

## **AWARENESS ON RIGHT BASED ENTITLEMENTS AMONG MGNREGA WORKERS IN DISTRICT SIRMAUR**

**Virender Sharma\*, Rajeev Bansal<sup>†</sup> & Mamta Mokta<sup>‡</sup>**

---

### *Abstract*

*MG NREGA is an ambitious act passed by the Government of India in 2005 and aimed at providing 100 days of unskilled wage employment to willing households for providing livelihood security to the poor rural households while focusing on creation of durable assets and empowering the rural poor. The Act and the Scheme made there under afford statutory right based entitlements to the MG NREGA workers which offer them decent job with work site facilities, transport allowance, payment of wages in stipulated time, role in selection of works, guarantee of 100 days wages, unemployment allowance in case work is not provided. The indicator for success of these entitlements is dependent upon the awareness of workers about these statutory provisions. The paper has analysed the delivery and awareness of workers of right based entitlements promised in MG NREGS in selected blocks of District Sirmour, Himachal Pradesh. Though the act and scheme has placed a robust information and education system enable them to leverage the mandatory provisions of Act, yet the findings of this field study presented a contrary picture, especially on the part of the awareness of the workers about their rights and entitlements. In the last, a few suggestions have been made for better implementation of scheme to aim at the real empowerment of people which can lead to better rural development besides economic uplifting the rural poor.*

---

### **Introduction**

The concept of rural development has emerged with new force and is almost at the top of agenda in national politics of the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America because a significant number of people are residing in rural areas in those countries. Rural development is the base for the overall growth of developing countries like India. Rural development is the improvement in the overall rural community conditions, including the economic and other aspects such as the environment, health, infrastructure, and housing.

---

\*Research Scholar, Department of Public Administration, HP University, Shimla

† Research Officer, SIRD, HP Institute of Public Administration, Shimla

‡ Prof. & Head, Department of Public Administration, H. P. University, Shimla

India lives in villages and no developmental effort can be successful unless it addresses rural areas and its people. Rural people constitute the greater part of the population often lacking of basic needs such as water, food, education, health care, sanitation and security, leading to low life expectancy and high infant mortality. The purpose of rural development is “to improve the standard of living of rural population – is multi-sectoral including agriculture, industry, and social facilities”. Since independence till today, India has continuously and persistently implemented more than thirty programmes of rural development-with a view to improving the economic and social life of the rural poor. It is in this background that a need was felt to formulate a programme which could address the issue of rural poverty, infrastructure gap and livelihood security aiming at the development of rural areas and providing a sense of security to the rural masses.

### **Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005**

Implemented by the Ministry of Rural Development, the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA), now titled as MGNREGA, is the flagship programme of the government that directly touches lives of the poor and promotes inclusive growth. The Act aims at enhancing livelihood security of households in rural areas of the country by providing at least one hundred days of guaranteed wage employment in a financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work.

The Act came into force on February 2, 2006 and was implemented in a phased manner. In Phase One, it was introduced in 200 most backward districts of the country. It was implemented in an additional 130 districts in Phase Two during 2007-2008. As per the initial target, MGNREGA was to be expanded countrywide in five years. However, in order to bring the whole nation under its safety net and keeping in view the demand, the Scheme was extended to the remaining 285 rural districts of India from April 1, 2008 in Phase III. In Himachal Pradesh in the first phase, the National Rural Employment Guarantee scheme (MGNREGS) was introduced in District Chamba and Sirmour on 2nd February, 2006. In second phase MGNREGS was started in District Kangra and Mandi w.e.f. 1-4-2007. In the third phase all the remaining 8 districts of the State have been covered under the scheme w.e.f. 1.4.2008

MGNREGA is the first ever law internationally, that guarantees wage employment at an unprecedented scale. The primary objective of the Act is augmenting wage employment. Its auxiliary objective is strengthening natural resource management through works that address causes of chronic poverty like draught, deforestation and soil erosion and so encourage sustainable development. The process outcomes include strengthening grassroot processes of democracy and infusing transparency

and accountability in governance. The objective of the Act is to create durable assets and strengthen the livelihood resource base of the rural poor. The choice of works prescribed in the guidelines for the act addresses causes of chronic poverty like drought, deforestation, soil erosion etc., so that the process of employment generation is sustainable. The main salient features of the act and scheme include that a household will have to apply for registration to the local Gram Panchayat, in writing. Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) have a principal role in planning and implementation of works executed under MG NREGS. Each Gram Panchayat has to prepare a shelf of projects. The selected works to provide employment are to be selected from the list of permissible works. The workers have certain right based entitlements as given under:

