

Research Study No: 148

Impact of NREGA on Wages Rates, Food Security and Rural Urban Migration in Kerala

**Dr. R. Arunachalam
A. Abdul Salam**



**Agro Economic Research Centre
University of Madras
Chennai 600 005**

2011-2012

Research Team

1. **Dr. R. Arunachalam**
Director I/c - Overall guidance
2. **A. Abdul Salam**
Project Associate - Collection of Secondary data
and Drafting of the Report
3. **Dr. S. Ramachandran**
Research Officer - Collection of Secondary data
4. **T. Priya**
Research Associate - Preparation of Analysis Table and
Computer Typing
5. **Dr. K. Murugan**
Research Associate -Data Analysis and Secondary data
Collection
6. **P. Prajeesh**
Field Investigator (Temp) - Field Investigation
7. **V. Vinod Kumar**
Field Investigator (Temp) - Field Investigation
8. **S. Santhiran**
Office Assistant - Office Assistance

Preface

The National Rural Employment Guarantee Programme is an outcome of the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) which got the assent of the President of India on September 5, 2005. The act provided for the enhancement of livelihood security of the Indian rural households by providing at least 100 days of guaranteed wage employment in every financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do the unskilled manual work. The NREGA was implemented in three phases in the whole country. The programme was launched on February 2, 2006 from Anantpur in Andhra Pradesh, initially covering 200 most backward districts of India and is expected to increase the purchasing power, reduce distress migration and to create useful assets in rural areas. The programme intends to eliminate the gender wage differentials in the rural labour markets as it ensures equal wages for the male and female workers. It also intends to provide worksite facilities such as childcare, drinking water and makes provision for social auditing of the works done. Through NREGA, there has also been an attempt for the largest financial inclusion of the poor by linking them with the banks or post offices and paying them the wages directly in these accounts. The current study makes an assessment of all such issues in the Kerala State.

The study was conducted in Kerala and for that five districts viz Palakkad, Wayanad, Kasaragod, Kottayam and Thiruvananthapuram were chosen as sample districts for the study. The results of the study show that the functioning of the scheme was effective in Kerala as more rural poor were benefited by the scheme. But the concern revealed from the study was that because of the scheme there was acute shortage of manpower for the agriculture sector. However, the findings of the study show that rural unemployed poor people welcome the scheme as it provides supplementary income to them. The results of the study we hope would be useful to the policy makers to make appropriate changes in the scheme so as to make it more effective to attain the desired results. We are grateful to coordinator of the project study Dr. Parmod Kumar Professor & Head, ADRT for his Coordination and support at every stage of the study. We take this opportunity to thank the Rural Development Department, Government of Kerala for the timely and sincere help and cooperation rendered in carrying out the study. We also express our thanks to the respondent sample households.

A. Abdul Salam
Project Associate

Dr. R. Arunachalam
Director I/c

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	INTRODUCTION	1 - 7
II	MANPOWER EMPLOYMENT GENERATED UNDER NREGA AND ITS SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS	8 - 36
III	HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS, THEIR INCOME AND CONSUMPTION PATTERN	37 - 45
IV	WORK PROFILE UNDER NREGA, WAGE STRUCTURE AND MIGRATION ISSUES	46 - 53
V	THE FUNCTIONING OF NREGA – CERTAIN QUALITATIVE ASPECTS	54 - 68
VI	NREGA IMPACT ON VILLAGE ECONOMY	69 - 77
VII	CONCLUDING REMARKS AND POLICY SUGGESTIONS	78 - 85

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	Title	Page No.
1.1	Details of Sample Population in the Sample Villages of Kerala	7
2.1	Performance of NREGA in Kerala 2008-09 to 2010-11 at a glance.	8
2.2	District wise Employment Generated under NREGA in Kerala State – 2008-2009.	<u>10</u>
2.3	District wise Employment Generated under NREGA in Kerala State – 2009-2010.	12
2.4	District wise Employment Generated under NREGA in Kerala State – 2010-2011.	15
2.5	District wise Works Completed/Progress under NREGA (number of Projects) - 2008-2009	17-18
2.6	District wise Works Completed/Progress under NREGA (number of Projects) - 2009-2010	20-21
2.7	District wise Works Completed/Progress under NREGA (number of Projects) - 2010-2011	23-24
2.8	District wise Works Completed/Progress under NREGA (Amount spent - Rs. in Lakhs) – 2008-2009	26-27
2.9	District wise Works Completed/Progress under NREGA (Amount spent - Rs. in Lakhs) – 2009-2010	29-30
2.10	District wise Works Completed/Progress under NREGA (Amount spent - Rs. in Lakhs) – 2010-2011	32-33
2.11	The NREGA Payment processed through banks/Post Office (2010-11)	34
2.12	Unemployment allowance paid in lieu of not providing employment 2010-11	35
3.1	Demographic profile of the respondents	38
3.2	Main Occupation	40
3.3	Source wise Distribution of Household net income (Annual)	<u>41</u>

3.4	Variability in Consumption and Income	42
3.5	Determinants of participation in NREGA	44
4.1	The work profile under NREGA(Reference period-Jan-Dec 2009)	47
4.2	The activity in which employed under NREGA and the quality of assets created (Reference period-Jan-Dec 2009)	49
4.3	The migration incidents recorded during the Reference period -Jan-Dec 2009	51
4.4	Wage Differentials among different activities	52
5.1	Assets Holdings	54
5.2	Borrowing by Sample households	55
5.3	Household strength on borrowing and other household assets	57
5.4.1	Qualitative questions related to functioning of NREGA	59-61
5.4.2	Quantitative questions related to NREGA functioning	65
5.4.3	Details on the Potential benefits of NREGA	66
5.4.4	Quantitative questions related to food security	67
6.1	Infrastructure available within the village	69
6.2	Occupational structure	70
6.3	Wage rates for different activities	71
6.4	Prevailing labour charges for agricultural operations	73
6.5.1	Qualitative questions on changes in the villages during last one year	74
6.5.2	Quantitative questions about the functioning of NREGA	76
7.1	Performance of NREGA in Kerala 2008-09 to 2010-11 a glance	81

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

High incidence of poverty and unemployment in rural India is a matter of great concern. The low rate of growth of agriculture sector also affects the rate of creation of employment opportunities in rural areas. It is observed that majority of the poor in rural areas of the country largely depend on the wages earned through unskilled casual manual labour. Employment situation in the rural areas is precarious due to growing casualisation of rural work force. In the absence of adequate and timely availability of other types of employment in rural areas, agriculture labour is the major form of employment opportunity. In the rural areas the pattern of employment has changed due to modern technology and non-farm employment. The women labourers are severely affected in rural employment scenario. Poverty and poor nutritional level of the masses are the burning problems in rural India. The market for agriculture labour is a function of economic, social and demographic variables rather than mere wage rate.

Under the choice of technology labour intensive technology is better for labour surplus countries like India with potential to boost employment opportunities as well as income of the rural people. It is observed that if labour absorbing technology is opted to labour displacing one and if labour is used for capital construction, it meets the requirements of increased productivity and employment, without indulging in population transfers. Agriculture is an important sector with a small additional amount of fixed capital it is possible to generate relatively large output¹. Poverty and the prevalence of inequalities of income between rural and urban and between the rich and the rural poor are the serious issues in the country. In the rural areas, the economic activities are irregular with pronounced seasonal fluctuations leading to periodic entry and withdrawal from the labour force, especially on the part of marginal labourers, often women, who shift back and forth between what is reported as domestic work and gainful work.

1. Pranab K. Bardhan: Land, Labour and Rural Poverty, Oxford University Press, Madras 1984, P.13

1.2 Historical Background

With an objective to alleviate rural poverty and unemployment several employment generation programmes were introduced by the Government of India. These programmes offered wage employment on public works to needy rural households. The wage employment programmes started long back as pilot projects in the form of Rural Manpower (RMP) (1960-61), Crash Scheme for Rural Employment (CRSE) (1971-72), Pilot Intensive Rural Employment Programme (PIREP) (1972), Small Farmers Development Agency (SFDA), Marginal Farmers and Agricultural Labour Scheme (MFAL) to benefit the poorest of the poor. These pilot programmes were converted into a fullfledged wage employment programme. Special mention may be made of several programmes in this regard, such as Rural Works Programmes, Employment cum Production Scheme, Food for Work Programme for the upliftment of the down trodden and yet another pace setter in the structural framework of planning was the minimum needs programmes and the revised list of 20 point programme. These programmes lay particular stress on providing health care, housing, education and nutritional facilities to the poor, particularly to the scheduled castes and tribes. In short, poverty alleviation programmes hover around creation of employment opportunities through RLEGP, NREP, Food for work and Minimum Wages Act for agriculture labourers. Integrated Development Programmes such as IRDP, ITDP, and Integrated Child Development Programmes were also formulated.

The demand for an Employment Guarantee Act is not new, but a series of unlikely events had necessitated the Government of India to put it on the top of political agenda. The Act gives a legal guarantee of employment in rural areas to anyone who is willing to do casual manual labour at the statutory minimum wage. Any adult who applies for work under the Act is entitled to being employed on public works within 15 days, failing which an employment allowance has to be paid. In the draft Act prepared by the National Advisory Council, guaranteed employment is subject to an initial limit of 100 days per household a year which may be raised or removed over time. There is another major difference between a scheme and an Act. Schemes come and go, but laws are more durable. A scheme can be trimmed or even cancelled by a bureaucrat, whereas changing a law requires an amendment in Parliament.

To start with, an EGA would go a long way towards protecting rural households from poverty and hunger. In fact, a full-fledged EGA would enable most poor households in rural India to cross the poverty line. It would lead to a dramatic reduction of rural-urban migration: if work is available in the village, many rural families will stop heading for the cities during the slack season. Guaranteed employment would be a major source of empowerment for women. A large proportion of labourers employed under an EGA are likely to be women, and guaranteed employment will give them some economic independence. The EGA is an opportunity to create useful assets in rural areas. In particular, there is a massive potential for labour-intensive public works in the field of environment protection: watershed development, land regeneration, prevention of soil erosion, restoration of tanks, protection of forests, and related activities. Guaranteed employment is likely to change power equations in the rural society, and to foster a more equitable social order. The EGA is a unique opportunity to activate and empower the Panchayat raj institutions, including Gram Panchyats and Gram Sabhas. It will give them a new purpose, backed with substantial financial resources².

The crucial weakness of the scheme is the presumption that only members of poor rural households will “self-select” themselves as applicants for the NREGA. In many states, people work at below the statutory minimum wage, which is rarely enforced under the ground realities of rural employment. So, many non-poor agricultural workers could switch from existing agricultural employment to the NREG. With the job card as the key document for recording work done and claiming wage payment, it is easy to see that this piece of paper will become the key qualification for wage payment under the scheme, not any actual work done on a project site. In most of rural India the reality of governance/administration may not distinguish between real and fake claims for work done under the NREGA”³.

The employment guarantee programme based on the Maharashtra Employment Guarantee scheme, enables the rural unemployed to seek and gain employment in public work for a minimum of 100 days each year.

² Jean Dreze: Employment as a social responsibility, *The Hindu*, 22 November, 2004.

³ Shankar Acharaya: “Guaranteeing jobs or fiscal crisis”, *Business Standard*, 30 November, 2004.

The Government of India passed the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) in September 2005, with a broad national consensus. This was hailed as a historic piece of legislation and people's Act'. The Act provides for the enhancement of livelihood security of the households in the rural areas by providing atleast one hundred days of guaranteed wage employment in every financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual labour. It is noted that NREGA envisaged a paradigm shift from programme to Act, compared to the different Wage Employment Programmes (WEP) operating in the country since 1980. The Act came into force initially in 200 districts and later extended to another 130 districts (except urban districts). The remaining 266 districts were notified under the NREGA with effect from April 11, 2008.

