2
Yojana	23	1	5	14
Other	36	3	4	2
In %				
IAY	67.3	75.0	33.3	48.6
RAY	3.9	0.0	6.7	5.7
Yojana	11.2	6.3	33.3	40.0
Other	17.6	18.8	26.7	5.7

card	Rice & wheat	Kerosene & oil	All	Total
0	0	0	0	23
APL	4	13	7	35
Antyodaya	0	0	10	10
BPL	4	2	575	582
Total	8	15	592	650
In %				
0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100
APL	11.4	37.1	20.0	100
Antyodaya	0.0	0.0	100.0	100
BPL	0.7	0.3	98.8	100
Total	1.2	2.3	91.1	100

Chapter 4

Landholding Status among the SCs in the study area (Field work Observations)

4.1 Landholding status by different social groups

Land is the fundamental means of production in an agrarian society without which no agricultural production can take place. An understanding of the pattern of ownership and operational holdings of land is, therefore, of central importance especially when the study is related to employment guarantee programmes. This is because the land holding size of the farmers definitely influences the access to MGNREGS programme in rural areas. Given this background, the present chapter discuss the ownership of land, present conditions of land, awareness and access to the employment guarantee programme and land development activities under the programme. The proportion of households owned land by social groups is presented in table 4.1. Overall, it is seen that 97.2 per cent of surveyed households have owned land, while only 2.8 per cent of households do not own land. In Gulbarga, all surveyed households have owned land, while about 96.6 and 96 per cent of households owned land in Belgaum and Tumkur districts respectively. The proportion of landless households is higher among SC households compared to other social groups, especially in both Belgaum and Tumkur districts. Land ownership across different type of ration card holders reveals that all APL ration card holders have owned land while about 97 per cent of BPL cardholders possessed land among the surveyed households. In case of different type of households, 96 and 98 per cent of households staying in pucca and kutcha houses, respectively, owned land.

4.1 Proportion of households possessed land by social groups

	SC	ST	OBC	OC	Total
Belgaum					
Yes	141 (94.0)	16 (100.0)	12 (100.0)	89 (100.0)	258 (96.6)
No	9 (6.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	9 (3.4)
Total	150 (100.0)	16 (100.0)	12 (100.0)	89 (100.0)	267 (100.0)
Gulbarga					
Yes	144 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	13 (100.0)	3 (100.0)	160 (100.0)
No	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Total	144 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	13 (100.0)	3 (100.0)	160 (100.0)
Tumkur					
Yes	107 (93.0)	33 (97.1)	18 (100.0)	56 (100.0)	214 (96.0)
No	8 (7.0)	1 (2.9)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	9 (4.0)
Total	115 (100.0)	34 (100.0)	18 (100.0)	56 (100.0)	223 (100.0)
Total					
Yes	392 (95.8)	49 (98.0)	43 (100.0)	148 (100.0)	632 (97.2)
No	17 (4.2)	1 (2.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	18 (2.8)
Total	409 (100.0)	50 (100.0)	43 (100.0)	148 (100.0)	650 (100.0)

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

The average land holding size of sample households is found to be 4 acres. There are variations among social groups with respect to average land size owned by agricultural households. While households belong to OBC (5 acres) and OC (4.5 acres) communities reported higher land sizes per households, average land parcel is around 3.8 acres for SC households and 4 acres for ST households. Similarly, average land size of APL ration cardholders is found to be 7.3 acres, while BPL card holders have 3.8 acres. The land sizes are some extent reflecting the status of cultivator households and their farming potential. The size distribution of land holding is classified into five categories such as marginal (less than 1 acre), small (1-2 acres), semi-medium (2-4 acres), medium (4-10 acres) and large (more than 10 acres). The percentage distribution of operational holdings given in Table 4.2 reveals that the highest proportion of households belonged to the semi-medium category of land holdings (32 per cent) and the lowest of households belonged to the large land holdings (4.6 per cent).

In Belgaum district, the majority of households belong to small land holdings, while the highest proportion of households in Gulbarga and Tumkur districts belong to medium and semi-medium landholdings respectively. The proportion of households belong to large land holding is higher in Gulbarga district than other districts. The landholding size across different social groups reveals that the highest proportion of households from all communities belong to semi-medium landholding category. The percentage distribution of households belong to semi-medium category is around 28.4, 34.7, 42 and 37.8 for SC, ST, OBC and OC households respectively. In SC community, 18.7, 26.6, 22.3 and 4.1 per cent of households belong to marginal, small, medium and large landholdings respectively. When we look at marginal land holdings, we can observe that the higher proportion of SC households belongs to marginal landholdings compared to other social groups. In case of BPL ration card holders, 14.4, 27, 33.6, 22 and 3 per cent of households belong to marginal, small, semi-medium, medium and large landholdings respectively.

4.2 Proportion of households by size category of landholding

Land size	Belgaum	Gulbarga	Tumkur	Total
Marginal	65 (25.2)	5 (3.1)	20 (9.4)	90 (14.3)
Small	79 (30.6)	24 (15.1)	62 (29.0)	165 (26.2)
Semi-medium	64 (24.8)	54 (34.0)	84 (39.3)	202 (32.0)
Medium	45 (17.4)	60 (37.7)	40 (18.7)	145 (23.0)
Large	5 (1.9)	16 (10.1)	8 (3.7)	29 (4.6)
Social groups				
	SC	ST	OBC	OC
Marginal	73 (18.7)	2 (4.1)	3 (7.0)	12 (8.1)
Small	104 (26.6)	13 (26.5)	6 (14.0)	42 (28.4)
Semi-medium	111 (28.4)	17 (34.7)	18 (41.9)	56 (37.8)
Medium	87 (22.3)	14 (28.6)	13 (30.2)	31 (21.0)
Large	16 (4.1)	3 (6.1)	3 (7.0)	7 (4.7)
Total	391 (100.0)	49 (100.0)	43 (100.0)	148 (100.0)

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

Table 4.3 gives the percentage distribution of households owned land by different sources. It is found that land got from their ancestral (88 per cent) is a major source in the study area, followed by purchase (8.4 per cent), occupy (3 per cent) and land got from

government (0.8 per cent). In Belgaum district, about 92.7 per cent of households obtained land from ancestral, while around 87.4 and 82.6 per cent of households received it from ancestral in Gulbarga and Tumkur districts respectively. It is observed that the majority of households across different social groups obtained land from their ancestral. For instance, in SC community, 85.7 per cent of them got land from their ancestral, while 8.7 and 4.3 per cent of households obtained land through purchase and occupy respectively. In ST community, while 90 per cent of households got from their ancestral, 8.2 per cent of them got it by purchase. In OBC community, 88.4 per cent of households obtained it from their ancestral and 11.6 per cent got it by purchase. Similarly, around 93.2 per cent and 6.8 per cent of households received land from their ancestral and purchase respectively. The details on present status of land reveals that about 93 per cent of households reported that they are cultivating their land, while 7 per cent of households have not used their land for cultivation or given for lease. In Belgaum, around 97.4 per cent of households are cultivating their land presently, while 95.6 and 86 per cent households are cultivating their land in Gulbarga and Tumkur districts respectively. Across social groups, it is observed that 90.3 per cent of SC households are currently cultivating their land while 96 per cent of ST households do the same. Similarly, the percentage of households cultivating their land is higher among OC community (100 per cent) than OBC community (93 per cent).