- Worksite facilities (Medical aid, drinking water and shade) are to be provided at the worksite.
- In case the number of children below the age of six years accompanying the women working at any site are five or more, a crèche will need to be provided. One of such women worker shall be made to depute to look after such children. She will be paid wages equal to the prevalent wage rate paid to the unskilled worker.

## **2. Statement of Research Problem**

MG NREG Act and scheme made by each state there under to give effect to the minimum provisions have paved way for rights and entitlements for workers. MG NREGA operational guidelines mentioned public vigilance and verification at all the stages of implementation to ensure the followings rights and entitlement to workers viz. Registration of families, Distribution of job cards, Receipt of work applications, Preparation of shelf of projects and selection of sites, Approval of technical estimates and issuance of work order, Allotment of work to individuals, Implementation and supervision of works, Payment of unemployment allowance, Payment of wages, Evaluation of works and mandatory social audit in the Gram Sabha. It was felt that there is sufficient gap in theory and practice and the entitlements were not disbursed to the workers: rather the workers were hardly aware about these entitlements which weaken their chance of access to active participation as well as availing the guaranteed employment. The programme provided participation in every stage of implantation to community as well as selection of works. In case, the workers were not able to avail the job, there was provision for unemployment allowance. Besides this, there were standard wage rates and time limits for disbursal of wages. The present paper attempted to look into these major dimensions and findings on this part to reach at the practices prevailing at the grassroot level to assess the gap in theory and practice.

### **3. Objectives of the Study**

The study has been conducted with the following objectives-

1. To study the rights and entitlements available to MG NREGA workers on various aspects.
2. To assess the awareness level of MG NREGA workers on the rights and entitlements available to them on various aspects.
3. To find out the receipt and the awareness on right based entitlements of MG NREGA to workers i.e. delivery of basic benefits of the scheme to the beneficiaries.
4. To suggest measures for implementation of the scheme to ensure delivery of rights and entitlements to MG NREGA workers.

### **4. Research Methodology**

It is a descriptive study with a view to analyze the awareness level of MG NREGA workers in comparison to their participation in execution of works. The envisioned results trickle down to people with their awareness about such entitlements to realize the benefits of the scheme. An attempt has been made in this paper to ascertain the contrast between the receipt and their awareness on right based entitlements of MG NREGS. The focus was on significant factors of awareness which included unemployment allowance, worksite facilities, role of workers in selection of works, mechanism for selection of works, delay in payment of wages and payment of unemployment allowance. Whereas, on account of their participation, the factors included providing job to the households, provision of 100 days jobs in a year to a household in a year, delay in payment besides distribution of respondents in terms of their participation in MG NREGS works over the years. The study was undertaken in selected blocks of District Sirmour, Himachal Pradesh. Sirmour is a backward district of Himachal Pradesh where MG NREGS has been implemented in the Phase-1 in 2006. The district has six development blocks out of which three blocks viz. Nahan, Pachhad & Paonta have been selected as sample. Pachhad block represented the hill area, Paonta is a typical plain valley and Nahan block represented hills and plains geographical area. The geographical contrast of these three blocks gave fair representation of the areas and indicated the variation in the respective dimensions of the factors studied in the paper. The data for the present study was collected through both primary & secondary sources. The primary data sources included information generated by administering schedules to the workers, data collected through extensive field visits to various gram panchayats besides focussed group discussions with the beneficiaries, both males & females. The secondary data was collected from the offices of Rural Development

Directorate, District Programme Coordinator, Project Director and Project Officer (DRDA), MGNREGS guidelines, Official circulars, orders, notifications, directions etc. issued by Department of Rural Development (Govt. of India & State Govt.) from time to time. In addition to this, management information system website [www.nrega.nic.in](http://www.nrega.nic.in) of Government of India was accessed to collect the required information. The entire population of the district is spread over six development blocks and 228 panchayats. A sample of 3% households from the total 15118 households spread over three selected development blocks has been taken which comes to 450 households. The 450 respondents were the workers with 150 women i.e. 1/3rd beneficiary workers to be females as per the provisions of MGNREGS. Efforts were made to select the respondents in way which is representative of the entire population. The data collected through the schedules has tabulated and analysed in accordance with the objectives of the study to arrive at the meaningful conclusions.