Salient features of NREGA

The scheme aims at providing safety net to the rural poor and weaker sections when other livelihood options are scarce and inadequate. The Act is expected to address the worst kind of poverty in the country, as it will provide unskilled wage work to the poor at the bottom level. The scheme has shown satisfactory results in terms of employment in the most backward states and participation of the weaker section (NCAER 2009). The most novel feature of NREGA is the complete ban on the use of contractor and machines and provision of unemployment allowance. It ensures inter alia grass-root level participation of every rural citizen through democratic process, multi-layered transparent social audit, participatory planning, monitoring and implementation at village level.

The following are some of the special features of NREGA

- (i) Adult members of a rural household willing to do unskilled manual work may apply for registration in writing or orally to the local Gram Panchayat
- (ii) The Gram Panchayat after due verification will issue a job card to the household as a whole. The job card will bear the photograph of all adult members to the household willing to work under NREGA. The Job card with photograph is free of cost and should be issued within 15 days of application.
- (iii) A job card holder may submit a written application for employment to the Gram Panchayat or programme officer stating the time and duration for

which work is sought. The minimum days of employment have to be atleast fourteen.

- (iv) The Gram Panchayat will issue a dated receipt of the written application for employment against which the guarantee of providing employment within 15 days
- (v) Employment will be given within 15 days of application of work by an employment seeker. If it is not provided within 15 days daily unemployment allowance in cash has to be paid. Liability of payment of unemployment allowance is of the states.
- (vi) Work should ordinarily be provided within 5 km radius of the village. In case work is provided beyond 5km extra wages of 10% are payable to meet additional transportation and living expenses.

At least one third of persons to whom work is allotted have to be women. Wages are to be paid according to the minimum wages Act 1948 to the 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.

Wages are to be paid according to piece rate or daily rate. Disbursement of wages has to be done on weekly basis and not beyond a fortnight in any case.

Panchayat Raj Institutions (PRIs) have a principal role in planning, implementation and monitoring. The Gram Sabha must monitor the execution of projects and conduct social audit of all projects executed within its territorial jurisdiction.

Each district has to prepare a shelf of projects. The work for providing employment is to be selected from the list of permissible works. The shelf of project has to be prepared on the basis of priority assigned by Grama Sabhas. The execution of atleast 50 per cent of works has to be allotted to Gram Panchayats.

Work site facilities such as creche, drinking water, shade have to be provided.

The shelf of projects for a village will be recommended by the Gram Sabha and approved by the Zilla Panchayat.

The ratio of wage costs to material costs should be no less than the minimum form of 60:40 stipulated in the Act. No contractors and machinery is allowed.

Central Government 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.

Social Audit has to be done by the Gram Sabha.

Grievance redressal mechanism has to be put in place for ensuring a responsive implementation process. Complaints should be submitted to the programme officer and disposed within 7 days of its receipt.

All accounts and records relating to the scheme should be available for public scrutiny.

1.3 Main Objectives of the Study

The Study was conducted with the following broad objectives

1. Measure the extent of manpower employment generated under NREGA, their various socio-economic characteristics and gender variability in all the districts implementing NREGA since its inception in Kerala.
2. To compare wage differentials between NREGA activities and other wage employment activities.
3. To study the effect of NREGA on the pattern of migration from rural to urban areas.
4. To find out the nature of assets created under NREGA and their durability.
5. Identification of factors determining the participation of people in NREGA scheme and whether NREGA has been successful in ensuring better food security to the beneficiaries.
6. To assess the implementation of NREGA, its functioning, and to suggest suitable policy measures to further strengthen the programme.

1.4 Database and Methodology

The study was based on both primary and secondary data collected from Kerala state. Five districts one each from the North, South, East, West and Central location from Kerala were chosen as sample districts for the present evaluation work

following the guidelines of the Coordinating Centre. The names of the sample districts, sample villages and sample population are given in the following table.

Table 1.1 Details of Sample Population in the Sample Villages of Kerala

SI. No	Name of the District	Name of the village	Sample population
1	Kottayam	Pallam & Pallam	50
2	Thiruvananthapuram	Kazhakuttom & Adiyannur	50
3	Wayanad	Kalpetta & Kalpetta	50
4	Palakkad	Malampuzha & Kuzzhalmannam	50
5	Kasaragod	Kasaragod & Kanhangad	50
Total			250

Source: Government of Kerala, 2011.

As given in Table 1.1 two villages in each sample district were selected for an in depth study. In each sample village 20 beneficiaries and 5 non-beneficiaries were randomly selected. Altogether the sample population was 250. A well structured questionnaire was used to collect the required primary data.

1.5 Organization of the study

The study is divided into seven chapters. First chapter is the introductory chapter providing details regarding the general background of the study, objectives, methodology etc. Manpower employment generated under NREGA and its various socio economic characteristics are presented in the second chapter. Third chapter deals with the profile of the households, their income, and consumption pattern. Key issues like work profile, activities under which employed, migration incidents, wage differentials etc are dealt with in the fourth chapter. Fifth chapter presents details regarding the functioning of NREGA and its qualitative aspect. Sixth chapter focuses on the impact of NREGA on the village economy such as availability of infrastructure, occupation structure, wage rate differentials and changes in the village economy. Concluding remarks and policy decisions are presented in the last chapter.

CHAPTER II

MANPOWER EMPLOYMENT GENERATED UNDER NREGA AND ITS SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

This chapter deals with the functioning of NREGA, total employment generated and their socio-economic characteristics, total number of projects completed, total expenditure incurred etc in Kerala. This analysis was carried out with the secondary data provided by the Department of Rural Development, Government of Kerala.

2.1 The functioning of NREGA

Various activities were undertaken under NREGA. The performance of NREGA over the period 2008-2009 to 2010-2011 is presented in Table 2.1

Table 2.1 Performance of NREGA in Kerala 2008-09 to 2010-11 at a glance

S.No.	Indicators	Unit	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	Growth rate
1	Cumulative No. of HH issued job cards	No.	2414517	2898047	2915700	82.81
2	Cumulative No. of HH demanded employment	No.	642455	959535	1186356	54.15
3	Cumulative No. of HH provided employment	No.	640188	956790	1175816	54.45
4	Cumulative Person days generated	No.	15623723	34035275	48034457	32.53
5	Cumulative No. of HH completed 100 days of work	No.	11244	43724	67970	16.54
6	Total Expenditure	Rs. In Lakhs	22011.69	47068.11	70325.63	31.30
7	Total No. of works completed	No.	26035	98105	104489	24.92

The performance level could be assessed by taking into account the number of job cards issued, number of households demanded employment, the total employment provided, persons days generated, total number of works completed, total expenditure

incurred towards generating employment etc. A simple look at the table shows that all indicators are showing an upward trend from 2008-09 to 2010-2011. For instance the total number of man days generated under NREGA increased drastically from 15623723 in 2008-2009 to 34035275 in 2009-10 and it further rose to 48034457 during 2010-2011, thus accounted for over 275 percent increase. Similarly, the total number of works completed as could be seen from Table 2.1 dramatically increased from 26,035 in 2008-09 to 98,105 and 1,04,489 in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 respectively. A total number of 67,970 households had completed 100 days of work in 2010-2011 which was just 11244 during 2008-09. With regard to expenditure an amount of Rs.220 crores was spent towards all activities under NREGA in 2008-2009 which rose to Rs.470 crores in 2009-2010 and the expenditure incurred towards employment generation further increased to the tune of Rs.703 crores in 2010-2011. Thus it may be concluded that all the indicators show a satisfactory performance of NREGA over the period 2008-2009 to 2010-2011 in Kerala.

2.2 Total Employment generated and their Socio-Economic Characteristics

The NREGA was implemented with the main objective of creating employment opportunities in the rural areas of the country to the rural masses in order to sustain their livelihood. This section analyses the total number of job cards issued to the households, number of employment demanded by the households, total number of employment provided, total persons days generated during the period 2008-2009, 2009-2010 and 2010-2011. The details are depicted in Tables 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4.

It is observed from the table 2.1 that cumulative number of job cards issued to the households in Kerala during the year 2008-2009 was 2414517. Among the districts Thiruvananthapuram stood first with 2,47,751 households followed by Alappuzha (2,30,513) and Palakkad (2,24,268) districts. The districts where lowest number of job cards issued were found to be Pathanamthitta (86,428) and Kasaragod (1,07,338). Of total number of households who were issued job cards 82.4 percent belonged to communities other than SCs and STs. It is understood from Table 2.2 that SCs constituted 13.9 percent and the remaining 3.7 percent belonged to STs. The district where highest percentage of SC households who were issued job cards was found to be Palakkad (24.50%) followed by Thrissur (22.00%) The lowest percentage of (4.30%) SC households who were issued job cards was in Kannur district.

Table 2.2 District wise Employment Generated under NREGA in Kerala State

2008-2009

Name of the District	Cumulative No. of HH issued job cards (Till the reporting month)				Cumulative No. of HH demanded employment (Till the reporting month)	Cumulative No. of HH provided employment (Till the reporting month)	No. of HH working under NREGA during the reporting month	Cumulative Person days generated (Till the reporting month)					Cumulative No. of HH completed 100 days (Till the reporting month)
	SCs	STs	Others	Total				SCs	STs	Others	Total	Women	
Palakkad	46858 (20.9)	13779 (6.1)	163631 (73.0)	224268 (100)	98851 (100)	98730 (99.9)	NA	883465 (23.8)	205158 (5.5)	2629563 (70.7)	3718186 (100)	3324688 (89.4)	3646
Wayanad	7550 (5.8)	33611 (25.9)	88804 (68.3)	129965 (100)	56500 (100)	56383 (99.8)	NA	176275 (6.8)	680263 (26.2)	1744055 (67.0)	2600593 (100)	2005034 (77.1)	3722
Idukki	25674 (13.7)	12649 (6.7)	149281 (79.6)	187604 (100)	50433 (100)	49977 (99.1)	NA	194757 (12.8)	148740 (9.7)	1183350 (77.5)	1526847 (100)	1129688 (74.0)	1245
Kasargod	6179 (5.8)	6232 (5.8)	94927 (88.4)	107338 (100)	33376 (100)	33256 (99.6)	NA	106405 (8.1)	73770 (5.6)	1129372 (86.2)	1309547 (100)	1124860 (86.0)	1787
Alappuzha	29112 (12.6)	1115 (0.4)	200286 (86.9)	230513 (100)	37781 (100)	37722 (99.8)	NA	101189 (19.0)	1931 (0.4)	430826 (80.7)	533946 (100)	478589 (90.0)	38
Ernakulam	24868 (14.8)	1560 (0.9)	141462 (84.2)	167890 (100)	46316 (100)	46165 (99.7)	NA	115470 (17.1)	3975 (0.6)	552538 (82.2)	671983 (100)	619519 (92.2)	57
Kannur	6268 (4.3)	6528 (4.4)	134307 (91.3)	147103 (100)	35483 (100)	35217 (99.3)	NA	13991 (2.5)	30090 (5.3)	519271 (92.1)	563352 (100)	519586 (92.2)	75
Kollam	19576 (11.1)	938 (0.5)	156110 (88.3)	176624 (100)	34340 (100)	34209 (99.6)	NA	67603 (13.3)	1708 (0.3)	437080 (86.3)	506391 (100)	425009 (84.0)	51
Kottayam	14836 (12.2)	2692 (2.2)	104001 (85.6)	121529 (100)	14772 (100)	14689 (99.4)	NA	27359 (14.5)	4501 (2.4)	156729 (83.1)	188589 (100)	174075 (92.3)	10
Kozhikode	23124 (11.1)	1832 (0.9)	183060 (88.0)	208016 (100)	45303 (100)	45130 (99.6)	NA	87290 (14.3)	5116 (0.8)	517798 (84.5)	610204 (100)	550441 (90.2)	3
Malappuram	36051 (17.8)	2813 (1.4)	163232 (80.8)	202096 (100)	44437 (100)	44227 (99.5)	NA	240665 (30.9)	10254 (1.3)	526985 (67.7)	777904 (100)	696552 (90.0)	91
Pathanamthitha	21170 (24.5)	1262 (1.5)	63996 (74.0)	86428 (100)	25132 (100)	25096 (99.9)	NA	110340 (26.5)	2836 (0.7)	303587 (72.8)	416763 (100)	377657 (90.6)	33
Thiruvananthapuram	34301 (13.8)	3222 (1.3)	210228 (84.9)	247751 (100)	75140 (100)	74896 (99.7)	NA	190256 (15.5)	11120 (0.9)	1026749 (83.6)	1228125 (100)	1055196 (85.9)	119
Thrissur	39016 (22.0)	1569 (0.9)	136807 (77.1)	177392 (100)	44591 (100)	44491 (99.8)	NA	287386 (29.6)	2407 (0.2)	681500 (70.2)	971293 (100)	923792 (95.1)	367
Kerala	334583 (13.9)	89802 (3.7)	1990132 (82.4)	2414517 (100)	642455 (100)	640188 (99.6)	NA	2602451 (16.7)	1181869 (7.6)	11839403 (75.8)	15623723 (100)	13404686 (85.8)	11244

Note: The figures in parentheses are respective percentages of total
Source: Department of Rural Development, Government of Kerala

It is understood from Table 2.2 that Wayanad district had more number of ST population compared to other districts in Kerala. In Wayanad district 25.90 percent of the households who were issued job cards were found to be STs and the lowest number (0.40%) in this case was found in Alappuzha district.