4.3 Proportion of households owned land by source of land

	Belgaum	Gulbarga	Tumkur	Total
<i>From which source you got?</i>				
Ancestral	241 (92.7)	139 (87.4)	176 (82.6)	556 (88.0)
Purchased	17 (6.5)	15 (9.4)	21 (9.9)	53 (8.4)
Occupied	0 (0.0)	2 (1.3)	16 (7.5)	18 (2.9)
Government gave	2 (0.8)	3 (1.9)	0 (0.0)	5 (0.8)

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

Questions were also asked to collect information about land distribution scheme, which government agency has distributed land? Have they got benefitted from the scheme? present

conditions of distributed land, is the distributed land needs any development? If so, what type of development activity needed? Out of total sample, nearly 13.2 per cent of households reported that land distribution scheme was operated in their village. Across districts, around 18.4, 11.3 and 8.5 per cent of households informed that land distribution scheme was operated in Belgaum, Gulbarga and Tumkur districts respectively. Under the land distribution scheme, the state government (71 per cent) has mostly distributed land to landless households, followed by SC Corporation and under Bhoodan movement. SC Households (71 per cent) mostly got benefitted in the land distribution scheme. In Belgaum district, 55.4 per cent of households got benefitted in the scheme, while 24 and 20.5 per cent of families got benefitted in Gulbarga and Tumkur districts respectively. Studies show that majority of SC households do not cultivate their land because the land obtained from the government under the land reforms was uncultivable. Moreover, the land owned by SC families is tiny and unviable (Yadav 1998; Manjula and Rajasekhar, 2015). These factors influence SC families to lease out their small land and work as agricultural labourers. This study found that about 91 per cent of households cultivate their land, which they got under the land distribution scheme. However, almost 4 per cent of households reported their land not cultivable and barren land.

The guidelines of MGNREGS for individual land development works provides scope to take up works pertaining to irrigation facilities, land development activities, horticulture, afforestation and other land development activities in the lands of individual beneficiaries which help the farmers to develop their own lands enhance its productivity and develop rural economy. As per the guidelines, works on lands of SC/ST families are taken up on priority, followed by works in the lands of small and marginal farmers. On the whole, nearly 85 per cent of households reported that their lands need to be improved in the study area. In Belgaum districts, 89.5 per cent of households informed that land development activity is required for their land, while 76.3 per cent and 85.2 per cent of households reported the same

in Gulbarga and Tumkur districts respectively. Around 84 per cent of SC households reported that their lands need improvement while 90 per cent of ST households reported the same. About 89.2 per cent of households reported that they thought of developing their land in the past.

4.2 Development activities needed for land

Table 4.4 shows the proportion of households needed different development activities for their land. On the whole, around 40 per cent of households reported that their lands need levelling and water facility, while 36.6 per cent of households reported that their lands need to do levelling and ploughing work. Another 23.2 per cent of households stated that their lands need trenching and banding work. In Belgaum district, a majority of households reported that their lands need irrigation facility and levelling work. In Gulbarga district, the highest percentage of households stated that levelling and ploughing work is necessary for their lands, while in Tumkur district, trenching and banding work is mainly required for their lands. In SC community, 42.2 per cent of households stated that their lands need levelling and water supply facility. Another 37 per cent of households reported that their lands need levelling and ploughing work. In ST community, a majority of households reported their lands required levelling work and water supply. In OBC community, a highest proportion of families reported that their lands required levelling and ploughing work.

4.4 Proportion of households needed different development activities for their land

	Belgaum	Gulbarga	Tumkur	Total
Levelling and ploughing	89 (36.2)	74 (46.5)	56 (29.0)	219 (36.6)
Trenching and banding	28 (11.4)	37 (23.3)	74 (38.3)	139 (23.2)
Levelling and water facility	129 (52.4)	48 (30.2)	63 (32.6)	240 (40.1)
	SC	ST	OBC	OC
Levelling and ploughing	139 (36.9)	18 (40.0)	21 (48.8)	41 (30.8)
Trenching and banding	79 (21.0)	8 (17.8)	11 (25.6)	41 (30.8)
Levelling and water facility	159 (42.2)	19 (42.2)	11 (25.6)	51 (38.4)

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

4.3 Awareness and Participation in MGNREGS Programme

Awareness about the programme and its provisions is important because that is responsible for successful implementation of poverty alleviating programmes like MGNREGS. The success of any programme largely depends on the awareness among the people. Low level of awareness among the intended beneficiaries becomes a deterrent in their ability to benefit fully from the programme. In this study, awareness has been assessed by using measures such as knowledge about the various provisions of MGNREGS programme, how did they come to know about the programme, have they approached anybody in the village, what documents have they submitted to access the programme, how much money was sanctioned for the land development work, nature of work undertaken in their land with MGNREGS money, etc. On the whole, this study found that nearly 99.7 per cent of households aware about the programme. Across social groups, 0.5 per cent of SC households only reported that they are not aware about the programme. Apart from this, all surveyed households belong to ST, OBC and OC communities are aware about the scheme.

4.5 Proportion of households know about MGNREGS programme

	Belgaum	Gulbarga	Tumkur	Total
Yes	266	159	223	648
No	1	1	0	2
	SC	ST	OBC	OC
Yes	407	50	43	148
No	2	0	0	0

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

The government runs awareness campaigns through various media such as TV, Radio, newspapers etc. In order to strengthen the awareness campaigns, it is important to identify the main sources of information. In order to do so, frequency tables have been drawn for each of the various sources of information. These include panchayat office, wall writings, news paper, TV and radio. Table 4.6 presents the proportion households aware about the programme by various source of information. Overall, it is found that about 93.2 per cent of

households reported panchayat offices is the main source of information, followed by news paper (3.4 per cent) and wall writings (3.2 per cent). Though having a wider reach TV/Radio, very few households identified it as a source of information. In Belgaum district, 85.4 per cent of households reported panchayat offices is the main source of information and another 8.2 per cent of households reported information from news paper. In Gulbarga and Tumkur districts, panchayat offices play a major role in disseminating information. Across all social groups, this study found that local panchayat offices identified as the primary source of information.

4.6 Proportion of households know about the programme by sources of information

	Belgaum	Gulbarga	Tumkur	Total
Panchayati office	228	157	221	606
Wall writings	17	3	1	21
News paper	22	0	0	22
Radio/ T.V	0	0	1	1
	SC	ST	OBC	OC
Panchayati office	381	49	40	136
Wall writings	15	0	1	5
News paper	13	1	2	6
Radio/ T.V	0	0	0	1

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

Table 4.7 shows which year people come to know about the programme. It is found that majority of households (55 per cent) come to know about the programme in 2011. Around 16.8, 10.8 and 10 per cent of households come to know it in 2010, 2007 and 2008 respectively. In both Belgaum and Tumkur districts, the highest proportions of households come to know it in 2011, while, in Gulbarga district, more than 50 per cent of households come to know the programme in 2007 and 2018. When we look at different social groups, a majority of households from each social group come to know the programme in 2011. Especially, around 90 per cent of ST households come to know the programme only in 2011. Similarly, 73 per cent of OC households reported the same. It indicates that the programme has reached people later only due to lack of information dissemination by the government.

4.7 Proportion of households know about the programme by which year

	Belgaum	Gulbarga	Tumkur	Total
<i>Which year have you come to know about MGNREGS?</i>				
2007	17	43	10	70
2008	14	42	9	65
2009	11	18	19	48
2010	53	28	28	109
2011	172	29	157	358

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

Presently, around 99.7 per cent of households aware about the provision to develop land under MGNREGS programme (Table 4.8). We found similar results across social groups as well. About 56.2 per cent of households approached ward member to know more about the provision to develop land the scheme. Likewise, 14.5, 18.6 and 10.8 per cent of households approached panchayat president, panchayat office and NREGS official respectively to know the provisions of NREGS programme. In Belgaum and Gulbarga districts, a majority of households approached ward members in regarding to this matter, while the panchayat office is the primary source of information for the highest proportion of households in Tumkur. In SC community, 59.4 per cent of households approached ward member to know about the provisions of NREGS. Another 16, 13 and 11.5 per cent of households approached panchayat office, NREGS officials and president respectively. In ST community, 40 per cent approached ward member, while 30 per cent went to panchayat office to know about this scheme. In both OBC and OC communities, ward member is the primary source of information for them.