### 5. Analysis of Data

The primary data collected from the sample Gram Panchayats has been tabulated, classified and analyzed in accordance with the objectives of the study to reach at logical conclusions. The data contains information on distribution of respondents in term of their participation as workers under MG NREGS over the years and provision of work to these workers. The data collected has been further classified into two broad categories and further four sub categories of both the categories. The presentation of data in categories and sub categories go deep into analysis and to discuss the awareness and receipt of right based entitlements in MG NREGS to workers in sample GPs of District Sirmour, Himachal Pradesh.

*Table 5.1: Distribution of Respondents*

Beneficiaries working for	Development Block		
	Nahan	Pachhad	Paonta
0-1 Year	19 (12.6)	15 (10.0)	10 (6.66)
1-2 Year	28 (18.6)	24 (16.1)	30 (2.0)
2-3 Year	35 (23.33)	30 (2.0)	26 (17.33)
More than 3 years	68 (45.3)	81 (54)	84 (56)
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b> <b>(100)</b>	<b>150</b> <b>(100)</b>	<b>150</b> <b>(100)</b>

*Source: Primary Data Collection from Sample Area; Figures in parentheses indicate percentages*

The distribution of respondents indicated that majority of workers have working under MG NREGA for more than three years. 45.3% of respondents is case of Development Block Nahan, 54% of workers in case of Development Block Pachhad and 56% of respondents in case of Development Block Paonta have been working under MG NREGA for a period of over three years.

Table 5.2 reflected the number of households which were provided employment in Development Blocks Nahan, Pachhad & Paonta.

**Table 5.2: Households provided work and completing 100 days of work**

Indicator	Development Block		
	Nahan	Pachhad	Paonta
No. of Household provided employment	5092	4740	5286
No. of Households completing 100 days of work	749 (14.71)	399 (8.41)	276 (5.22)

*Source: www.nrega.nic.in; Figures in parentheses indicate percentages*

Though there is not much variation across sample blocks in the number of households that were provided employment but there is significant variation in no. of households that completed 100 days of employment, which as per provisions of the Act, can be provided to a household in any financial year. Development Block Nahan had 14.71% households completing 100 days of work, Development Block Pachhad had 8.41 % households competing 100 days of work and Development Block Paonta had 5.22% of households completing 100 days of work. The average for the entire district stood at 7.99%. The percentage of households completing 100 days of work has been measured against households provided work & not households that have been registered under MNREGS since there may be many households that have registered them but do not seek work. In the latter case the percentage of households completing 100 days of work will go down further. But the figures in case of Development Block Pachhad & Nahan are hard to explain.

## **5.1 Right based Entitlements of MG NREGS**

### **5.1.1 Unemployment Allowance**

The provision of unemployment allowance has been incorporated in the Act to ensure timely employment to people. In case of inordinate delay on part of executing agency responsibility is fixed. This provision acts as a safeguard and ensures that guaranteed employment is a right and is not the choice of executive agency.

**Table 5.1.1: Unemployment Allowance**

When does one get unemployment allowance	Development Block		
	Nahan	Pachhad	Paonta
It one doesn't get work with 7 days	12 (8)	109 (6)	15 (10)
If one doesn't get work with 14 days	17 (11.33)	21 (14)	21 (14)
If one doesn't get work with 21 days	23 (15.33)	29 (18.66)	30 (20)
Don't know	98 (65.33)	92 (61.33)	84 (56)

Source: Primary Data Collection from Sample Area; Figures in parentheses indicate percentages

The applicant either gets employment or unemployment allowance. As such not providing the work within stipulated time period and then failing to provide unemployment allowance not only negates the spirit of the Act but also impediments the effective participation of people.