It is observed from Table 2.2 that the total number of households demanded employment was 6,42,455 in Kerala State as a whole during 2008 – 2009. Among the districts Palakkad topped with 98,851 households and the lowest being 14,772 households in Kottayam district. It is shown in the table that out of the total 6,42,455 number of employment demanded close to cent percent (99.6%) i.e., 640188 households were provided employment in the state which shows the satisfactory level of implementation of the programme in Kerala. A maximum of 99.90 percent of the total employment demanded by the households was given in Palakkad and Pathanamthitta districts which reflected the high poverty level of the people in these two districts when compared to other districts in Kerala.

It is also observed from Table 2.2 that by implementing the programme a total of 156.2 lakh person days were generated in Kerala during the year 2008-2009. It is worth mentioning here that a very high percentage of 86 persons days generated was by women in Kerala. As could be seen from the table that of the total man days generated the share of SCs and STs accounted for 17 and 8 percent respectively and the rest of 76 percent was by other communities during the year 2008-2009 in Kerala. The participation of SCs was found to be high with nearly 31 percent in Malappuram district followed by Thrissur district and the lowest could be seen in Kannur district (2.5%). Turning to STs, Wayanad which is a hill district ranked high and the lowest percentage of STs share was found in Thrissur district (0.2%). In case of women 95 percent of person days generated was by women in Thrissur district followed by Kottayam district (92.3%) The lowest 74.0 percentage could be found in Idukki district in 2008-2009.

Although a large number of households was given employment those who had completed 100 days of work accounted for only 11244 and of which Wayanad district with 3722 households topped the list followed by Palakkad district. The lowest number of 3 households was found in Kozhikode district in 2008-2009.

Details of employment generated during the year 2009-2010 are given in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3 District wise Employment Generated under NREGA in Kerala State

2009-2010

Name of the District	Cumulative No. of HH issued job cards (Till the reporting month)				Cumulative No. of HH demanded employment (Till the reporting month)	Cumulative No. of HH provided employment (Till the reporting month)	No. of HH working under NREGA during the reporting month	Cumulative Person days generated (Till the reporting month)					Cumulative No. of HH completed 100 days (Till the reporting month)
	SCs	STs	Others	Total				SCs	STs	Others	Total	Women	
Palakkad	49643 (20.6)	13985 (5.8)	176807 (73.5)	240435 (100)	108490 (100)	108362 (99.9)	46850	1108929 (23.9)	230927 (5.0)	3295582 (71.1)	4635438 (100)	4271461 (92.1)	7036
Wayanad	7711 (5.3)	33985 (23.4)	103656 (71.3)	145352 (100)	58559 (100)	58537 (100)	15912	202884 (6.4)	868286 (27.2)	2121348 (66.4)	3192518 (100)	2534416 (79.4)	7189
Idukki	28706 (13.0)	13184 (6.0)	179092 (81.0)	220982 (100)	93033 (100)	92868 (99.8)	49798	504687 (11.1)	391650 (8.6)	3659116 (80.3)	4555453 (100)	3302074 (72.5)	12236
Kasargod	6359 (5.2)	6443 (5.3)	108590 (89.5)	121392 (100)	39047 (100)	38945 (99.7)	21375	150601 (8.6)	82531 (4.7)	1517589 (86.6)	1750721 (100)	1538557 (87.9)	3373
Alappuzha	31373 (11.9)	1156 (0.4)	231148 (87.7)	263677 (100)	94058 (100)	93986 (99.9)	55039	391579 (15.6)	10303 (0.4)	2083485 (83.8)	2485367 (100)	2316524 (93.2)	577
Ernakulam	27260 (14.0)	1646 (0.8)	165772 (85.2)	194678 (100)	59358 (100)	58755 (100)	27941	252578 (19.1)	10676 (0.8)	1060487 (80.1)	1323741 (100)	1243033 (94.0)	340
Kannur	7079 (4.2)	6965 (4.1)	156241 (91.2)	170285 (100)	46719 (100)	46439 (99.4)	22103	40607 (3.4)	59850 (5.0)	1106887 (91.7)	1207344 (100)	1129660 (94.0)	727
Kollam	24263 (11.0)	961 (0.4)	195537 (88.6)	220761 (100)	60146 (100)	59891 (99.6)	31639	221454 (12.9)	5743 (0.3)	1490766 (86.8)	1717963 (100)	1497689 (87.2)	832
Kottayam	16742 (10.7)	3143 (2.0)	136821 (87.3)	156706 (100)	38050 (100)	37799 (99.3)	17121	133240 (14.3)	24963 (2.7)	771826 (83.0)	930029 (100)	879362 (94.6)	443
Kozhikode	25147 (9.2)	1984 (0.7)	247506 (90.1)	274637 (100)	75186 (100)	75085 (99.9)	42021	342983 (15.9)	24963 (1.1)	1795521 (83.0)	2163467 (100)	2005438 (92.7)	1188
Malappuram	39283 (15.6)	2942 (1.2)	210107 (83.3)	252332 (100)	61630 (100)	61473 (99.7)	35496	754277 (32.6)	27596 (1.2)	1528724 (66.2)	2310597 (100)	2131002 (92.2)	2850
Pathanamthitha	22961 (23.5)	1459 (1.5)	73337 (75.0)	97757 (100)	38839 (100)	38753 (99.8)	20979	368357 (27.3)	14101 (1.0)	965969 (71.6)	1348427 (100)	1250440 (92.7)	899
Thiruvananthapuram	37526 (12.9)	3481 (1.2)	250017 (85.9)	291024 (100)	123015 (100)	122626 (99.7)	74782	603938 (14.5)	42860 (1.0)	3524168 (84.5)	4170966 (100)	3752970 (90.0)	2817
Thrissur	41646 (16.8)	1649 (0.7)	204734 (82.5)	248029 (100)	63405 (100)	63271 (99.8)	31677	625546 (27.9)	16213 (0.7)	1601485 (71.4)	2243244 (100)	2150375 (96.0)	3217
Kerala	365699 (12.6)	92983 (3.2)	2439365 (84.2)	2898047 (100)	959535 (100)	956790 (99.7)	492733	5701660 (16.8)	1810662 (5.3)	26522953 (77.9)	34035275 (100)	30003001 (88.2)	43724

Note: The figures in parentheses are respective percentages of total
Source: Department of Rural Development, Government of Kerala

A total number of 29 lakh households were issued job cards in 2009-2010 and of which 12.6 percent belonged to SCs and a meagre 3.2 percent was STs. The rest of 84.2 percent being other communities. It could be observed from Table 2.3 that Thiruvananthapuram and Kozhikode districts stood first and second respectively with regard to the number of persons issued job cards and the lowest of 97,757 job cards was found in Pathanamthitta district in 2009-2010. The table shows that Pathanamthitta district had the highest number of SC population who got job cards. The lowest percentage of (4.2) SC households was in Kannur district. Wayanad district is noted for ST population where about 23 percent of STs were issued job cards which stood first among all the districts in Kerala during 2009-10 and the lowest was in Alappuzha and Kollam districts.

The table shows that 9.6 lakh households demanded employment in Kerala during the year 2009-2010. Around 1.23 lakh households demanded employment in Thiruvananthapuram district which topped the list followed by Palakkad district during the year 2009-10. It is understood from the table that lowest number of households demanded employment was found in Kottayam district (38,050). As could be seen from Table 2.3 that over 99 percent of the households who demanded employment were given job in all the districts in Kerala during the year 2009-10. The number of people worked under NREGA during the reporting month worked out to 492733 in Kerala. The number of households worked under NREGA during the reporting month was high in Thiruvananthapuram district (74782) and Wayanad district ranked last with 15912 households.

It could be understood from Table 2.3 that the number of person days generated under NREGA in Kerala during 2009-10 was 340 lakhs of which women constituted 88 percent leaving less than 12 percent to men. The share of SC people accounted for only 17 percent and the ST constituted just 5.3 percent in Kerala. About 80 percent of person days generated was by communities other than SCs and STs during 2009-10. About 32 percent of the total man days generated in Malappuram district was by SC people which stood first among all the districts and the share of SC was abysmally low (3.4%) in Kannur district. Of the total person days generated in Wayanad district the contribution of ST people worked out to as high as 27.2 percent, ranking first among the districts in Kerala and the lowest share of 0.3 percent was in Kollam district.

It is understood from the table that 96 percent of the person days generated was by women in Thrissur district which was the highest when compared to other districts in Kerala. The number of person days generated by women was the lowest in Idukki district compared to other districts in 2009-10.

The table shows that the number of households who completed 100 days of work under NREGA worked out to 43,724 in Kerala during 2009-10 of which Idukki district topped with 12,236 households and the lowest number of households completed 100 days of work was found to be in Ernakulam district (340)

The table 2.4 depicts details regarding various aspects of employment generated under NREGA in Kerala during 2010-11. It is observed from the table that the total number of households issued job cards in Kerala worked out to 2915700 during 2010-11. Out of the total number of households issued job cards 84 percent belonged to communities other than SC and ST and the share of SC and ST accounted for 12.6 percent and 3.2 percent respectively in Kerala as a whole. Among the households who were issued job cards in Pathanamthitta district a maximum of 23.5 percent belonged to SC community which was the highest when compared to other districts and Kannur district recorded the lowest percentage (4.1%) in Kerala. With regard to ST population the same Wayanad district had the highest percentage of 23.3 ST households issued job cards and the lowest percentage of 0.4 was found in Alappuzha district. In case of other communities Kannur district stood first with 91.8 percent of households and about 71 percent of the households issued job cards belonged to other communities in Wayanad district which was the lowest percentage compared to other districts in 2010-11.

It is understood from table 2.4 that a total number of 11.9 lakh households demanded employment in Kerala during the year 2010-2011. Among the districts Palakkad had the highest number of 1.42 lakh persons demanded job followed by Alappuzha during 2010-2011. The lowest number of households demanded employment according to the above table was in Pathanamthitta district (43652). It is shown in the table that over 99 percent of the employment demanded was provided under NREGA during 2010-11 in Kerala and the percentage among the district ranges from 96.1 to 99.7.