This study also reports how ward members, panchayat presidents and NREGS officials were responded when people approached them to know about the programme. On the whole, around 88.3 per cent of households reported their response was good, while 6.3 per cent of households stated their response was co-operative. Almost 3 per cent of households stated there was no response from the concerned authority when they approached. Around 99.6, 70 and 88 per cent of households reported they got good response from

authorities, when they approached, in Belgaum, Gulbarga and Tumkur districts respectively. When we look at responses across concerned authorities, 90, 87.2, 87.6 and 83 per cent of households have received good responses from ward member, panchayat president, panchayat office and NREGS officials respectively. However, around 2.2 and 14.3 per cent of families reported there was no response from ward member and NREGS officials respectively when they approached them for further clarification. In SC community, 87.3 per cent of families have received good response from concerned authorities, while 4.4 per cent of households have not received any responses. Similarly, 83.7 per cent of households received good response in OBC community and another 2.3 per cent have got no response. In ST community, 76 per cent of households reported they got good response from authorities, while in OC community 96.6 per cent reported the same.

Table 4.8 Proportion of households aware about the provision to develop land under the scheme

	Belgaum	Gulbarga	Tumkur	Total
Do you know that there is a provision to develop your land under MGNREGS?				
Yes	265	160	223	648
No	2	0	0	2
If yes, have you approached anybody in the village?				
Ward member	209	102	54	365
President	27	6	61	94
Panchayat Secretary	25	10	86	121
NREGS officials	6	42	22	70
What is the response?				
Better	0	0	16	16
Co-operative	1	30	10	41
Good	266	112	196	574
No Response	0	18	1	19

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

The beneficiary households have to submit some documents in order to utilise the MGNREGS programme. It may be land document, ration card, etc. Almost 94.5 per cent of households reported the authorities have asked the beneficiary households to submit relevant document to access the programme (Table 4.9). In Belgaum district, 99.6 per cent of

households have submitted documents, while, 82.5 and 97 per cent of households submitted documents in Gulbarga and Tumkur districts respectively. Among SC community, 92 per cent of them submitted documents, while, in ST and OBC community, all surveyed households submitted documents. Around 83.3 per cent of households have submitted both land document and ration card, while 13.3 per cent of them submitted only land document. In Belgaum district, 99.6 per cent of households submitted both documents. In Gulbarga district, while 51.7 per cent submitted land document, 45.6 per cent of households submitted ration card only. Around 89 per cent of households submitted both documents in Tumkur district. Across social groups, a majority of households submitted both documents to avail the programme. Particularly, in SC community, 79 per cent of the submitted both documents and 17 per cent submitted on land document.

Table 4.9 Proportion of households submitted document to access the scheme

	Belgaum	Gulbarga	Tumkur	Total
<i>Have they asked to submit any document?</i>				
Yes	266	132	216	614
No	1	28	7	36
	SC	ST	OBC	OC
Yes	376	50	43	145
No	33	0	0	3

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages
Source: Field survey

4.10. Proportion of households by type of document submitted for use of the programme

	Belgaum	Gulbarga	Tumkur	Total
Land document	0	76	8	84
Ration card	0	4	12	16
Both	266	67	192	525
Any one	1	0	4	5
	SC	ST	OBC	OC
Land document	66	1	12	5
Ration card	11	2	1	2
Both	312	47	30	136
Any one	2	0	0	3

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

In order to avail the NREGS programme, the gram sabha has to be organised in the village. On the whole, 93.2 per cent of households stated that gram sabha was held in their village. In both Belgaum and Tumkur districts, 99 per cent of households each reported the same. In Tumkur district, 75.6 per cent of households reported gram sabha was held in their village. Almost 94 per cent of households informed that gram sabha agreed for land development scheme under the MGNREGS. Around 99.6, 78.8 and 97.8 per cent of households stated gram sabha agreed for the programme in Belgaum, Gulbarga and Tumkur districts respectively.

4.11 proportion of households participated in gram sabha

	Belgaum	Gulbarga	Tumkur	Total
<i>Have they called Gram sabha in this regard?</i>				
Yes	264	121	221	606
No	3	39	2	44
<i>Has Gram sabha agreed?</i>				
Yes	266	126	218	610
No	1	34	5	40

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

Around 44 per cent of households reported more than 1 lakh sanctioned for the land development work under the MGNREGS programme. Another 22.5 per cent of households stated INR 70,000-100,000 was sanction for land development work. Likewise, 13.8 and 19.6 per cent of families reported 40,000-70,000 and 10,000-40,000 sanctioned respectively. Across districts, more than 1 lakh was sanctioned for the land development work in 51, 37.8 and 39.6 of households in Belgaum, Gulbarga and Tumkur districts respectively. In Gulbarga district, a highest proportion of households (36.3 per cent) received INR 10,000-40000 for the land development work compared to other districts. In SC community, 39.3 per cent of households reported more than 1 lakh was sanction for the land development work while 26.6 per cent of households reported INR 70000-100000 was sanctioned. Another 19.3 and 14.8 per cent SC households stated 10,000-40000 and 40000-70000 was sanctioned for their land

development work under the scheme. Around 59.2, 41.5 and 52 per cent of households informed more than 1 lakh was sanctioned for the land development work in ST, OBC and OC households respectively.

About 40 per cent of households reported the implementing authorities have taken 1 month to release fund for the land development work under the MGNREGS programme. Another 39.2 and 17.8 per cent of households stated the authorities took 3 and 6 months, respectively, to release fund for the work. Nearly 3 per cent of households stated the authorities have taken more than 1 year to release the money. In Belgaum district, almost 50 per cent of households reported 3 months time gap to lease the money for the land development work and 4.5 per cent of households stated more than 1 year time gap for releasing the fund. In Gulbarga district, 51.6 per cent stated 6 months time gap for releasing the fund and 2.4 per cent reported more than 1 year time gap. In Tumkur district, 64.6 per cent and 31 per cent of households reported the authorities have taken 1 month and 3 months respectively to release the fund. Across social groups, 1 month time was taken to release the fund for 33.6 per cent of SC, 67.4 per cent of ST, 50 per cent of OBC and 45.3 per cent of OC households.

4.12 The money sanctioned for the land development programme

	Belgaum	Gulbarga	Tumkur	Total
<i>If yes! How much money was sanctioned for the land development work?</i>				
10,000-40,000	21	49	52	122
40,000-70,000	40	18	28	86
70,000-1,00,000	70	17	53	140
1,00,000 above	136	51	87	274
<i>What is the time gap between the Gram sabha decision and the actual release of money?</i>				
One month	85	19	142	246
Three months	133	39	68	240
Six months	37	65	7	109
Less than one year	12	3	3	18

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

On the whole, almost 58.6 per cent of households performed trenching and banding activities with NREGS money, while 30.8 per cent of households have undertaken levelling and ploughing activities in their land. Another 7 per cent of households used the money to make shed for their cattle. In Belgaum district, 68.2 per cent of respondents used the money for trenching and banding activities. In Gulbarga district, while 53.8 per cent of the respondents performed levelling and ploughing activities, 43 per cent of the respondents had taken up trenching and banding based works. Similarly, in Tumkur district, 58.3 per cent of households undertook trenching and banding related work and 25.6 per cent of households performed levelling and ploughing activities. Across social groups, we can see that the majority of households performed trenching and banding based works in all communities.

4.13 Nature of work under taken

	Belgaum	Gulbarga	Tumkur	Total
Leveling & ploughing	57	86	57	200
Trenching & banding	182	69	130	381
Cattle shed	22	0	23	45
others	6	5	13	24
	SC	ST	OBC	OC
Leveling & ploughing	139	11	16	34
Trenching & banding	218	32	25	106
Cattle shed	38	4	1	2
others	14	3	1	6

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

Nearly 90.6 per cent of the respondents reported their land is transferred into cultivable conditions by the MGNREGS activity. Around 93.3, 85.6 and 91 per cent of the respondents stated their land can be cultivable now in Belgaum, Gulbarga and Tumkur districts respectively. In SC community, 90 per cent of respondents reported their land is now in cultivable condition. Likewise, 98, 79 and 93 per cent of respondents reported the same in ST, OBC and OC communities. Households, who did not get money from the MGNREGS programme, had to manage with some other sources such as taking loan from bank, borrowing from money lenders, mortgaging of gold, etc.