### 5.1.2 Delay in Payment of Wages

Table 5.1.2: Work &amp; wage payment

Duration after which payment was received	Development Block		
	Nahan	Pachhad	Paonta
0-10 days	32 (21.33)	34 (22.66)	37 (24.66)
10-15 days	45 (30)	47 (31.33)	51 (34)
15-20 days	33 (22)	31 (20.66)	27 (18)
More than 20 days	40 (26.6)	38 (25.33)	35 (23.33)

Source: Primary Data Collection from Sample Area; Figures in parentheses indicate percentages

Timely payment of wages is another factor affecting the association of people with MNREGS. In such scenario it is extremely important that the workers are paid wages timely else they look for alternate mode of unemployment where the payments are more or less made at frequent intervals. Only 51.33% of respondents in Development Block Nahan, 53.99% of respondents in Development Block Pachhad & 58.66% respondents in Development Block Paonta claimed that they received wages within the stipulated period of 14 days. Therefore, 48.67 % of respondent in Development Block Nahan, 46.01% respondent in

Development Block Pachhad & 41.34% respondents in Development Block Paonta did not receive the wages within mandated period which is not only violation of the provisions of the Act but also detrimental to long term association & participation of people in MNREGS.

### 5.1.3 Works Selection Mechanism

Table 5.1.3: Selection of Works

Who selects the work under MGNREGS	Development Block		
	Nahan	Pachhad	Paonta
Gram Sabha	36 (24)	44 (29.33)	40 (26.69)
Pradhan/Secy/ ward Members	46 (30.66)	52 (34.66)	41 (27.33)
Govt./Govt. officers	36 (24)	39 (26)	42 (28)
Don't know	32 (21.33)	15 (10)	27 (18)

Source: Primary Data Collection from Sample Area; Figures in parentheses indicate percentages

On being asked how the shelf of works is decided, the respondents were given to select between Gram Sabha, Pradhan /Secy. /Ward Members, Govt/Govt. functionaries. 24% of respondents in case of Development Block Nahan, 29.33% respondents in case of Development Block Pachhad & 26.6% respondents in case of Development Block Paonta perceived that it is Gram Sabha that decided the shelf of works. 30.66% of respondents in Nahan, 34.66% respondents in Pachhad & 27.33% respondents in Developments Block Paonta felt that the shelf of works is decided by the Pradhan or Panchayat Secretary /Sahayak or ward members and they had minimal role in it. To sum up the perception of nearly one fourth of respondents only is in sync with spirit of the Act. Response of rest three fourth of the respondents is inclined in favour of centralised approach or non-participative democracy which essentially negates the purpose of the Act.

### 5.1.4 Non-Completion of 100 Days of Work

The Act mandates every rural household to be entitled to 100 days of wage employment subject to certain conditions. The physical performance of the State, district & selected blocks present a dismal picture about the number of households completing 100 days of work. In view of the poverty, unemployment & resource gap the outcome expected is that most of the

households will be completing 100 days of work & then seeking employment elsewhere.

**Table 5.1.4: Non completion of 100 days of work**

Why not completed 100 days of work	Development Block		
	Nahan	Pachhad	Paonta
Untimely work	40 (26.6)	44 (29.33)	37 (24.66)
Inadequate wages	31 (20.66)	37 (24.66)	27 (18)
Delayed wages	43 (28.66)	34 (22.69)	55 (37.559)
Domestic reasons	12 (8)	17 (11.33)	14 (9.33)
Other reasons	24 (16)	18 (12)	16 (10.66)

Source: Primary Data Collection from Sample Area; Figures in parentheses indicate percentages

However, the actual indicators indicate something else. The respondents were thus asked reason for non-completion of 100 days of work. 26.6% of the respondents in Development Block Nahan, 29.33% of the respondents in Development Block Pachhad & 24.66% of the respondents in Development Block Paonta cited non availability of work on time as the reason for households not completing 100 days of work. 20.66% of the respondents in Development Block Nahan, 24.66% of the respondents in Development Block Pachhad & 18% of the respondents in Development Block Paonta cited inadequate or less wage per day as the reason for non-completion of 100 days by the households. 28.66% of the respondents in Development Block, Nahan 22.66% of respondent in Development Block Pachhad & 37.33% respondents in Development Block Paonta were of the opinion that delayed wages is a reason for most of the households not working for full 100 days of entitlement.