Table 2.4 District wise Employment Generated under NREGA in Kerala State

2010-11													
Name of the District	Cumulative No. of HH issued job cards (Till the reporting month)				Cumulative No. of HH demanded employment (Till the reporting month)	Cumulative No. of HH provided employment (Till the reporting month)	No. of HH working under NREGA during the reporting month	Cumulative Person days generated (Till the reporting month)					Cumulative No. of HH completed 100 days (Till the reporting month)
	SCs	STs	Others	Total				SCs	STs	Others	Total	Women	
Palakkad	49673 (20.6)	13989 (5.8)	177212 (73.6)	240874 (100)	107325 (100)	106965 (99.7)	41759	1101403 (24.0)	250205 (5.4)	3241840 (70.6)	4593448 (100)	4315603 (94.0)	7085
Wayanad	7713 (5.3)	33991 (23.3)	103884 (71.4)	145588 (100)	53582 (100)	53143 (99.2)	18474	121979 (6.2)	451236 (22.9)	1399609 (71.0)	1972824 (100)	1658316 (84.0)	1886
Idukki	28732 (13.0)	13197 (6.0)	179515 (81.1)	221444 (100)	111356 (100)	110750 (99.5)	50792	616957 (10.7)	366173 (6.4)	4763911 (82.9)	5747041 (100)	4135328 (72.0)	13018
Kasargod	6362 (5.2)	6443 (5.3)	108764 (89.5)	121569 (100)	45839 (100)	45596 (99.5)	15664	145886 (7.3)	76788 (3.8)	1778865 (88.9)	2001539 (100)	1770314 (88.4)	3279
Alappuzha	31422 (11.9)	1159 (0.4)	231871 (87.7)	264452 (100)	125826 (100)	123605 (98.2)	52692	770181 (15.0)	22984 (0.4)	4354904 (84.6)	5148069 (100)	4884682 (94.9)	3619
Ernakulam	27344 (14.0)	1646 (0.8)	166684 (85.2)	195674 (100)	81427 (100)	81182 (99.7)	27824	530908 (16.6)	20768 (0.65)	2642328 (82.7)	3194004 (100)	3037672 (95.1)	4930
Kannur	7096 (4.1)	6985 (4.0)	158789 (91.8)	172870 (100)	57290 (100)	57129 (99.7)	15577	59345 (3.2)	77130 (4.2)	1695264 (92.5)	1831739 (100)	1748463 (95.5)	2406
Kollam	24499 (11.0)	1031 (0.5)	197863 (88.6)	223393 (100)	87683 (100)	84268 (96.1)	30772	349490 (11.8)	11439 (0.4)	2611347 (87.9)	2972276 (100)	2625650 (88.3)	3482
Kottayam	16810 (10.2)	3155 (2.0)	139134 (87.5)	159099 (100)	58436 (100)	58038 (99.3)	19747	266292 (13.0)	41823 (2.0)	1733066 (84.9)	2041181 (100)	1955369 (95.8)	1669
Kozhikode	25155 (9.1)	1985 (0.7)	248041 (90.1)	275181 (100)	101738 (100)	101291 (99.6)	39742	546931 (14.7)	32547 (0.9)	3131529 (84.4)	3711007 (100)	3469522 (93.5)	3178
Malappuram	39376 (15.5)	2943 (1.2)	212245 (83.4)	254564 (100)	78459 (100)	78080 (99.5)	30867	1018444 (30.6)	32964 (1.0)	2281603 (68.5)	3333011 (100)	3077065 (92.3)	5709
Pathanamthitha	22966 (23.5)	1459 (1.5)	73360 (75.0)	97785 (100)	43652 (100)	43414 (99.5)	19355	474473 (27.0)	19093 (1.1)	1261288 (71.9)	1754854 (100)	1667183 (95.0)	1314
Thiruvananthapuram	37789 (12.8)	3490 (1.2)	253337 (86.0)	294616 (100)	142131 (100)	140990 (99.2)	65011	753402 (13.2)	65267 (1.1)	4894555 (85.7)	5713224 (100)	5228670 (91.5)	5569
Thrissur	41677 (16.8)	1649 (0.7)	205265 (82.6)	248591 (100)	91612 (100)	91365 (99.7)	42085	1036960 (25.8)	20990 (0.5)	2962312 (73.7)	4020262 (100)	3843249 (95.6)	10826
Kerala	366614 (12.6)	93122 (3.2)	2455964 (84.2)	2915700 (100)	1186356 (100)	1175816 (99.1)	470361	7792651 (16.2)	1489407 (3.1)	38752421 (80.7)	48034479 (100)	43417086 (90.4)	67970

Note: The figures in parentheses are respective percentages of total
Source: Department of Rural Development, Government of Kerala

The cumulative persons days generated in Kerala during 2010-11 worked out to 480.3 lakhs of which over 90 percent were women days as in previous years. The break up details of SCs STs and other communities worked out to 16.2 percent, 3.1 percent and 80.7 percent respectively in Kerala. It could be seen from table 2.4 that about 30 percent of man days generated in Malappuram district was by SCs and the lowest percentage (3.2%) was found in Kannur district. As in previous years persons days generated by STs was found to be highest (22.9%) in Wayanad district and lowest 0.4 percent was in Alappuzha and Kollam districts. Persons days generated by women was found to be the highest (95.8) in Kottayam district followed by Thrissur and Kannur district. In Idukki district the person days generated by women accounted for 72.00 percent which was the lowest compared to other districts in 2010-2011.

It is understood from Table 2.4 that the number of households who completed 100 days of work under NREGA worked out to 67,970 in Kerala during 2010-2011. Idukki and Thrissur districts ranked first and second with 13018 and 10826 households and the lowest 1314 households could be observed in Pathanamthitta district.

2.3 Number of projects completed and total amount spent

The impact of NREGA on poverty alleviation could be measured by the quantum of works completed in the state. There were various types of works undertaken under NREGA. District wise works completed under NREGA is presented in Table 2.5. The table 2.5 reveals that a total of 26,035 works were completed and 34,729 works were in progress in Kerala state during 2008-09. Of the different works undertaken in Kerala flood control topped the list with 11601 projects completed and 13,602 in progress. The lowest number of projects completed was under other activity approved by MRD. Among the districts maximum number of 4486 works was completed in Wayanad and the lowest was found in Kollam (504). Similarly with regard to on going/suspended projects 10,363 works were in progress in Palakkad district which was the highest on going works Kerala followed by Wayanad district. The lowest was found in Kottayam (353) district. It could be observed from table 2.5 that 372 rural connectivity projects were completed in Wayanad district which was the highest number of rural connectivity works compared to all districts in Kerala. Similarly the lowest number of (1) Rural connectivity projects was completed in

Table 2.5 District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (number of projects)

2008 – 2009									
District		Alappuzha	Ernakullam	Idduki	Kannur	Kasargod	Kollam	Kottayam	Kozhikode
Rural Connectivity	Completed	4	80	16	2	86	2	9	4
	Ongoing/Suspended	4	47	27	0	194	50	1	23
Flood Control	Completed	1346	769	569	1794	507	162	213	767
	Ongoing/Suspended	773	645	1908	224	1611	219	71	1163
Water Conservation and Water Herversting	Completed	1	77	107	40	41	7	8	5
	Ongoing/Suspended	22	45	571	18	205	30	21	30
Drought Proofing	Completed	16	3	12	6	9	14	5	14
	Ongoing/Suspended	3	9	5	2	23	28	4	4
Micro Irrigation	Completed	48	278	72	404	23	302	188	31
	Ongoing/Suspended	36	358	235	114	95	734	81	346
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	Completed	10	0	122	36	2	0	0	1
	Ongoing/Suspended	12	2	221	1	49	2	0	0
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	Completed	157	295	118	319	21	2	189	82
	Ongoing/Suspended	112	924	38	54	137	191	160	311
Land development	Completed	98	35	225	63	257	15	32	42
	Ongoing/Suspended	59	48	688	29	1000	66	15	75
Any Other activity approved by MRD	Completed	3	8	19	1	0	0	0	4
	Ongoing/Suspended	2	1	8	0	2	12	0	0
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	Completed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ongoing/Suspended	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	Completed	1683	1545	1260	2665	946	504	644	950
	Ongoing/Suspended	1023	2079	3701	442	3316	1332	353	1952

Condt...

Table 2.5 District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (number of projects)

2008 - 2009								
District		Malappuram	Palakkad	Pathanamthitha	Thiruvananthapuram	Thrissur	Wayanad	Kerala
Rural Connectivity	Completed	1	110	25	106	43	372	860
	Ongoing/Suspended	20	426	14	131	11	542	1490
Flood Control	Completed	1098	904	331	301	2010	830	11601
	Ongoing/Suspended	1298	3040	621	128	202	1159	13062
Water Conservation and Water Herversting	Completed	26	169	56	94	17	574	1222
	Ongoing/Suspended	52	1396	153	39	4	553	3139
Drought Proofing	Completed	3	21	0	14	26	453	596
	Ongoing/Suspended	1	171	1	15	7	234	507
Micro Irrigation	Completed	64	952	2	525	515	49	3453
	Ongoing/Suspended	163	2058	10	285	91	171	4777
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	Completed	0	15	0	2	26	38	252
	Ongoing/Suspended	2	78	0	1	5	6	379
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	Completed	34	533	240	1439	924	726	5079
	Ongoing/Suspended	173	2316	545	567	167	1036	6731
Land development	Completed	69	339	42	118	55	1428	2818
	Ongoing/Suspended	91	870	102	91	4	1332	4470
Any Other activity approved by MRD	Completed	1	1	0	101	0	16	154
	Ongoing/Suspended	3	8	9	34	0	95	174
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	Completed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ongoing/Suspended	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	Completed	1296	3044	696	2700	3616	4486	26035
	Ongoing/Suspended	1803	10363	1455	1291	491	5128	34729

Source: Department of Rural Development, Government of Kerala

Malappuram district in Kerala in 2008-2009. With regard to on going/ suspended rural connectivity works the highest number of 542 was found in Wayanad district and the lowest went to Kottayam district. Maximum number of flood control (2010) works was completed in Thrissur district followed by Kannur district in 2008-2009. Palakkad district with 3040 ongoing / suspended works stood first in respect of ongoing flood control in Kerala and lowest was (71) found in Kottayam district in 2008-2009. Of the total, 1,222 conservation and water harvesting projects completed under NREGA in Kerala Wayanad had a lion's share of 574 works and Alappuzha district with a single work completed ranked last when compared to other districts. Micro irrigation project was an important work under NREGA. It is understood from Table 2.5 that maximum number of 952 micro irrigation works were completed in Palakkad district and the minimum was in Pathanamthitta district. Another important work undertaken according to the data provided in Table 2.5 was renovation of traditional water bodies. Over 5000 renovation works of water bodies were completed in Kerala and out of which 1439 works were completed in Thiruvananthapuram district which was found to be the maximum compared to other districts in 2008-09. Only 2 projects were completed in Kollam district. As could be seen from the table that 2818 land development works were completed in Kerala and the number of ongoing/suspended works was 4470. Wayanad district had the maximum number of 1428 land development works completed during 2008-09. It could be understood from the table that no works under the category Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra was carried out in Kerala during 2008-09.