4.14 proportion of households reported their land transferred into cultivable condition

	Belgaum	Gulbarga	Tumkur	Total
<i>With MGNREGS activity, Is your land transferred into cultivable condition?</i>				
Yes	249	137	203	589
No	18	23	20	61

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

The study also discusses about whether family members contributed in the land development activity. Around 94.5 per cent of respondents reported their family members helped to develop their land. In Gulbarga district, about 80.6 per cent reported the same, while in Belgaum and Tumkur districts, almost all surveyed households reported their family members contributed while developing their land.

4.15 Proportion of households reported their family member contributed while developing the land

	Belgaum	Gulbarga	Tumkur	Total
<i>While developing your land, has your family contributed?</i>				
Yes	267	129	218	614
No	0	31	5	36
<i>If yes! In what form?</i>				
Labour	250	119	219	588
Money	0	26	4	30
<i>Is your wages are meet from the MGNREGs</i>				
Yes	231	52	214	497
No	36	108	9	153

Summary

This chapter analysed the ownership and present status of land, awareness and access to the employment guarantee programme and land development activities under the programme. Nearly 97.2 per cent of surveyed households have owned land, while only 2.8 per cent of households do not own land. The proportion of landless households is higher among SC households compared to other social groups. In terms of land holding size, the average land holding seize is higher among OBC and OC community compared to SC/ST households in the study area. The details on present status of land reveals that about 93 per cent of households reported that they are cultivating their land, while 7 per cent of households

have not used their land for cultivation or given for lease. Nearly 85 per cent of households reported that their lands need development activities such as levelling, ploughing work and water facility. The awareness about the programme has increased in the study area through various media such as TV, Radio, newspapers etc. A majority of households stated that they got good response from the concerned authority when they approached to know about the programme. Households mainly used the MGNREGA's money to perform trenching and banding activities, levelling and ploughing activities in their land. Some households used the money to make shed for their livestock. As a result, their land is now transferred to cultivable conditions. Family members of beneficiary households were also contributed in the land development activity.

Chapter 5

MGNREGS and Its Impact on Land Development Activities among SC Households (Field work Observations)

5.1 MGNREGA and crop cultivation

This chapter mainly discusses the land development work under the MGNREGA programme and its impact on cropping patterns, agriculture investments, out-migration, children's education, household expenditure patterns, housing, participation in Self Help Groups (SHGs) and local elections. The cropping pattern of the state is influenced not only by the agro-climatic conditions, but also by government policies and programmes. Table 5.1 presents the proportion of households cultivated various crops before and after the land development work under the MGNREGS programme. On the whole, it can be seen that the proportion of households cultivating certain crops has increased after the land development work in both kharif and rabi seasons. In the kharif seasons, the proportion of households cultivating corn, sugarcane, chick pea, soya and wheat have increased significantly after the land development work. Particularly, the percentage of households cultivating sugarcane has increased from 3 per cent to 9 per cent after the land development work. When it comes to rabi seasons, the proportion of households which cultivated sugarcane, chick pea, paddy, soya, tobacco and wheat have increased after the land development work in the study area. Especially, there has been an 5.6 per cent increase in each paddy and wheat cultivating households after the land development work.

Table 5.1 Proportion of households cultivated different types of crops

Type of crops	Belgaum				Gulbarga				Tumkur				Total			
	Before NREGS		After NREGS		Before NREGS		After NREGS		Before NREGS		After NREGS		Before NREGS		After NREGS	
	Kharif	Rabi	Kharif	Rabi	Kharif	Rabi	Kharif	Rabi	Kharif	Rabi	Kharif	Rabi	Kharif	Rabi	Kharif	Rabi
Corn	24.5	26.6	27.7	14.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	9.9	8.7	11.8	6.3
Dal	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	60.7	21.1	55.1	16.7	3.9	46.2	4.8	32.6	16.6	23.7	14.9	15.8
Groundnut	31.1	12.7	7.9	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	63.6	14.3	51.7	9.8	34.5	9.5	21.0	5.5
Jowar	17.0	29.1	8.7	17.3	30.0	43.7	33.3	43.6	0.0	7.7	1.0	6.1	14.4	25.3	12.0	18.9
Millet	4.1	1.3	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.0	14.3	17.7	12.1	7.9	5.8	6.1	4.6
Sugar Cane	5.4	8.9	20.6	10.3	1.3	2.8	1.4	1.3	1.5	1.1	0.5	0.8	3.0	4.1	9.0	4.9
Chick pea	0.4	0.0	6.7	11.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.8	0.0	3.0	4.9
Paddy	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	1.1	3.8	16.7	1.2	0.4	1.3	6.0
Soya	5.0	8.9	9.5	11.5	0.7	8.5	2.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	2.2	5.4	4.4	6.0
Tobacco	5.8	0.0	4.7	6.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	2.0	2.7
Wheat	0.0	1.3	9.5	14.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	3.9	6.0
Cotton	2.5	5.1	2.4	3.2	0.0	1.4	0.7	1.3	0.5	1.1	0.5	0.8	1.2	2.5	1.3	1.9
Others	3.3	6.3	2.4	4.5	7.3	22.5	7.5	33.3	8.3	14.3	18.7	20.5	6.0	14.1	9.2	16.4

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

Table 5.2 Average household expenditure on agriculture in different seasons (in INR)

Social groups	Belgaum				Gulbarga				Tumkur				Total			
	Before NREGS		After NREGS		Before NREGS		After NREGS		Before NREGS		After NREGS		Before NREGS		After NREGS	
	Kharif	Rabi	Kharif	Rabi	Kharif	Rabi	Kharif	Rabi	Kharif	Rabi	Kharif	Rabi	Kharif	Rabi	Kharif	Rabi
SC	5606	2844	9266	5163	15996	4398	20024	5713	11933	6965	18313	11365	12118	4550	15598	7104
ST	8843	5062	14000	6437	NA	NA	NA	NA	22794	18088	28705	25470	18330	13920	24000	19380
OBC	6833	2083	10250	6083	14769	3384	19307	3461	17222	13888	17500	15555	13581	7418	16023	9255
OC	11438	5162	11530	7573	26666	NA	26666	NA	20482	13928	23160	21428	15168	8375	16237	12662
Total	7800	3716	10348	6084	16097	4232	20090	5421	18152	10968	21049	16381	13390	6335	16418	9460

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

At the same time, the number of households which cultivated daal, groundnut, Jowar and millet have decreased after the land development work in both the seasons. In Belgaum district, the proportion of households cultivating sugarcane, corn, chick pea, soya and wheat has increased enormously after the land development work in the kharif seasons. Likewise, in the rabi seasons, the percentage of households that cultivated chick pea, soya, tobacco and wheat have increased significantly after the land development work. In Gulbarga district, households mainly cultivated daal, Jowar, sugar cane and soya after the land development in both the seasons. In Tumkur district, as compared to other crops, the percentage of households cultivating paddy crop have increased significantly after the land development work in both the seasons.

Table 5.2 presents the average household agriculture spending in difference seasons. On the whole, it is seen that households' expenditure on agriculture has sharply increased after the land development programme in both seasons. In the kharif seasons, the households farming expenditure has increased from INR 13,390 to INR 16,418, while it increased from INR 6335 to 9460 in the rabi seasons. When we look at farming expenditure across social groups, it is found that the average households spending on agriculture is highest among ST households and least among SC households. However, the average agriculture spending has rapidly increased after the land development programme among all social groups in both seasons. In the SC community, the average households' agriculture expenditure in the kharif seasons has increased from INR 12,118 to INR 15,598 after the land development programme, while it increased from INR 4550 to INR 7104 in the rabi seasons. Similarly, the average farming expenditure has raised from INR 18,330 to INR 24,000 among ST households in the kharif seasons, while it increased from INR 13,920 to INR 19,380 in the rabi seasons. In Belgaum district, it is observed that the average households farming expenditure has increased almost two times in the rabi seasons after the land development programme. In Gulbarga district, the average households farming expenditure has increased

almost INR 4000 more in kharif and INR 1189 more in rabi seasons after the land development programme. Similarly, in Tumkur district, the average household expenditure on agriculture has increased INR 2897 more in kharif and INR 5413 more in rabi seasons.