## 5.2 Awareness on right based entitlements of MG NREGS

### 5.2.1 Unemployment Allowance

Table 5.2.1: Unemployment Allowance

Whether aware about unemployment allowance	Development Block		
	Nahan	Pachhad	Paonta
Yes	60 (40)	53 (35.33)	54 (36)

No	90 (60)	97 (64.67)	86 (64)
Total	150 (100)	150 (100)	150 (100)

Source: Primary Data Collection from Sample Area; Figures in parentheses indicate percentages

60% of the beneficiaries in Development Block Nahan 64.67% of the beneficiaries in Development Block Pachhad and 64% of the beneficiaries in Development Block Paonta expressed ignorance about unemployment allowance. The awareness among 27.33%, 22%, 18% of respondents in case of Development Block Nahan, Pachhad & Paonta respondents though encouraging, doesn't serve any purpose because of the continued practice of not issuing dated receipts.

### 5.2.2 Wage Days

The Act envisages 100 days of unskilled wage employment for every rural household. The perception of beneficiaries about their entitlement about number of days will decide the number of days they actually works for and this is crucial for success of the programme.

**Table 5.2.2: Awareness about entitlement of wage days**

No. of days any Household can work for	Development Block		
	Nahan	Pachhad	Paonta
90 days	31 (20.66)	29 (19.3)	35 (23.3)
100 days	92 (61.33)	87 (58)	85 (56.69)
As many days one wants to work	4 (2.66)	7 (4.66)	3 (2)
All days in year	3 (2)	2 (1.3)	5 (3.33)
As many Pradhan/ Secy. wants to give	20 (13.3)	25 (16.6)	22 (14.66)

Source: Primary Data Collection from Sample Area; Figures in parentheses indicate percentages

As indicated in above table, only 61.33% respondents in Development Block Nahan, 58% respondents in Development Block Pachhad & 56.6% respondents in Development Block Paonta knew about the exact entitlement of days per household. 20.66% respondents in Development Block Nahan, 19.3% respondents in Development Block Pachhad & 23.3% respondents in Development Block Paonta perceived that the entitlement

per household is 90 days only. A significant perception is the entitlement of days to be decided by Pradhan/Panchayat Secretary. 13.3% of respondents in Development Block Nahan, 16.6% respondents in Development Block Pachhad & 14.66% respondents in Development Block Paonta were of the opinion that the number of days entitlement per household is decided by the Pradhan or Panchayat Secretary/Sahayak of the Gram Panchayat. In nutshell perception of 38.66 % of the respondents in Development Bolck Nahan, 42% respondents in Development Block Pachhad & 43.3% respondents in Development Block Paonta about the entitlement of number of days of wage employment was incorrect. As indicated, about 40% of the respondents were not aware of their exact entitlement in term of number of employment days therefore to expect most of the families to complete 100 days of work is unrealistic.

### 5.2.3 Role in Selection of Works

Empowering the people to plan things for their community is empowerment in real sense of the term.

**Table 5.2.3: Role in selection of works**

Whether people have an important role in selection of works	Development Block		
	Nahan	Pachhad	Paonta
Yes	82 (54.66)	87 (58)	73 (48.66)
No	55 (36.60)	44 (29.33)	52 (34.66)
Can't say	13 (8.66)	19 (12.66)	25 (16.66)
Total	150 (100)	150 (100)	150 (100)

*Source: Primary Data Collection from Sample Area; Figures in parentheses indicate percentages*

54.66% of the respondents in Development Block Nahan & 58% of the respondents in Dev. Block Pachhad feel that they have an important role in selection of works. The same percentage was further below at 48.66% in Development Block Paonta. Thus, only half of the respondents felt that they had an important role is deciding the shelf of works. 36.60% of the respondents in case of Development Block Nahan, 29.33% of the respondents in case of Development Block Pachhad, & 34.66% of the workers in case of Development Block Paonta explicitly deny that they have

any important role in deciding shelf of works. Same percent of people also seemed indecisive about their role.