It is shown in Table 2.6 that all categories of works as in 2008-2009 were carried out in 2009-2010 also in Kerala under NREGA. It is observed from the table that total number of works completed rose to 98,105 in 2009-2010 from 26,035 in 2008-2009 in the State. Maximum number of works under all categories were completed in Palakkad district (13,280) followed by Idukki (10,904) and the minimum was found in Kottayam district (3,299). Of the different categories of works completed flood control topped the list with 34,749 works and the minimum of 274 works were completed in the category of other activity approved by MRD. The number of rural connectivity works completed was 655 in Thiruvananthapuram district which was the highest in Kerala compared to other districts. Alappuzha district had the lowest number (26) of rural connectivity works completed during

Table 2.6 District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (number of projects)

2009-2010									
District		Alappuzha	Ernakullam	Idduki	Kannur	Kasargod	Kollam	Kottayam	Kozhikode
Rural Connectivity	Completed	26	262	219	97	280	66	77	302
	Ongoing/Suspended	6	67	15	6	91	35	9	20
Flood Control	Completed	2788	2012	4460	1460	1467	2028	799	3045
	Ongoing/Suspended	497	765	173	154	723	283	128	441
Water Conservation and Water Herversting	Completed	44	167	1617	815	590	295	80	996
	Ongoing/Suspended	15	42	786	42	412	58	49	188
Drought Proofing	Completed	217	24	135	339	91	354	129	172
	Ongoing/Suspended	24	28	4	31	10	35	12	38
Micro Irrigation	Completed	463	870	343	1039	190	1933	536	667
	Ongoing/Suspended	143	453	4	76	23	288	140	160
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	Completed	724	6	676	375	156	72	114	12
	Ongoing/Suspended	107	6	17	19	9	20	25	2
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	Completed	475	1775	317	505	294	435	1354	1020
	Ongoing/Suspended	269	1233	10	38	78	76	364	240
Land development	Completed	1225	128	2729	565	2172	521	209	1284
	Ongoing/Suspended	747	52	622	76	399	108	52	209
Any Other activity approved by MRD	Completed	23	2	408	23	5	29	1	1
	Ongoing/Suspended	27	0	145	4	6	3	0	0
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	Completed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ongoing/Suspended	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	Completed	5985	5246	10904	5218	5245	5733	3299	7499
	Ongoing/Suspended	1835	2646	1776	446	1751	906	779	1298

Condt...

Table 2.6 District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (number of projects)

2009-2010								
District		Malappuram	Palakkad	Pathanamthitha	Thiruvananthapuram	Thrissur	Wayanad	Kerala
Rural Connectivity	Completed	226	598	199	655	162	526	3695
	Ongoing/Suspended	77	346	47	455	14	338	1526
Flood Control	Completed	3252	3673	2408	2883	3371	1103	34749
	Ongoing/Suspended	928	2223	674	616	141	753	8499
Water Conservation and Water Herversting	Completed	245	1041	510	379	224	1527	8530
	Ongoing/Suspended	129	804	98	91	29	764	3507
Drought Proofing	Completed	198	412	184	221	442	921	3839
	Ongoing/Suspended	159	330	4	48	78	176	977
Micro Irrigation	Completed	587	2960	167	1364	1082	68	12269
	Ongoing/Suspended	123	922	55	596	121	190	3294
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	Completed	308	72	8	143	644	4	3314
	Ongoing/Suspended	101	131	2	56	19	3	517
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	Completed	965	3066	1656	2095	1812	352	16121
	Ongoing/Suspended	275	1306	379	595	143	421	5427
Land development	Completed	643	1348	616	1008	211	2097	14756
	Ongoing/Suspended	140	844	126	577	37	1108	5097
Any Other activity approved by MRD	Completed	27	110	35	117	1	50	832
	Ongoing/Suspended	8	43	5	11	1	21	274
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	Completed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ongoing/Suspended	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	Completed	6451	13280	5783	8865	7949	6648	98105
	Ongoing/Suspended	1940	6949	1390	3045	583	3774	29118

Source: Department of Rural Development, Government of Kerala

2009-2010. There were 4,460 flood control works completed in Idukki district and 799 works completed in Kottayam district. It could be observed from Table 2.6 that the number of water conservation and water harvesting works completed was 1527 in Wayanad district and only 4 in Alappuzha district during 2009-10. With regard to Drought proofing maximum number of 921 works were completed in Wayanad district and the minimum of 24 works were completed in Ernakulam district. There were 2,960 micro irrigation works completed in Palakkad district which was the maximum among the districts in Kerala during 2009-10 and Wayanad district had the least number (68) of works. It could be understood from Table 2.6 that renovation of traditional water bodies was an important work carried out under NREGA. Maximum work under this category was completed in Palakkad district and the number was 3066 and the minimum number was 294 in Kasaragod district. The land development works completed in Idukki district was 2729 which was the highest when compared to other districts and the lowest number (128) completed was in Ernakulam district. It could be observed from Table 2.6 that there were no works completed under the category Rajive Gandhi Seva Kendra.

Different categories of works completed and in progress during year 2010-2011 are depicted in Table 2.7.

The total number of works completed in Kerala under NREGA during 2010-2011 was over 1 lakh and the ongoing/suspended was around 43000. The rural connectivity work completed in Thiruvananthapuram district was the highest (779) when compared to other districts and the lowest (12) was found in Alappuzha district during 2010-11. With regard to Flood Control works Ernakulam district topped the list with 3538 completed works and Kozhikode district had the lowest number (733) of works completed. It is observed from Table 2.7 that 1685 water conservation and water harvesting works were completed in Wayanad district which was found to be the highest compared to other districts in Kerala during 2010-11. The least number of water conservation and water harvesting works completed was in Kottayam district. It could be seen from Table 2.7 that a lot of micro irrigation works numbering 1579 was completed in Kollam district which was the maximum among the districts in Kerala and the lowest number (15) was found in Idukki district. The number of completed works under the category provision of irrigation facility to land development was 999 in Malappuram district which ranked high among the districts in Kerala during 2010-11 and the lowest number went to Wayanad (3) district. It was surprising to note that no work under this

Table 2.7 District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (number of projects)

2010-2011									
District		Alappuzha	Ernakullam	Idduki	Kannur	Kasargod	Kollam	Kottayam	Kozhikode
Rural Connectivity	Completed	12	639	60	94	129	136	198	31
	Ongoing/Suspended	8	78	285	8	170	29	59	62
Flood Control	Completed	1910	3538	1069	2557	1171	1664	1132	739
	Ongoing/Suspended	551	684	988	304	620	380	550	605
Water Conservation and Water Herversting	Completed	182	1512	1437	1020	1281	776	172	1351
	Ongoing/Suspended	173	361	1353	162	476	109	198	733
Drought Proofing	Completed	292	77	17	182	43	245	178	70
	Ongoing/Suspended	169	21	139	12	16	41	34	62
Micro Irrigation	Completed	475	1377	15	721	152	1579	374	95
	Ongoing/Suspended	136	278	38	147	103	196	305	378
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	Completed	492	198	334	348	139	245	89	0
	Ongoing/Suspended	148	12	35	19	25	12	13	15
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	Completed	722	3066	158	581	180	349	1123	328
	Ongoing/Suspended	66	597	9	28	76	82	503	293
Land development	Completed	4006	846	2582	1486	2415	1887	1470	1662
	Ongoing/Suspended	1548	136	3521	175	1114	503	458	2157
Any Other activity approved by MRD	Completed	66	0	145	18	9	64	1	1
	Ongoing/Suspended	12	0	262	6	5	53	1	0
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	Completed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ongoing/Suspended	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	Completed	8157	11253	5817	7007	5519	6945	4737	4277
	Ongoing/Suspended	2811	2167	6630	861	2605	1405	2121	4305

Condt...

Table 2.7 District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (number of projects)

2010-2011								
District		Malappuram	Palakkad	Pathanamthitha	Thiruvananthapuram	Thrissur	Wayanad	Kerala
Rural Connectivity	Completed	251	371	205	779	117	368	3390
	Ongoing/Suspended	34	439	93	516	21	95	1897
Flood Control	Completed	2154	2860	2389	2237	2663	1753	27836
	Ongoing/Suspended	133	2662	1204	637	451	306	10075
Water Conservation and Water Herversting	Completed	1155	945	475	266	1534	1685	13791
	Ongoing/Suspended	110	666	106	292	193	203	5135
Drought Proofing	Completed	261	319	95	179	488	967	3413
	Ongoing/Suspended	40	370	13	35	89	61	1102
Micro Irrigation	Completed	573	1106	169	1094	931	250	8911
	Ongoing/Suspended	35	1626	103	666	127	17	4155
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	Completed	999	174	4	552	764	3	4341
	Ongoing/Suspended	105	177	5	191	173	1	931
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	Completed	1471	2033	1126	1494	1813	324	14768
	Ongoing/Suspended	131	1348	682	773	223	54	4865
Land development	Completed	1651	1479	943	2892	1490	2759	27568
	Ongoing/Suspended	268	1569	625	1477	424	221	14196
Any Other activity approved by MRD	Completed	89	37	8	5	5	22	470
	Ongoing/Suspended	27	33	12	19	1	2	433
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	Completed	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	Ongoing/Suspended	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	Completed	8604	9324	5414	9499	9805	8131	104489
	Ongoing/Suspended	883	8890	2843	4606	1702	960	42789

Source: Department of Rural Development, Government of Kerala

category was completed in Kozhikode district. Turning to the work on renovation of traditional water bodies, the number of works completed was 3066 in Ernakulam district and Idukki district with 158 works completed stood last among the districts in Kerala during 2010-11. It could be understood from Table 2.7 that the number of land development works completed was 4.66 which was found to be the highest compared to other districts in Kerala and the lowest number of 846 works were completed in Ernakulam district. Except a single work completed under the category Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra in Thiruvananthapuram district no such work was completed in all other districts in Kerala during 2010-11.

Amount spent on Projects:

The table 2.8 presents the details regarding the amount of money spent on works under NREGA during 2008-2009.

It could be seen from the Table 2.8 that the total expenditure incurred on the completed projects was to the tune of Rs.9,151.48 lakhs, whereas an amount of Rs.10,717.95 lakhs was spent on the ongoing works in Kerala in 2008-2009. Among the districts the amount spent on completed works was the highest in Wayanad district (Rs.2,347.60 lakhs) followed by Palakkad district (Rs.1,212.03 lakhs) whereas the lowest was in Pathanamthitta district. With regard to the amount spent on ongoing projects the highest expenditure was found in Palakkad district (Rs.4,004.82 lakhs) and the lowest went to Kottayam district. While we analyse the expenditure incurred on different works completed under NREGA flood control works topped the list with Rs.3,476.30 lakhs followed by renovation of traditional water bodies whereas the lowest amount spent on the project completed was other activity approved by MRD. Similarly expenditure on ongoing works also flood control had the highest amount, while the lowest amount on ongoing works was spent on any other activity approved by MRD.

It is understood from the above table that total amount spent on different works completed under NREGA in Kerala during 2009-2010 was Rs.39,758.74 whereas the same for ongoing work was Rs.4,696.60. The table 2.9 reveals that highest expenditure on completed works went to flood control project and the lowest expenditure was on any other activity approved by MRD. In case of ongoing work it is understood from Table 2.9 that highest amount was spent on the same flood control work and the lowest expenditure was on any other activity approved by MRD. While we analyse district wise expenditure on completed projects maximum amount

Table 2.8 District Wise Works Completed/Progress under NREGA (Amount Spent- Rs. in Lakhs)

2008 – 2009									
District		Alappuzha	Ernakullam	Idduki	Kannur	Kasargod	Kollam	Kottayam	Kozhikode
Rural Connectivity	Completed	0.856	17.9832	6.3113	0.7492	42.159	0.2962	3.6055	0.582
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.0784	8.3814	28.5147	0	84.1787	19.387	0	4.7959
Flood Control	Completed	333.9173	176.159	241.012	415.8764	178.2869	50.5364	44.4569	233.3819
	Ongoing/Suspended	127.2227	100.1481	807.0602	22.0755	567.0366	55.5401	2.5716	221.6185
Water Conservation and Water Herversting	Completed	0.1021	13.1344	50.4471	14.3266	23.4842	2.0211	9.6402	1.1688
	Ongoing/Suspended	9.3515	3.1584	238.5733	5.5288	40.276	8.7028	0.7049	5.6629
Drought Proofing	Completed	4.5862	0.5959	7.0706	2.2816	6.5694	1.8178	1.7429	5.9078
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.3737	1.2934	0.9331	0	5.6798	4.9293	0.666	0.4236
Micro Irrigation	Completed	15.4662	63.1013	26.9209	95.1854	8.5645	113.1361	49.3007	16.8547
	Ongoing/Suspended	3.245	85.0428	78.3253	4.4366	39.2866	298.6022	12.3092	92.6293
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	Completed	2.5758	0	36.1605	10.102	1.4828	0	0	0.4528
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.2241	0.4788	94.7095	0	20.3428	0.5934	0	0
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	Completed	42.0396	53.4941	29.6238	69.9992	7.0684	1.2555	51.072	21.5237
	Ongoing/Suspended	16.1037	181.0546	16.5599	10.6243	34.4329	39.3124	24.9145	53.7427
Land development	Completed	35.6721	6.8043	89.3354	22.323	185.4295	9.9359	6.2026	14.2105
	Ongoing/Suspended	30.1549	5.1319	257.4972	2.6358	443.6685	19.7872	1.6613	13.9443
Any Other activity approved by MRD	Completed	1.0537	3.0669	2.4708	0.032	0	0	0	1.2797
	Ongoing/Suspended	0	0.45	1.6907	0	0.4011	1.0547	0	0
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	Completed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ongoing/Suspended	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	Completed	436.269	334.339	489.3527	630.8754	453.0446	178.9991	166.0208	295.3618
	Ongoing/Suspended	186.754	385.1395	1523.8639	45.301	1235.3032	447.909	42.8275	392.8172

Cond...