5.2 Whether their economic status improved after the programme

Questions were also asked about their annual income from land and whether their economic condition has improved after the land development programme. Overall, around 46 per cent of households reported their economic status has improved after the land development programme, while 38.2 per cent reported the same before implementing the programme (Table 5.3). Nearly, 73, 34.4 and 21.5 per cent of households reported their economic status has got better after the land development programme in Belgaum, Gulbarga and Tumkur districts respectively. In SC community, 42.3 per cent of households said their economic status has improved after the land development programme under MGNREGA, while 34.2 per cent of households stated the same before the land development programme. Around 46, 40 and 57.4 per cent of households reported their economic condition has improved after the land development programme in ST, OBC and OC community respectively.

Table 5.3 Proportion of households reported their economic condition has improved before and after the land development programme

	Belgaum		Gulbarga		Tumkur		Total	
	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS
Yes	175 (65.5)	195 (73.0)	38 (23.8)	55 (34.4)	35 (15.7)	48 (21.5)	248 (38.2)	298 (45.9)
No	92 (34.5)	72 (27.0)	122 (76.3)	105 (65.6)	188 (84.3)	175 (78.5)	402 (61.9)	352 (54.2)

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

Data on household income of the beneficiary families from land was collected for two different periods of times, i.e., before the implementation and after the implementation of land development work under MGNREGA. The comparative analysis of household annual

income from land indicated that household income of the beneficiary families before implementing the land development programme under MGNREGA was substantially lower compared to the household income after the land development programme which highlights the positive role of MGNREGA programme in increasing the household income (Table 5.4). On the whole, before implementing the MGNREGA programme, the average annual income of the beneficiary family was INR 10,744 which increased to INR 25,461 showing an increase of 42.2 per cent immediately after the implementation of land development work under the MGNREGA programme. When we compare household income across social groups, it is found that household income has increased after the MGNREGA programme as high as 43, 50.8, 45.6 and 37.8 per cent among SC, ST, OBC and OC households respectively compared to household income before implementing the MGNREGA programme. Similarly, as compared to household income before MGNREGA programme, it increased to 38.6, 53.8 and 40 per cent in Belgaum, Gulbarga and Tumkur districts respectively after the MGNREGA programme. As compared to the household income before MGNREGA programme, household income of SC households has increased by 39, 52 and 32 per cent after implementing the MGNREGA programme in Belgaum, Gulbarga and Tumkur districts respectively.

Table 5.4 Average annual income from land (in INR)

Social groups	Belgaum		Gulbarga		Tumkur		Total	
	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS
SC	11745	30076	11916	22777	3608	11217	9517	22204
ST	21250	45875	NA	NA	11735	21176	14780	29080
OBC	15916	47416	12923	23692	5833	7777	10790	23651
OC	17382	46519	33333	33333	4303	13517	12756	33764
Total	14381	37283	12400	23050	5201	13035	10744	25461

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

Table 5.5 presents the proportion of households repaid their loans before and after the implementation of land development work under the MGNREGA programme. Overall, it is

observed that before joining the MGNREGA programme only 8.6 per cent of the beneficiary households could repay their loans, but it increased to 13.1 per cent after joining this programme in study area. Especially, as compared to before joining this scheme, loan repayment by the beneficiary households has increased to 17.2 per cent after joining of MGNREGA in Belgaum district. Across social groups, it can be seen that 8.6 per cent of SC households could repay their loan before joining this scheme, but it increased to 11.3 per cent after the joining this scheme. The proportion of households repaid their loans has increased to more than two times higher in ST and OC households after joining this scheme. Therefore, this result suggests that repayment of outstanding loan/debt has been facilitated by MGNREGA programme. Studies have also shown that a higher proportion of farmers are indebted to money lenders and many of them could repay their debts partially from their MGNREGA income. Income received under the MGNREGA was clearly relieved them from their debt burden.

Table 5.5 Proportion of households paid back their loans

	Belgaum		Gulbarga		Tumkur		Total	
	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS
Yes	7.1	17.2	13.8	15.0	6.7	6.7	8.6	13.1
No	92.9	82.8	86.3	85.0	93.3	93.3	91.4	86.9
Social groups								
	SC		ST		OBC		OC	
Yes	8.6	11.3	4.0	10.0	16.3	20.9	8.1	16.9
No	91.4	88.8	96.0	90.0	83.7	79.1	91.9	83.1

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

5.3 Effect of MGNREGA on children's education

The MGNREGA programme can have significant impact on children because it has a potential to transform the well being of them. This scheme particularly significant as it prohibits the employment of children below the age of 18 years in any work under the scheme. Table 5.6 shows the percentage of beneficiary households reported their children's activity. On the whole, it is observed that before joining the MGNREGA scheme around 25.2

per cent of households reported their children were working but it increased 27.4 per cent after joining the scheme. A similar result is observed across all social groups except OC households. In case of children's education, it can be seen that compared to before implementing the scheme, the percentage of households reported their children currently attending school has declined after the implementation of MGNREGA scheme. The fall in the number of children going to school could be because of decline in fertility rates. At the same time, the proportion of households reported their children going to English medium private schools has increased substantially in the study areas. Overall, before joining this scheme, the proportion of households reporting their children going to English medium schools was 3.9 per cent which increased to 5.2 per cent after joining the scheme. In SC households, before the scheme, it was 3.2 per cent and it increased to 4.7 per cent after implementing the scheme. Around 2 per cent of ST households reported their children attending English medium school before joining the scheme, but it increased to 4 per cent after joining the scheme. In OBC households, it was 4.7 per cent before joining the scheme and it increased to 7 per cent after joining the scheme. This indicates that the income come from the scheme has enabled the beneficiary households to invest more on their children's schooling.

Table 5.6 Proportion of households reported their children's current activity

	SC		ST		OBC		OC		Total	
	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS
Working										
Yes	31.3	34.5	8.0	12.0	23.3	37.2	14.9	10.1	25.2	27.4
No	68.7	65.5	92.0	88.0	76.7	62.8	85.1	89.9	74.8	72.6
In school										
Yes	54.3	39.4	52.0	24.0	46.5	30.2	47.3	35.1	52.0	36.6
No	45.7	60.6	48.0	76.0	53.5	69.8	52.7	64.9	48.0	63.4
In English Medium School										
Yes	3.2	4.7	2.0	4.0	4.7	7.0	6.1	6.8	3.9	5.2
No	96.8	95.4	98.0	96.0	95.4	93.0	93.9	93.2	96.2	94.8

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

5.2 MGNREGA and Migration

One of the significant objectives of the MGNREGA is to arrest out-migration of unskilled, landless labour force from the rural areas to urban areas by ensuring up to 100 days of wage employment within their native jurisdiction so that these 100 days guaranteed wage employment can be judiciously and rationally utilized by the landless peasants during lean and distress seasons. This section analyses the impact of this scheme in arresting out-migration by taking the opinion of households who have benefitted from the land development scheme under the MGNREGA programme. Overall, around 18.2 per cent of households reported that their adult members migrated for employment. In Belgaum district, 7.9 per cent of households reported their adult member migrated, while 28 and 23.3 per cent of households reported the same in Gulbarga and Tumkur districts respectively. In SC community, 21 per cent of households reported to be migrant households, while 23.3 per cent of OBC households reported the same. Around 8 and 12.2 per cent households reported to be migrant households in ST and OC households respectively. The majority of households reported their adult members are migrating to town within the state (53 per cent), followed by other states (35 per cent) and nearest village (7.7 per cent). People living in Belgaum and Gulbarga are mainly migrating to other states for jobs, while people staying in Tumkur district are migrating to city within the state. Similarly, 46 per cent of SC households reported their adult members are migrating to other states, while 45 per cent of household reported their adult member are migrating to city within the state. Households belong to ST, OBC and OC community are mainly migrating to city within the state.