#### 5.2.4 Facilities at Work Site

The primary data collected on awareness facilities provided at worksite is presented below:

**Table 5.2.4: Facilities at work site**

Awareness about work site facilities	Development Block		
	Nahan	Pachhad	Paonta
Yes	41 (24.33)	33 (22)	27 (18)
No	109 (72.67)	117 (78)	123 (82)
Total	150 (100)	150 (100)	150 (100)

*Source: Primary Data Collection from Sample Area; Figures in parentheses indicate percentages*

72.67% of respondents in Development Block Nahan, 78% of respondents in Pachhad and 82% of respondents at Paonta did not find any of the basic work site facilities. Most of the respondents carried their own water to the worksite. Only 27.32% of the respondents in Development Block Nahan, 22 % of the respondents in Development Block Pachhad & 18% of the respondents in Development Block Paonta accepted that some worksite facilities are provided at the worksite. 72.68% of the respondents in Development Block Nahan, 78 % of the respondents in Development Block Pachhad & 82% of the respondents in Development Block Paonta expressed ignorance about worksite facilities. Worksite facilities are more required in case of mothers with young babies who cannot be left at home.

#### 6. Findings

The major findings and conclusions that emerged from the analyses are briefly summarized hereunder.

- There is strong correlation between the need of workers for job and the employment provided by the scheme.
- It is a matter of concern that low percentage of households demanding employment completed 100 days of work against the mandate to provide atleast 100 days of unskilled work to willing households.
- The operational procedures, policies, awareness, payment pattern, kind of work etc. were observed to be root cause of the dismal performance statistics of the sample blocks.

- The concept of guaranteed employment within stipulated time period gets undermined in view of the practice of officials not to issue dated receipts. Non-availability of timely work tends to discourage people and they seek employment elsewhere.
- By not being able to give timely wages to the people, the reliance of people on MNREGS as a mode of guaranteed employment is dispelled. As a result, people look towards MNREGA only when nothing else is available.
- More than three fourth of the respondents could neither get employment & nor unemployment allowance within stipulated period.
- The unemployment allowance was not provided in many legitimate cases owing to the reasons of not giving dated receipts which functions as a channel to demand unemployment allowance.
- A large number of respondents cited untimely work, inadequate wages delayed wage payments as factor presenting people from completing 100 days of work. There are procedural lapses and consequences of inappropriate implementations of work.
- A large number of respondents getting payments after the mandated 14 days period hampers the implementation of Act adversely. Timely payments & 100 days of work are thus closely intertwined.
- The reason for delay in payment of wages was unavailability of funds which may suit the executing agency but certainly not the workers.
- A significant percentage of respondents perceived that they had no role in selection of works or preparing the shelf of works. The respondents perceived that shelf of works is decided by Govt. and which made it a top down process instead of bottom up approach as perceived in act.
- It is pertinent to mention here that delayed compensation is payable in case wages are not paid within 14 days after completion of work. Some of the respondents also cited domestic & other reason for non-completion of 100 days of work. In case of females respondents one of the reason for lower turnout was non-availability of child care. Availability of crèche facility could to some extent increase the turn out.
- The people are not aware of unemployment allowance therefore it is concluded that in case they don't get timely work they will at the best shy away from working under MNREGS and will look for alternate form of employment. As such their dependence upon MNREGS for employment will come down and so will their participation. Such contributed apathy will lead to poor performance of MNREGS.
- None of the respondents were aware of the provision of dated receipt and most of them informed the officials; elected or appointed verbally about their desire to work. Most of them were merely acquainted with the term 'unemployment allowance' and did not know how to demand it. In such

situation all the employment seekers are entirely dependent upon the officials.

- In absence of adequate awareness about entitlement people fail to plan to utilise the entitlements hence the programme doesn't meet anticipated. Less than one tenth of households realising 100 days of work is indicative to this fact and also emphasises the big role IEC can play in charming the success for the programme.
- Not providing work within stipulated time period will make people look for alternate source of employment which may not be as fruitful as MG NREGA.
- In absence of the worksite facilities, the basic purpose of the Act to provide minimum comfort to people and to make working conditions better gets defeated and it can lure people away from MNREGS.
- Most of the respondents referred to shade of the trees as the provision of shade at the worksite as against artificially created shade as per the Act. At most of the locations, even the most basic of the worksite facility i.e. water is being fetched by the workers themselves from their own houses let alone some kind of a system to provide water to all the workers whereas as per the Act drinking water at the worksite is to be provided by executing agency and the beneficiaries are not expected to bring it with them.
- People resort to MG NREGA only under extreme circumstances because of its inherent limitations but given the unsuitable conditions of work the situation is worsened further and in such scenario the participation of people is severely limited.
- In absence of worksite facilities the mothers prefer staying at home which is not only detrimental to implementation of the Act but runs contrary to one of the goal of the Act i.e. women empowerment.