Table 2.8 District Wise Works Completed/Progress under NREGA (Amount Spent- Rs. in Lakhs)

2008 - 2009								
District		Malappuram	Palakkad	Pathanamthitha	Thiruvananthapuram	Thrissur	Wayanad	Kerala
Rural Connectivity	Completed	0.3512	48.8882	5.2105	48.9498	8.8417	213.4999	398.2837
	Ongoing/Suspended	5.3668	174.1221	1.1396	80.1255	0.3555	175.3992	581.8448
Flood Control	Completed	382.101	318.1518	73.3805	71.0767	588.6004	369.358	3476.295
	Ongoing/Suspended	301.8702	999.5716	57.2936	13.2159	21.952	337.6494	3634.826
Water Conservation and Water Herversting	Completed	9.3289	80.7389	14.9622	18.3558	3.3273	315.3779	556.4155
	Ongoing/Suspended	4.1248	455.8806	16.6228	16.091	0.3463	294.3344	1099.359
Drought Proofing	Completed	1.1502	6.5664	0	6.1026	5.9794	309.9671	360.3379
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.2587	70.807	0.445	4.2941	3.7459	97.539	191.3886
Micro Irrigation	Completed	24.483	310.5501	0.2988	195.7023	167.9552	20.0353	1107.555
	Ongoing/Suspended	9.049	636.9723	3.0823	42.9277	14.8632	26.8315	1347.603
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	Completed	0	3.1263	0	0.7518	9.0387	14.869	78.5597
	Ongoing/Suspended	0	34.7218	0	0	0	2.7956	153.866
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	Completed	13.373	282.2361	60.0846	482.9617	300.354	380.6114	1795.697
	Ongoing/Suspended	11.3945	1293.1685	62.8421	102.7817	16.7945	153.112	2016.838
Land development	Completed	26.4323	161.6306	5.8336	28.1696	31.7838	723.5604	1347.324
	Ongoing/Suspended	14.4115	337.9536	9.8994	24.5298	0.6382	507.3779	1669.292
Any Other activity approved by MRD	Completed	0.7004	0.145	0	21.9377	0	0.385	31.0712
	Ongoing/Suspended	2.0028	1.6194	1.0752	11.1851	0	3.4554	22.9344
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	Completed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ongoing/Suspended	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	Completed	457.9201	1212.0335	159.7701	874.0079	1115.8805	2347.6019	9151.476
	Ongoing/Suspended	348.4783	4004.8169	152.4	295.1507	58.6956	1598.4945	10717.95

Source: Department of Rural Development, Government of Kerala

of expenditure went to Idukki district (Rs. 5,614.04) and the lowest amount was spent in Kottayam district on completed project works during 2009-2010.

As could be seen from Table 2.10 that an amount of Rs.47,838.77 was spent on total works completed under NREGA during 2010-2011 whereas the expenditure on ongoing works was to the tune of Rs.19,271.67 lakhs. Of all the works under NREGA highest amount was spent on flood control works both completed as well as ongoing projects during 2010-2011. It is also observed from the table that the completed works under the category Rajive Gandhi Seva Kendra consumed a very little amount of Rs.2,975 lakhs. Among the districts the amount of expenditure on completed works was the highest in Thiruvananthapuram district followed by Kottayam and the lowest share went to Pathanamthitta district. In case of ongoing works the expenditure was very high in Idukki district and lowest amount was spent in Wayanad district during 2010-2011.

2.3 Performance of NREGA - Some quantitative Indicators

Performance of NREGA may be measured by quantitative indicators such as social accounting, auditing, bank accounts, unemployment allowance and work projects. But the concern is that despite all our concerted efforts, the relevant data could not be obtained either from the website of the Kerala Rural Development department or in person. Hence this part could not be analysed for want of data.

Bank Accounts

The wages to the households worked under NREGA was distributed through bank and post offices. The details were available only for the year 2010-2011.

It could be seen from the table that the number of joint accounts in banks was much more than individual bank accounts. Out of 9,57,200 joint bank accounts opened in 2010-2011, Thiruvananthapuram district had 11,965 accounts. Kozhikode district had more number of individual bank accounts. It is observed from the table that the total amount of wages disbursed through bank was to the tune of Rs.591.73 crores in 2010-2011 of which Thiruvananthapuram district had the highest share of Rs.78.76 crores followed by Idukki district. The total number of individual accounts opened in post offices was 29,700 and joint account opened was 1,06,886 during 2010-2011. The table reveals that the total amount of wages disbursed through post office was to the tune of Rs.64.78 crores. Out of different districts, Alappuzha stood first in

Table 2.9 District Wise Works Completed/Progress under NREGA (Amount Spent- Rs. in Lakhs)

2009-2010									
District		Alappuzha	Ernakullam	Idduki	Kannur	Kasargod	Kollam	Kottayam	Kozhikode
Rural Connectivity	Completed	8.5356	64.4977	186.3072	38.3283	117.4635	12.908	28.8011	90.0955
	Ongoing/Suspended	0	6.2318	42.9508	0	16.3259	9.9373	0.9503	3.6197
Flood Control	Completed	1002.7277	521.2436	2148.7904	392.7075	415.0069	686.9718	244.3553	727.0093
	Ongoing/Suspended	15.485	107.9363	52.6291	4.8886	80.3337	38.3793	8.7601	53.073
Water Conservation and Water Herversting	Completed	26.5259	54.9183	852.2911	278.1675	312.1067	194.9543	43.1328	576.7039
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.0025	4.603	189.1242	2.8939	44.6921	11.5764	27.9049	11.009
Drought Proofing	Completed	52.1866	2.4471	92.2631	46.3238	16.8856	65.194	18.2163	52.9382
	Ongoing/Suspended	1.3556	1.2147	0.7975	0.5586	0.195	2.2546	0.6888	9.2184
Micro Irrigation	Completed	175.0188	273.7251	73.3132	294.3071	60.8524	799.8104	132.9872	167.7071
	Ongoing/Suspended	2.9378	51.1974	0.2462	1.4249	2.7213	29.3082	21.0496	25.4998
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	Completed	424.4085	1.0326	295.6564	150.4608	70.1852	57.6859	25.9372	3.0926
	Ongoing/Suspended	2.9967	0.3676	1.4842	1.4502	1.1563	2.0737	2.4874	0
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	Completed	302.5827	443.0924	107.3758	148.7258	78.2706	73.9307	449.044	315.8428
	Ongoing/Suspended	25.8172	201.0401	0.6446	0.2266	10.9556	11.2718	28.5093	33.9764
Land development	Completed	1058.4141	27.9877	1604.1918	187.5738	976.8451	218.7712	75.8492	773.4764
	Ongoing/Suspended	113.1565	5.1447	109.2491	1.4645	120.1414	8.7682	3.7534	75.0943
Any Other activity approved by MRD	Completed	17.4489	1.4516	253.8481	0.8919	0.638	6.0508	0.5088	0.195
	Ongoing/Suspended	1.1175	0	3.4288	0.0825	2.3879	0.5022	0	0
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	Completed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ongoing/Suspended	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	Completed	3067.8487	1390.3961	5614.0373	1537.4865	2048.2541	2116.277	1018.832	2707.061
	Ongoing/Suspended	162.8687	377.7357	400.5547	12.9897	278.9095	114.0718	94.1039	211.4906

Cond...

Table 2.9 District Wise Works Completed/Progress under NREGA (Amount Spent- Rs. in Lakhs)

2009-2010								
District		Malappuram	Palakkad	Pathanamthitha	Thiruvananthapuram	Thrissur	Wayanad	Kerala
Rural Connectivity	Completed	98.995	299.7298	46.5754	270.5056	57.4597	260.3212	1580.524
	Ongoing/Suspended	28.2429	128.4495	4.3006	133.0176	0	40.4643	414.4907
Flood Control	Completed	1248.8895	1486.0241	662.5992	921.6622	1127.7376	379.8788	11965.6
	Ongoing/Suspended	186.5609	224.5619	38.3862	115.7996	12.3722	78.6621	1017.828
Water Conservation and Water Herversting	Completed	100.1364	358.0368	164.2865	193.4592	80.9595	1177.6267	4413.306
	Ongoing/Suspended	56.8378	97.3741	9.4218	33.5486	2.8132	292.191	783.9925
Drought Proofing	Completed	67.9703	131.7024	22.8199	70.541	114.1859	677.3506	1431.025
	Ongoing/Suspended	42.0423	45.5486	0.0195	16.6033	18.0581	27.2285	165.7835
Micro Irrigation	Completed	198.4314	814.5554	57.5844	641.3424	527.3119	46.1103	4263.057
	Ongoing/Suspended	32.8879	119.2005	3.4098	61.0398	7.6441	3.7837	362.351
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	Completed	201.4728	35.3985	7.281	92.5778	241.3972	0.352	1606.939
	Ongoing/Suspended	25.0903	9.8816	0	2.0853	2.097	0	51.1703
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	Completed	397.4278	1634.045	502.4886	958.9153	691.0799	52.1241	6154.946
	Ongoing/Suspended	33.1543	296.5835	18.2147	179.395	23.8217	19.5799	883.1907
Land development	Completed	323.3576	636.2754	140.9724	361.0798	111.1798	1479.038	7975.012
	Ongoing/Suspended	40.4502	192.3057	8.1398	112.8918	7.6241	199.0429	997.2266
Any Other activity approved by MRD	Completed	23.0796	31.7429	6.1515	25.625	0.1584	0.5348	368.3253
	Ongoing/Suspended	8.2918	1.6713	0.3438	2.7454	0	0	20.5712
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	Completed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ongoing/Suspended	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	Completed	2659.7604	5427.5104	1610.7591	3535.7083	2951.4697	4073.3365	39758.74
	Ongoing/Suspended	453.5583	1115.5768	82.2362	657.1263	74.4303	660.9524	4696.605

Source: Department of Rural Development, Government of Kerala

disbursing an amount of Rs.25.88 crores. The total number of accounts was 13,13,558 comprising 2,49,472 individual accounts and 10,64,086 joint accounts. The Table 2.11 shows that Kozhikode district had more number of individual accounts compared to other districts. In case of joint account Idukki stood first with 1,27,975 followed by Thiruvananthapuram. Individual and joint accounts put together Thiruvananthapuram district stood first with 1,55,388 accounts followed by Idukki district. It is observed from Table 2.11 that the total NREGA payment processed through all accounts was to the tune of Rs.656.51 crores. Among the districts Thiruvananthapuram, Idukki and Alappuzha ranked first, second and third by disbursing an amount of Rs.89.25 crores, 76.55 crores and 69.27 crores respectively during 2010-2011.