On an average, 50 per cent of households reported that one person migrate from their family, while 42 per cent of households reported two persons migrated from their family. In SC community, a majority of households reported two persons migrated from their family, while a highest share of households reported one person migrated from their family in ST,

OBC and OC community. Almost 49 per cent of families stated their adult members migrated for 4 month in a year, while 20.5 and 15.4 per cent of them reported three and two months. In SC community, a highest proportion of families (55.3 per cent) reported their family members migrated for four months, while almost 19 and 17 per cent of them reported three and two months. In ST community, 75 per cent of households stated their family members migrated for three months. In OC community, 39 and 33.3 per cent of households stated four and one month respectively. In OBC community, 40 and 30 per cent of family stated their adult members migrated for one and two months respectively. This result indicates that the employment opportunities - including both MGNREGA and other labour work – were not adequate and also the local wage rates were lower.

Labour migrates to other prosperous destinations for work in expectation of earning more income as much as they can. This explicate whether or not migrants benefited by migrating to other places. In this regard, this study found that the annual average earning of the migrants is INR 2769 with a maximum earning of INR 150,000 and minimum earning of INR 2000. The annual average earning of migrants from SC households is INR 3365, whereas migrants from ST, OBC and OC households has earned INR 2300, INR 2046 and 1490 respectively. The duration of stay, type of destination and number of person migrating from the family are of course important elements in deciding migrant's income earnings. In this regard, this study found that migrant's earnings differ substantially according to duration of stay. On an average, if migrant stay one month in destination, migrants earns INR 7361 which increased to INR 14,611 for two months and 15937 for three months and further increased to 19192 if they stay four months in destination. When we look at migrants earning by place of destination, it is found that the average annual earnings is INR 7725, INR 15460, INR 22450 and INR 60,000 if they migrate to nearest village, city, other state and abroad respectively. Moreover, on an average, migrant earns INR 12630 in destination if one person from the family migrated and INR 17900 if two people migrated from the family.

Table 5.7 Proportion of households by migration status

	Belgaum		Gulbarga		Tumkur		Total	
	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS
Yes	5.6	5.6	21.3	21.9	13.9	15.7	12.3	13.1
No	94.4	94.4	78.8	78.1	86.1	84.3	87.7	86.9
Social groups								
	SC		ST		OBC		OC	
Yes	14.2	14.9	4.0	4.0	20.9	20.9	7.4	8.8
No	85.8	85.1	96.0	96.0	79.1	79.1	92.6	91.2

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

The information of impact on MGNREGA on out-migration is presented in the table 5.7. On the whole, it is found that migration in the surveyed districts has been increasing even after MGNREGA's intervention. Before the MGNREGA programme, 12.3 per cent of households reported their family member migrated out for employment, but it further slightly increased to 13 per cent after the implementation the scheme. In Gulbarga and Tumkur districts, the proportion of households reporting migration has increased after the land development programme. Similarly, it can be seen that out-migration has increased after the land development programme among SC and OC households compared to other social groups.

5.5 MGNREGA and Household Expenditure Pattern

Though the earnings from MGNREGA may not be very substantial, yet the manner in which the beneficiary uses this income is important in understanding the role of the MGNREGA in household expenditure patterns. In order to under the impact of MGNREGA on household expenditure patterns, we asked the beneficiary households "did you buy any new commodities after joining the scheme". In table 5.8, nine commodities are given for discussion. Overall, the expenditure pattern of beneficiary households on certain items before and after the scheme documents no significant improvement in this study. For instance, when compared to before joining the scheme, a small proportion of households only reported that

they bought cycle, bullock, tractor and radio after joining the programme. The proportion of households bought mobile phone after the scheme has increased significantly only among SC households.

At the same time, there is a substantial improvement reported in purchasing of motorcycle, television, cable connection, dish after joining the MGNREGA programme. Before joining the scheme, 26.5 per cent of households had bought motorcycle which increased to 28.2 per cent after joining the scheme. Especially, it has increased from 24 per cent to 36 per cent among ST households between before and after the scheme. In case of television, the proportion of households had bought television before joining the scheme was 57.4 per cent which increased to 71.2 per cent after joining the scheme. Before joining the scheme, 46 per cent of ST households possessed television, but after joining the scheme it went to 70 per cent of households. Similarly, purchasing of television has largely increased among SC, OBC and OC households after joining the scheme. The proportion of households purchased cable connection and dish has increased predominantly after joining the programme as the percentage of families bought television increased. When compared to before joining the scheme, the proportion of SC households purchased cable connection and dish has increased to 31.5 and 40.8 per cent respectively after joining the scheme. The proportion of households purchased dish has increased to 56, 51, 43.2 per cent among ST, OBC and OC households respectively after the joining the scheme.

Table 5.8 Proportion of households by household expenditure pattern

	SC		ST		OBC		OC		Total	
	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS
Cycle										
Yes	35.7	7.8	44.0	6.0	30.2	9.3	58.8	4.1	41.2	6.9
No	64.3	92.2	56.0	94.0	69.8	90.7	41.2	96.0	58.8	93.1
Motor cycle										
Yes	21.8	25.4	24.0	36.0	23.3	32.6	41.2	31.8	26.5	28.2
No	78.2	74.6	76.0	64.0	76.7	67.4	58.8	68.2	73.5	71.9
Mobile										
Yes	43.8	48.2	48.0	28.0	41.9	41.9	58.8	35.8	47.4	43.4
No	56.2	51.8	52.0	72.0	58.1	58.1	41.2	64.2	52.6	56.6
Bullock										
Yes	13.7	9.8	20.0	4.0	16.3	7.0	23.7	4.7	16.6	8.0
No	86.3	90.2	80.0	96.0	83.7	93.0	76.4	95.3	83.4	92.0
Tractor										
Yes	0.7	1.0	2.0	0.0	2.3	2.3	5.4	2.0	2.0	1.2
No	99.3	99.0	98.0	100.0	97.7	97.7	94.6	98.0	98.0	98.8
Radio										
Yes	9.1	2.4	8.0	0.0	9.3	0.0	8.1	2.0	8.8	2.0
No	91.0	97.6	92.0	100.0	90.7	100.0	91.9	98.0	91.2	98.0
Television										
Yes	60.2	70.9	46.0	70.0	44.2	67.4	57.4	73.7	57.4	71.2
No	39.9	29.1	54.0	30.0	55.8	32.6	42.6	26.4	42.6	28.8
Cable connection										
Yes	22.7	31.5	10.0	20.0	16.3	20.9	25.7	42.6	22.0	32.5
No	77.3	68.5	90.0	80.0	83.7	79.1	74.3	57.4	78.0	67.5
Dish										
Yes	32.5	40.8	38.0	56.0	30.2	51.2	31.8	43.2	32.6	43.2
No	67.5	59.2	62.0	44.0	69.8	48.8	68.2	56.8	67.4	56.8

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

In order to understand the impact of MGNRGEA on housing, we asked the beneficiary households “have you made any changes to your house after the land development scheme under the MGNREGA programme?” On the whole, after joining the scheme, the proportion of households made repairing work, constructing new room and separate water tap facility have not increased much, whereas construction of toilet and shed for livestock by the beneficiary households has increased largely (Table 5.9). However, in SC community, the percentage of families renovated their house before joining the scheme was 2.9 per cent which increased slightly to 3.2 per cent after joining the scheme. Similarly, the percentage of

OBC households renovated their house has raised from 4.7 per cent to 7 per cent after implementing the scheme. As compared to other social groups, construction new room and separate water tap facility has increased largely among OBC households after joining the scheme. In case of construction of latrine, it can be observed that before implementing the scheme almost 22 per cent of households constructed latrine in their house and it increased to 26.6 per cent after the implementation of the scheme. In particular, construction of toilets by the beneficiary households has increased largely among SC and OBC households after implementing the scheme. Construction shed for livestock also increased significantly in the beneficiary households. Before joining the scheme, 6 per cent of households constructed shed for livestock which increased to 11 per cent after joining the scheme. Especially, it has increased extensively among ST and OC households than others.