## **7. Suggestions**

On the basis of experience in the implementation of rural development programmes in the country, we must evolve appropriate strategies to be adopted in future to fulfil our long cherished goal of poverty alleviation. The parameters and components of rural development need to be prioritized taking into account the achievements made so far and the ultimate objectives of socio-economic upliftment of the rural people particularly the rural poor. On the basis of the field study and the analysis drawn, following measures are suggested to make the performance of MNREGS better-

1. The executing agency should focus more on IEC campaign, taking the awareness to the last mile. Infact it is inevitable conclusion of the analysis that a robust IEC plan is the solution to make people realise their rights.

- Issues like unemployment allowance, delayed wages, worksite facilities etc. can be fixed if people are aware of their rights and start demanding it.
2. Delayed wages have to be adequately compensated irrespective of the reason. In absence of compensation for the delayed wages the poor people take MG NREGA as a measure of the last resort.
  3. Demanding work should be online. Any person should be able to demand work from any place, panchayat office, internet booth, common service centre, etc. It will do away with practice of not giving dated receipts. The software in this case will automatically generate unemployment allowance.
  4. Alongwith photographs of the actual work which have to be uploaded on the software, photographs of the worksite facilities must be uploaded. This will automatically provide worksite facilities to the people.

### References

1. Thomas G. Fraser, India's Rural Transformation and Development Issues, Processes and Direction, Suryodya Books, New Delhi, 2013
2. Dr. Harnam Singh, Dr. Amit Kumar Dwivedi & Dr. K. Nagraj Rao, Rural Development in Post Colonial Era, Bookwell Publishers, New Delhi, 2012
3. N. Sreeramulu, Rural Development Administration in India, Serial Publications, New Delhi, 2011
4. Dr. Harnam Singh, Dr. Amit Kumar Dwivedi & Dr. K. Nagraj Rao, Rural Development in Post Colonial Era, Bookwell Publishers, New Delhi, 2012
5. Najmunessa Mahtab, Rural Development: Towards Integrated Approach, Ramesh K. Arora (ed.), The Mosaic of Rural Development: Cross-Nation Administrative Concerns, The Centre for Administrative Change, Jaipur, 1994.
6. World Bank, Sector Policy Paper on Rural development, World Bank Publications, Washington DC, 1975.
7. Alan W. Childs and Garg B. Melton, Rural Psychology, Plenum Press, New York, 1983.
8. Paul P. Sreeten, Alternative Theories and the Meaning of Development, in Michael P. Torado, Economic Development in the Third World, Orient Longman, Hyderabad, 1993.
9. LC Jain with B.V. Krishnamurthy & P.M. Tripathi, "Grass without Roots: Rural Development under Government", Sage Publications, New Delhi/London/Bevely Hills, 1985.
10. Gagan Kumar Singh, "Administration for Rural Development Programmes in India", Abhijeet Publications Delhi, 1st Edition 2003
11. Disa Sjoblom and John Farrington, "The Indian National Rural Employment Guarantee Act: Will it reduce poverty and boost the economy", Overseas Development Institute, London, 2008
12. Puja Dutta, Rinku Murgai, Martin Ravallion & Dominique van de walle "Right to Work: Assessing India's Employment Guarantee Scheme in Bihar, The World Bank, Washington DC, USA, 2014

64 Awareness Among MGNREGA.....- Virender Sharma et.al.

13. Bigi Thomas, "NREGA & Quality of life of beneficiaries", Allied Publishers, New Delhi, 2014
14. Arundhati Dhuru, "Has NREGA lived upto its expectations" in Economic Times on 5th May,2007
15. Siddhartha & Anish Vanaik, "CAG report on NREGA: Fact and Fiction" in Economic & Political Weekly on dated June 21, 2008
16. Jean Dreze, "Operational framework of NREGA needs overhaul" in The Times of India on dated 31st March, 2009
17. Mahim Pratap Singh, "Where NREGA is a failure", in The Hindu on 6th September, 2009.