Unemployment allowance

Details regarding unemployment allowance for the year 2010-2011 alone were available which are presented in Table 2.12

Data on unemployment allowance due and paid were available only for the year 2010-2011 despite our effort to secure the same for the period 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 from the Rural Development Department of Kerala. It is understood from the table that the number of days unemployment allowance due, worked out to 22,983 during 2010-2011. The total unemployment allowance worked out to 7,469 days in Idukki district which topped the list of districts and the same was only 32 days in Kannur district. The details regarding the total number of days unemployment allowance paid and the amount paid were not available even for 2010-2011.

Table 2.10 District Wise Works Completed/Progress under NREGA (Amount Spent- Rs. in Lakhs)

2010-2011									
District		Alappuzha	Ernakullam	Idduki	Kannur	Kasargod	Kollam	Kottayam	Kozhikode
Rural Connectivity	Completed	5.344	167.8471	38.3796	32.5818	47.1725	55.1851	62.6871	9.1047
	Ongoing/Suspended	5.6884	16.919	255.9165	3.4742	40.7231	4.0679	14.9805	7.9398
Flood Control	Completed	854.7777	1058.6392	504.1908	748.469	326.3573	636.5059	456.91	185.9311
	Ongoing/Suspended	193.7639	232.653	663.6621	84.9749	128.4405	95.2641	157.8629	86.4244
Water Conservation and Water Herversting	Completed	139.981	694.4852	567.6047	369.44	576.7415	685.1639	101.4429	935.5712
	Ongoing/Suspended	95.7709	139.8883	497.6152	77.6849	111.9459	63.4866	149.3004	339.3941
Drought Proofing	Completed	208.6129	20.0521	5.7599	38.706	8.6528	69.5061	71.0869	25.5759
	Ongoing/Suspended	105.1411	5.1871	51.169	0.9427	8.5448	4.7841	8.9733	9.7451
Micro Irrigation	Completed	195.403	471.5548	6.0664	200.8374	55.1129	763.261	122.5724	22.7894
	Ongoing/Suspended	55.498	93.3366	21.9667	32.1544	20.8517	78.4869	76.976	42.6239
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	Completed	378.0873	94.8052	172.2596	209.1402	66.912	230.5976	27.1465	0
	Ongoing/Suspended	100.9774	6.4566	9.0151	5.8909	11.4306	6.2767	3.888	1.6156
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	Completed	339.9488	886.8303	50.2634	176.7257	50.4634	97.5204	402.0403	97.3924
	Ongoing/Suspended	30.8184	117.3395	1.9629	3.8369	16.5553	20.1879	151.8726	38.2985
Land development	Completed	3403.8832	414.3748	1706.5499	488.6899	973.4579	973.2508	737.0451	1057.4169
	Ongoing/Suspended	1130.5	65.3264	2710.5276	59.5498	328.7506	255.124	166.7286	1181.8742
Any Other activity approved by MRD	Completed	34.0876	0	71.7858	4.9789	3.1634	15.4346	0.0253	0.0768
	Ongoing/Suspended	5.4833	0	245.1566	0.2197	0.0398	21.9993	0.0412	0
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	Completed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ongoing/Suspended	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	Completed	5560.1255	3808.5887	3122.854	2269.569	2108.0337	3526.4255	1980.9566	2333.8584
	Ongoing/Suspended	1723.6414	677.1065	4456.9916	268.7285	667.2823	549.6776	730.6236	1707.9156

Cond...

Table 2.10 District Wise Works Completed/Progress under NREGA (Amount Spent- Rs. in Lakhs)

2010-2011								
District		Malappuram	Palakkad	Pathanamthitha	Thiruvananthapuram	Thrissur	Wayanad	Kerala
Rural Connectivity	Completed	101.4555	146.7781	55.427	453.042	51.6056	176.3342	1402.944
	Ongoing/Suspended	13.9194	165.1808	18.8082	255.5753	6.9379	10.3244	820.4554
Flood Control	Completed	723.7428	828.7576	786.9893	1223.1626	997.7892	551.8	9884.023
	Ongoing/Suspended	33.1471	905.4791	245.2893	376.4183	142.6576	35.6414	3381.679
Water Conservation and Water Herversting	Completed	731.0016	206.9766	202.5047	223.2955	907.6628	707.401	7049.273
	Ongoing/Suspended	48.4019	248.7656	18.3102	202.7857	143.6245	64.5561	2201.53
Drought Proofing	Completed	58.2239	73.9095	25.5722	134.8644	167.9596	492.9404	1401.423
	Ongoing/Suspended	6.963	111.2286	4.1829	20.0705	38.22	20.3549	395.5071
Micro Irrigation	Completed	213.3382	381.3289	56.4501	604.7863	420.6056	40.7503	3554.857
	Ongoing/Suspended	12.9229	610.7822	23.3654	385.1874	46.1942	0	1500.346
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	Completed	674.7019	36.5418	5.526	794.5661	373.5541	0	3063.838
	Ongoing/Suspended	36.0267	40.9608	9.908	262.6395	80.9186	0	576.0045
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	Completed	586.976	1145.8671	379.8457	923.1112	742.847	63.9311	5943.763
	Ongoing/Suspended	43.9137	844.4041	148.3278	446.0676	80.1236	4.4088	1948.118
Land development	Completed	1090.3255	530.8626	267.553	1786.5971	999.7323	904.9528	15334.69
	Ongoing/Suspended	158.0619	620.5714	119.2248	1043.1506	300.5755	16.6707	8156.636
Any Other activity approved by MRD	Completed	50.2797	2.1375	1.624	2.1362	2.3977	15.5376	203.6651
	Ongoing/Suspended	7.0331	1.9291	0	3.0167	0	6.4762	291.395
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	Completed	0	0	0	0.2975	0	0	0.2975
	Ongoing/Suspended	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total	Completed	4230.045	3353.1599	1781.492	6145.8589	4664.1537	2953.6474	47838.77
	Ongoing/Suspended	360.3898	3549.3017	587.4166	2994.9118	839.2519	158.4324	19271.67

Source: Department of Rural Development, Government of Kerala

Table 2.11 The NREGA payment processed though banks/post office (2010-2011)

Name of the District	No. of Bank Account Opened		Amount of Wages disbursed through bank Accounts (Rs. In lakhs)	No. of Post Office Account Opened		Amount of Wages disbursed through post office Accounts (Rs. In lakhs)	Total Account			Total Amount Disbursed (Rs. In lakhs)
	Individual	Joint		Individual	Joint		Individual	Joint	Total	
Alappuzha	15429	69351	4338.6	10826	39938	2588.493	26255	109289	135544	6927.092
Ernakullam	12588	69059	4116.042	687	3168	198.735	13275	72227	85502	4314.777
Idduki	20208	109905	6660.496	4474	18070	995.477	24682	127975	152657	7655.973
Kannur	11915	45159	2340.075	1061	2572	134.783	12976	47731	60707	2474.858
Kasargod	8946	43703	2581.383	128	402	24.668	9074	44105	53179	2606.051
Kollam	19174	65907	3587.043	3156	6506	323.302	22330	72413	94743	3910.345
Kottayam	11283	46178	2594.376	870	3603	192.264	12153	49781	61934	2786.639
Kozhikode	27803	72230	4553.76	2466	5371	356.061	30269	77601	107870	4909.82
Malappuram	15364	67012	4313.852	604	1687	108.036	15968	68699	84667	4421.888
Palakkad	13193	99851	6199.988	329	1548	83.713	13522	101399	114921	6283.7
Pathanamthitha	6005	35417	2298.864	413	4590	244.787	6418	40007	46425	2543.651
Thiruvananthapuram	25009	110965	7876.157	3423	15991	1049.177	28432	126956	155388	8925.334
Thrissur	17234	75671	5123.758	676	2611	139.715	17910	78282	96192	5263.473
Wayanad	15621	46792	2588.619	587	829	38.944	16208	47621	63829	2627.564
TOTAL	219772	957200	59173.013	29700	106886	6478.155	249472	1064086	1313558	65651.165

Source: Department of Rural Development, Government of Kerala

Table 2.12 Unemployment allowance paid in lieu of not providing employment (2010-11)

District	Unemployment Allowance Due	Unemployment Allowance Paid	
	No. of Days	No. of Days	Amount
Alappuzha	3737	NA	NA
Ernakullam	99	NA	NA
Idduki	7469	NA	NA
Kannur	32	NA	NA
Kasargod	356	NA	NA
Kollam	26	NA	NA
Kottayam	1145	NA	NA
Kozhikode	3110	NA	NA
Malappuram	771	NA	NA
Palakkad	1472	NA	NA
Pathanamthitha	725	NA	NA
Thiruvananthapuram	1873	NA	NA
Thrissur	890	NA	NA
Wayanad	1278	NA	NA
Total	22983	NA	NA

Source: Department of Rural Development, Government of Kerala

Summary

The analysis clearly reveals that manpower employment generated under NREGA increased sizeably during the 3 phases of the programme. It is encouraging to find that in almost all the District of Kerala the employment generated was as high as 99 percent, during the study period. Between the period 2008-2009 and 2010-2011, the percentage of increase was of the order of over 275 percent which is positive dimension of the programme. Similarly, the total number of works completed increased from 26035 in 2008-09 to 104489 in 2010-2011. The total expenditure on all activities under NREGA increased from Rs.220 crores in 2008-2009 to Rs.703 crores in 2010-2011, recording over a 3 fold increase.

As regards job cards, the cumulative number of job cards issued to the households in Kerala remarkably increased from about 24 lakhs in 2008-2009 to over 29 lakhs during 2010-2011.

The total number of households demanded employment substantially increased from around 6.5 lakhs in 2008-2009 to about 11.9 lakhs in 2010-2011.

NREGA generated 156.2 lakhs person days during 2008-2009 which drastically increased to 480.3 lakhs person days during 2010-2011. The increase was more than 3 times.

The total number of works completed under NREGA during 2008-09 was around 26000 which rose to 1 lakh during 2010-2011.

Thus it could be inferred from the analysis that the results were encouraging and the benefits reached the targeted section of the population.

CHAPTER III

HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS, THEIR INCOME AND CONSUMPTION PATTERN

This chapter analyses the characteristics of the sample households, both beneficiary and non-beneficiary, their income and consumption pattern based on primary data of the selected areas in Kerala state. The general background of the sample respondents could be assessed from the socio-economic conditions. Demographic profile of the respondents such as age, gender, education, caste etc is discussed in this chapter.

3.1 Household profile of the Respondents:

The household profile of the sample respondents is presented in Table 3.1.

The table 3.1 shows 200 beneficiary and 50 non-beneficiary sample respondents. The average size of sample household worked out to 3.47 and 3.15 for beneficiary and non-beneficiaries respectively. The data indicates the small family conscience of the sample respondents. It could be understood from Table 3.1 that the average number of earners was as small as 1.4 in case of beneficiary and 1.6 for non-beneficiary sample respondents. There was more or less equal percentage of male and female members found among the beneficiary households and the percentage of male was high at 57.42 among the non-beneficiaries. It is observed from Table 3.1 that over 79 percent of beneficiary and over 76 percent of non beneficiary sample households' members belonged to the age productive group of 16-60 years. The table shows that more than 66 percent of the respondents were the head of the family and the rest were other persons belonging to the family.