Table 5.9 Proportion of households made changes to their house before and after the scheme

	SC		ST		OBC		OC		Total	
	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS
Repairs										
Yes	2.9	3.2	10.0	4.0	4.7	7.0	6.1	4.1	4.3	3.7
No	97.1	96.8	90.0	96.0	95.4	93.0	93.9	96.0	95.7	96.3
New room construction										
Yes	8.6	7.8	10.0	8.0	0.0	11.6	7.4	4.7	7.9	7.4
No	91.4	92.2	90.0	92.0	100.0	88.4	92.6	95.3	92.2	92.6
Separate tap facility										
Yes	18.6	16.1	28.0	10.0	16.3	20.9	14.9	6.8	18.3	13.9
No	81.4	83.9	72.0	90.0	83.7	79.1	85.1	93.2	81.7	86.2
Latrine										
Yes	18.8	26.9	26.0	26.0	11.6	32.6	31.8	24.3	21.9	26.6
No	81.2	73.1	74.0	74.0	88.4	67.4	68.2	75.7	78.2	73.4
Shed for livestock										
Yes	6.6	9.1	2.0	16.0	2.3	4.7	6.8	16.9	6.0	11.1
No	93.4	91.0	98.0	84.0	97.7	95.4	93.2	83.1	94.0	88.9

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

5.6 Women's participation in SHGs

Table 5.10 presents the proportion of households reported their female member participated in self help groups (SNGs) comparing before and after implementing the

MGNREGA programme in the study. On the whole, it is observed that participation of women in SHGs has not improved between before and after the implementation of the scheme. A similar result also observed across all social groups except OBC households. SHGs not only enhance awareness about various social welfare programmes in rural areas but also provide financial security to their members. In this regard, a question asked to beneficiary households “whether you have taken loan”. It can be seen that the proportion of households taken loan from SHGs have increased from 15.7 per cent to 17.2 per cent between before and after implementing the scheme. In SC community, it increased slightly from 15 per cent to 16.4 per cent. At the same time, the proportion of households taken loan from SHGs has increased more than two times higher in OBC households.

Table 5.10 Proportion of households reported their female member participated in SHG

	SC		ST		OBC		OC		Total	
	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS
Is your spouse member in any SHGs										
Yes	14.2	8.1	26.0	18.0	11.6	14.0	16.9	14.2	15.5	10.6
No	85.8	91.9	74.0	82.0	88.4	86.1	83.1	85.8	84.5	89.4
Have you taken loan from SHGs?										
Yes	14.9	16.4	20.0	20.0	7.0	18.6	18.9	18.2	15.7	17.2
No	85.1	83.6	80.0	80.0	93.0	81.4	81.1	81.8	84.3	82.8

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

The purpose of loan demanded by the women of SHGs is another interesting indicator of their socioeconomic status. The purposes of loan from SHGs were marriage, to start dairy, retail shop and for children education. The table 5.11 reveals that as compared to before joining the scheme, the proportion of households taken loan from SHGs to start dairy, small retail shop and for children’s education have increased substantially after joining the programme. Before joining the scheme, nearly 3.7 per cent of households have taken loan from SHGs to start small retail shop and that increased to almost 5 per cent after joining the scheme. As compared to ST and OC households, the loan taken for the purpose of retail shop

has increased substantially among SC and OBC households after joining the programme. Study also reveals that almost 5 per cent of households had taken loan to start dairy before joining the programme which increased to 6.3 per cent after joining the programme. The proportion of households taken loan to start dairy has raised considerably among all social groups except ST households. In SC households, it increased from 4.2 per cent to 5.6 per cent after implementing the scheme. Similarly, the loan taken for the purpose of children's education has increased significantly after joining the programme in the study area.

Table 5.11 Proportion of households taken loan for what purpose

	SC		ST		OBC		OC		Total	
	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS
Retail shop										
Yes	3.4	4.9	4.0	4.0	2.3	4.7	4.7	4.7	3.7	4.8
No	96.6	95.1	96.0	96.0	97.7	95.4	95.3	95.3	96.3	95.2
Dairy										
Yes	4.2	5.6	8.0	8.0	2.3	7.0	6.8	7.4	4.9	6.3
No	95.8	94.4	92.0	92.0	97.7	93.0	93.2	92.6	95.1	93.7
Education										
Yes	4.2	4.7	2.0	4.0	2.3	0.0	6.1	7.4	4.3	4.9
No	95.8	95.4	98.0	96.0	97.7	100.0	93.9	92.6	95.7	95.1
Marriage										
Yes	2.7	2.0	4.0	2.0	0.0	7.0	0.7	0.7	2.2	2.0
No	97.3	98.0	96.0	98.0	100.0	93.0	99.3	99.3	97.9	98.0

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

Though instructions have been given to pay wages through bank and post office savings accounts, which have been issued to ensure transparency in wage payments and prevent misappropriations, there remain the areas for concern. The government of India mandated that all MGNREGA related payments should be made through bank/post office accounts opened in the name of the individual workers. In this regard, this study found that almost 69 per cent of the beneficiary households had bank accounts before joining the programme whereas only 6.8 per cent of the beneficiary households opened account in banks after joining the scheme (table 5.12). In SC community, 60.4 per cent of households had bank accounts before joining the scheme but only 6 per cent of households opened account in bank after

joining the scheme. At the same time, a higher proportion of households have bank accounts in ST and OC community before joining the scheme. In terms of saving money in bank and post office, it can be seen that the proportion of households making savings in banks and post office have been increased largely during the period between before and after implementing the MGNREGA programme. The proportion of households making savings in bank was 19.2 per cent before joining the scheme and that increased to 24 per cent after joining the scheme. In SC community, it increased from 17.6 per cent to 25.4 per cent after joining the MGNREGA programme. On an average, the beneficiary households had saved INR 3221 in a year before joining the scheme and after joining the scheme they have saved INR 7654. The SC households were making savings of INR 2433 before joining the scheme and after joining the scheme it is INR 3581.

Table 5.12 Proportion of households opened account in bank and post office

	SC		ST		OBC		OC		Total	
	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS
Have you opened any saving bank account?										
Yes	60.4	5.9	94.0	6.0	51.2	16.3	88.5	6.8	68.8	6.8
No	39.6	94.1	6.0	94.0	48.8	83.7	11.5	93.2	31.2	93.2
Are you saving money in bank?										
Yes	17.6	25.4	16.0	12.0	18.6	20.9	25.0	25.0	19.2	24.0
No	82.4	74.6	84.0	88.0	81.4	79.1	75.0	75.0	80.8	76.0
Do you make savings in post office?										
Yes	2.2	3.2	6.0	2.0	4.7	4.7	4.7	6.8	3.2	4.0
No	97.8	96.8	94.0	98.0	95.4	95.4	95.3	93.2	96.8	96.0
How much do you save in a year (in INR)										
	2433	3581	2362	3244	2651	1988	5856	22047	3221	7654

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

5.7 Political participation of beneficiary households

Participation of beneficiary household members in local elections at ward and panchayat level shows their awareness and courage in the society. Table 5.13 depicts the proportion of households reported their adult members participating in the local elections before and after the implementation of the MGNREGA programme. On the whole,

participation of beneficiary households in local elections is mainly dominated by OBC and OC households in the study area. At ward level, SC households are more likely to participate in elections, whereas their participation is low at the panchayat president level in both before and after joining the MGNREGA programme.

Table 5.13 Proportion of households reported their adult member's participating in local elections

	SC		ST		OBC		OC		Total	
	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS	Before NREGS	After NREGS
Ward member										
Yes	7.3	1.5	6.0	0.0	9.3	0.0	11.5	2.0	8.3	1.4
No	92.7	98.5	94.0	100.0	90.7	100.0	88.5	98.0	91.7	98.6
President										
Yes	2.7	0.5	6.0	8.0	4.7	0.0	6.8	2.7	4.0	1.5
No	97.3	99.5	94.0	92.0	95.4	100.0	93.2	97.3	96.0	98.5

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages

Source: Field survey

Summary

This chapter is examined the land development work under the MGNREGA programme and its impact on cropping patterns, agriculture investments, out-migration, children's education, household expenditure patterns, housing, participation in Self Help Groups (SHGs) and local elections. The cultivation of certain crops by the beneficiary households has increased after the land development work in both kharif and rabi seasons. Average households' expenditure on agriculture has sharply increased after the land development programme in both seasons. When we look at farming expenditure across social groups, it is found that the average households spending on agriculture is highest among ST households and least among SC households. Around 46 per cent of households reported their economic status has improved after the land development programme. The comparative analysis of household annual income from land indicated that household income of the beneficiary families before implementing the land development programme under MGNREGA was substantially lower compared to the household income after the land

development programme which highlights the positive role of MGNREGA programme in increasing the household income. Compared to before joining the MGNREGA programme, a majority of beneficiary households could repay their loans. In case of children's education, it is found that compared to before implementing the scheme, the percentage of households reported their children currently attending school has declined after the implementation of MGNREGA scheme. The fall in the number of children going to school could be because of decline in fertility rates. At the same time, the proportion of households reported their children going to English medium private schools has increased substantially in the study areas.

One of the important objectives of MGNREGA programme is to arrest migration from rural areas. This study found the Out-migration in the surveyed districts has been increasing even after MGNREGA's intervention. In case of housing, after joining the scheme, the proportion of households made repairing work, constructing new room and separate water tap facility have not increased much, whereas construction of toilet and shed for livestock by the beneficiary households has increased largely. The proportion of women taking loan from SHGs has increased among the beneficiary households in the study area which indicates that MGNREGA enabled the women to repay their debt. In terms of saving money in bank and post office, it can be seen that the proportion of households making savings in banks and post office have been increased largely during the period between before and after implementing the MGNREGA programme. Participation of beneficiary households in local elections is mainly dominated by OBC and OC households in the study area. At ward level, SC households are more likely to participate in elections, whereas their participation is low at the panchayat president level in both before and after joining the MGNREGA programme.

Chapter 6

Conclusions and policy recommendations

The study mainly examined the ownership and present status of land, awareness and access to the employment guarantee programme and land development activities under the programme. It further analysed the land development work under the MGNREGA programme and its impact on cropping patterns, agriculture investments, out-migration, children's education, household expenditure patterns, housing, participation in Self Help Groups (SHGs) and local elections. The study found that the majority of the respondents were male. The number of beneficiary households from SCs accounts 63 per cent of the total sample, followed by OC (22.8 per cent), STs (7.7 per cent) and OBCs (6.6 percent). Though the land development programme was launched for the benefit of all the sub-groups of SC community, it failed to reach them horizontally. The factors may be many like awareness level, land factor and political influence. Previous studies on the implementation of MGNREGS in Karnataka districts found that lack of awareness on MGNREGS is an important factor that influences the flow of benefits to SC communities (Manjula and Rajashekar, 2015). Rural households are having only general awareness or only just heard the scheme. They did not have any precise idea on the entitlements, nature and type of work that can be taken up under the programme. In terms of housing, a substantial proportion of households were living in a house without room. This indicates that the government welfare programmes, especially housing scheme, have not reached to people who really needed.

Nearly 97.2 per cent of surveyed households have owned land, while only 2.8 per cent of households do not own land. The proportion of landless households is higher among SC households compared to other social groups. In terms of land holding size, the average land holding size is higher among OBC and OC community compared to SC/ST households in the study area. The details on present status of land reveals that about 93 per cent of

households reported that they are cultivating their land, while 7 per cent of households have not used their land for cultivation or given for lease. Nearly 85 per cent of households reported that their lands need development activities such as levelling, ploughing work and water facility. The awareness about the programme has increased in the study area through various media such as TV, Radio, newspapers etc. A majority of households stated that they got good response from the concerned authority when they approached to know about the programme. Households mainly used the MGNREGA's money to perform trenching and banding activities, levelling and ploughing activities in their land. Some households used the money to make shed for their livestock. As a result, their land is now transferred to cultivable conditions. Family members of beneficiary households were also contributed in the land development activity.

The cultivation of certain crops by the beneficiary households has increased after the land development work in both kharif and rabi seasons. Average households' expenditure on agriculture has sharply increased after the land development programme in both seasons. When we look at farming expenditure across social groups, it is found that the average households spending on agriculture is highest among ST households and least among SC households. Around 46 per cent of households reported their economic status has improved after the land development programme. The comparative analysis of household annual income from land indicated that household income of the beneficiary families before implementing the land development programme under MGNREGA was substantially lower compared to the household income after the land development programme which highlights the positive role of MGNREGA programme in increasing the household income. Compared to before joining the MGNREGA programme, a majority of beneficiary households could repay their loans. In case of children's education, it is found that compared to before implementing the scheme, the percentage of households reported their children currently attending school has declined after the implementation of MGNREGA scheme. The fall in

the number of children going to school could be because of decline in fertility rates. At the same time, the proportion of households reported their children going to English medium private schools has increased substantially in the study areas.

One of the important objectives of MGNREGA programme is to arrest migration from rural areas. This study found the Out-migration in the surveyed districts has been increasing even after MGNREGA's intervention. In case of housing, after joining the scheme, the proportion of households made repairing work, constructing new room and separate water tap facility have not increased much, whereas construction of toilet and shed for livestock by the beneficiary households has increased largely. The proportion of women taking loan from SHGs has increased among the beneficiary households in the study area which indicates that MGNREGA enabled the women to repay their debt. In terms of saving money in bank and post office, it can be seen that the proportion of households making savings in banks and post office have been increased largely during the period between before and after implementing the MGNREGA programme. Participation of beneficiary households in local elections is mainly dominated by OBC and OC households in the study area. At ward level, SC households are more likely to participate in elections, whereas their participation is low at the panchayat president level in both before and after joining the MGNREGA programme.

Literature

- Harish, B. G., Nagaraj, N., Chandrakanth, M. G., Murthy, P. S., Chengappa, P. G., & Basavaraj, G. (2011). Impacts and implications of MGNREGA on labour supply and income generation for agriculture in central dry zone of Karnataka. *Agricultural Economics Research Review*, 24(5), 485-494.
- Murthy, P. S. S., Nagaraj, N., Chandrashekhar, H., Chandrakanth, M. G., & Mahadevaiah, G. S. (2013). Economic impact of MGNREGA in Karnataka. *Mysore Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 47(4), 828-834.
- Channaveera, H. L., Hugara, L. B., Deshmanyab, J. B., & Goudappac, S. B. (2011). Impact of MGNREGA on input-use pattern, labour productivity and returns of selected crops in Gulbarga District, Karnataka. *Agric Econ Res Rev*, 24, 517-523.
- Vani, G. K., Murthy, P. S., Chandrakanth, M. G., Gaddi, G. M., Chandrashekar, H., Nagaraj, N., & Bhattaraid, M. (2015). Employment Generation, Labour Migration and MGNREGP Intervention: Evidences from a Village Level Study. *Agricultural Economics Research Review*, 28(conf), 267-274.
- Ahuja, U. R., Tyagi, D., Chauhan, S., & Chaudhary, K. R. (2011). Impact of MGNREGA on rural employment and migration: a study in agriculturally-backward and agriculturally-advanced districts of Haryana. *Agricultural Economics Research Review*, 24, 495-502.
- Manjula, R., & Rajasekhar, D. (2015). *Participation of scheduled caste households in MGNREGS: Evidence from Karnataka*. Institute for Social and Economic Change.
- Chakravorty, U., Pelli, M., & Marchand, B. U. (2014). Does the quality of electricity matter? Evidence from rural India. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 107, 228-247.
- Samad, H., & Zhang, F. (2016). *Benefits of electrification and the role of reliability: evidence from India*. The World Bank.