With regard to educational status, a majority of 69 percent beneficiary and 54 percent of non beneficiary sample respondents studied upto secondary school level and in aggregate it was 66 percent. It could be seen from Table 3.1 that around 11 percent of the beneficiary and 30.32 percent of the non-beneficiary members of the households were graduates and in aggregate it worked out to 14.42 percent. It is obvious that Kerala's literacy rate is highest in the country and, illiterates found among the beneficiary member of households were abysmally low at 2.72 percent and

Table 3.1: Demographic profile of the respondents

(% of households)

Characteristics	Unit	Beneficiaries	Non Beneficiaries	Aggregate	
No. of HH	Nos.	200	50	250	
Household size (numbers)	Nos.	3.47	3.15	3.40	
Average numbers of earners	Nos.	1.425	1.6	1.46	
Gender	Male	% TM	49.64	57.42	51.05
	Female	% TM	50.36	42.58	48.95
Age group	<16	% TM	10.84	6.45	10.05
	16-60	% TM	79.89	76.78	79.32
	>60	% TM	9.27	16.77	10.63
Identity of respondent	Head	%HH	66.5	64	66
	Others	%HH	33.5	36	34
Education status	Illiterate	% TM	2.72	0	2.22
	Up to primary	% TM	14.76	8.39	13.60
	Up to secondary	% TM	68.48	53.55	65.89
	Up to graduate	% TM	11.03	30.32	14.42
	Above graduate	% TM	3.01	7.74	3.87
Caste	SC	%HH	12	4	10.4
	ST	%HH	3.5	0	2.8
	OBC	%HH	59	54	58
	General	%HH	25.5	42	28.8
Card holding	AAY	%HH	17.5	6	15.2
	BPL	%HH	42.5	16	37.2
	APL	%HH	40	78	47.6
	None	%HH	0	0	0
Decision maker	Male	%HH	71	96	76
	Female	%HH	29	4	24
Main occupation	Farming	%EM	0.70	0	0.56
	Self business	%EM	8.16	11.54	8.89
	Salaried/pensioners	%EM	6.74	58.97	18.05
	Wage earners	%EM	84.40	29.49	72.5
Involved in migration during year 2009	%HH	0	0	0	

Source: Field Survey

Note: Unit of each characteristic is shown in brackets

%HH = Percentage to total HHs, %TM = Percentage to total Nos. of members, %EM = Percentage to total earners, AAY = Antyoday Anna Yojana, APL = Above Poverty Line, BPL = Below Poverty Line

there were no illiterates in the non-beneficiaries.

Caste wise details are given in the table. Of the different communities OBC was found to be the dominant one both in beneficiary as well as non beneficiary sample respondents and the percentage worked out to 59 and 54 respectively. Communities under General category ranked next to OBC. About 25 percent of the beneficiary and 42 percent of the non-beneficiary households belonged to General category. Table 3.1 shows that 12 percent of beneficiary households and 4 percent of

non-beneficiary households belonged to SC community. Among the beneficiary sample respondents 3.5 percent were STs and there was no ST among the non-beneficiary. It is observed from Table 3.1 that BPL card holders were high among the beneficiary households (42.5%) and APL cardholders were high in the non-beneficiary households (78%). Among the non-beneficiary households 40 percent were APL card holders. In the beneficiary households 17.5 percent were AAY card holders and only 6 percent were AAY card holders in the non-beneficiary households. It could be understood from the table that comparatively non-beneficiary sample households were economically better off than the beneficiary counterparts as it is visible that 78 percent of the non-beneficiary sample households were APL card holders.

The data also shows that at aggregate level the decision makers were males in 76 percent of the households. It is understood from Table 3.1 that 84 percent of the total earners were wage earners among the beneficiary sample households and it was around 30 percent in case of non-beneficiary households. Salaried people and pensioners constituted 59 percent of the total earners in the non-beneficiary category and the percentage was just 7 for beneficiaries. It is significant to note from the table that there was no migration of labour during the year 2009. Thus in all aspects of socio economic profile, the beneficiaries seem to have an edge over non-beneficiaries, showing a positive impact of the government initiative.

3.2 Main Occupation:

The details regarding the percentage of mandays generated in different main occupations by the sample households are provided in Table 3.2.

The table 3.2 shows that the sample beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries worked in agricultural sector, non –agricultural sector, worked as self employed under NREGA, and worked in government.

It is seen from the table that around 45 percent of the mandays generated by the beneficiaries was in the regular and salaried job and the same for the non-beneficiaries worked out to 56.53, little higher than the beneficiaries. The data show that pensioners were more in the beneficiary as well as non-beneficiary sample households, which pushed the percentage to a very high level. Thus according to the data only, around 50 percent of the mandays were involved in other occupations. Among other occupations non agricultural casual labour ranked high with 16 percent

Table 3.2: Main Occupation Wise distribution of Workers**(% of total man-days per hh)**

Occupation	Beneficiaries	Non beneficiaries	Aggregate
Agricultural casual labour	7.27	7.19	7.42
Non agricultural casual labour	16.24	22.32	17.02
Work for public work programmes other than NREGA	0.00	0.00	0.00
Self employed in non farming	11.18	13.96	11.56
Self employed in agriculture	9.17	0.00	9.52
Self employed in livestock	0.00	0.00	0.00
Regular/Salary job	44.63	56.53	46.34
Worked as a migrant worker	0.00	0.00	0.00
Worked under NREGA	11.51	0.00	8.14
Any other work	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

Note:

1. While calculating man days working population excludes dependent, household work, students and others
2. For salaried/pensioners the working days are considered as 365 man-days per person per annum
3. For self employment in agriculture/livestock, man-days are calculated as (days* number of hours/8)

mandays for beneficiary and 22.32 percent mandays for non-beneficiary sample households. The percentage of mandays generated under NREGA activity by the beneficiary sample household worked out to 12 which indicate that around one tenth of the total mandays was involved in NREGA programmes. It is understood from Table 3.2 that around 11 percent of mandays generated by the sample beneficiary households and around 14 percent by non-beneficiary sample households was in self employment in non-farming sector. The percentage of mandays generated in self employment in agriculture sector was 9 for the beneficiary sample households and the percentage was nil in the case of non-beneficiaries.

It is observed from the table that at aggregate level around 46 percent of the mandays generated was in the regular and salaried job and 17 percent was in non-agricultural casual labour. It could be seen from the table that at aggregate level only 8.14 percent of the mandays was generated in the NREGA programme.

3.3 Household Net Income:

The per household average net income is presented in Table 3.3.

**Table 3.3: Source wise Distribution of Household net income (Annual)
(Rs per household)***

	Average Income	CV (across HH)	Average Income	CV (across HH)	Average Income	CV (across HH)
	Beneficiaries		Non beneficiaries		Aggregate	
Income from work under NREGA	7,409.09 (6.71)	55.74	0 (0.00)	0.00	5,927.27 (5.71)	66.07
Income from wages in agriculture	22,317.72 (20.2)	94.84	32,562.5 (25.89)	45.51	23,522.99 (22.66)	88.12
Income from wages non agriculture	25,550.57 (23.12)	43.79	33,363.64 (26.53)	55.12	26,418.69 (25.44)	46.63
Income from wages in PWP	0 (0.00)	0.00	0 (0.00)	0.00	0 (0.00)	0.00
Income from wages as migrant workers	0 (0.00)	0.00	0 (0.00)	0.00	0 (0.00)	0.00
Income from self employed in non farming	21,422.5 (19.39)	44.77	35,222.22 (28.00)	42.43	23,957.14 (23.08)	49.59
Income from agriculture/livestock	11,250 (10.18)	15.71	0 (0.00)	0.00	90 (0.09)	1116.03
Income from regular job/salary/ pension	22,544.24 (20.4)	42.44	24,631.52 (19.58)	66.70	23,896.56 (23.02)	60.05
Income from sale of assets/ rent/transfer etc.	0 (0.00)	0.00	0 (0.00)	0.00	0 (0.00)	0.00
Total	1,10,494.1 (100.00)	87.53	1,25,779.9 (100.00)	58.73	1,03,812.7 (100.00)	84.35

Note: Figures in parentheses are respective percentage of total income

* Income from wages in non agriculture/income from migrant workers is calculated after subtracting their transportation cost, while income from agriculture also includes from hiring out assets if any.

The data shows that the average household income at aggregate level worked out to Rs. 1,03,812.7 per annum. The same for beneficiary and non-beneficiary households was put at Rs.1,14,094.1 and Rs.1,25,779.9 respectively. It is seen from the table that the per household net income of non-beneficiary household was little higher than the beneficiary household. In case of beneficiary households around one fourth (23.12%) of the total income was derived from wages in non agricultural sector. Similarly, out of total per household income of the beneficiary sample respondents wages in agriculture contributed 20.2 percent income and the next major source was income from regular job/Salaried/Pensioner. It is significant to note that percentage of annual self income obtained from NREGA activities was just 6.71 for beneficiary sample households.

In case of non-beneficiary sample households the data shows that out of the total household net income highest percentage (28.00%) was from self employment in

non farming sector followed by income from wages in non-agriculture and agriculture.

The coefficient of variation worked out across the beneficiary households shows high variation in income from wages in agriculture followed by income from work under NREGA. In case of non-beneficiary households coefficient of variation worked out was high with income from regular job, salary followed by the income from non-agricultural wages.

Between the beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, the coefficient of variation is large in respect of income from Agricultural wages, followed by income from regular job. The disparity is fairly large at the aggregate between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.

3.5 Variability (CV) and Gini ratio of income and consumption

The average household income and consumption expenditure of the sample households is presented in Table 3.6

Table 3.6 Variability in Consumption and Income

Description	Beneficiary	Non Beneficiary	Total
Average household Income during the reference years (Rs)	91,578	3,35,362	1,61,184.2
Average household consumption during the reference years (Rs)	30,914.63	88,902.70	33,195.97
Coefficient of variation in income across households	59.64	59.49	99.41
Coefficient of variation in consumption across households	279.80	216.21	280.21
Gini coefficient of income	0.32	0.33	0.46
Gini coefficient of consumption	0.51	0.50	0.51

The average household income during the reference period at aggregate level as shown in Table 3.6 was around 1.60 lakhs. The average household income was found to be more than Rs.3 lakhs for non-beneficiary sample households whereas it was around Rs.90,000 only for beneficiary. Thus there appeared huge difference in income between beneficiary and non-beneficiary sample households. The average household consumption during the reference year at aggregate level worked out to around Rs.33,000. It is significant to more that the average household consumption expenditure of beneficiaries during reference year was around Rs.30,000 whereas for non-beneficiary the consumption expenditure was found to be three times that of

beneficiary as it is obvious that there was much disparities in income between the beneficiary an non-beneficiary sample households. It is evident from the table that there was much variation in income across beneficiary as well as non-beneficiary households the Coefficient of variation was found to be over 59. The table 3.6 reveals that there was large variation in the consumption expenditure across households as the Coefficient of variation worked out to nearly 280 for beneficiary and 216 for non beneficiary sample households.

Gini coefficient was worked out find out the inequality in income and consumption. It is observed from Table 3.6 that inequality was some what moderate and not very high as the Gini ratio of income estimated was 0.32 and 0.33 in each case of beneficiary and non-beneficiary respectively and at aggregate level it worked out to 0.46. it could be observed from Table 3.6 that variance in consumption was found to be bit high as the Gini Coefficient showed 0.51 for beneficiary and 0.50 for non-beneficiary sample households.

3.6 Determinants of participation in NREGA – Functional Analysis

The factors determining the participation of household in NREGA activities has been analyzed using Regression analysis*. The regression coefficient is use to access the relationship between one dependent variable and several independent variables (i.e.) how strongly each Independent variables predicts the dependent variables. Specifically the Logit and Probit regression** models were used at household level for analysis.

Note:

* **Regression:** $Y = a + bX + e$, Y – Dependent (response) variable, X – Independent (predictor) variable, a - Y-Intercept, b - slop of the line, e - error term.

** Both **Logit** and **Probit** model allow us to determine the relationship between binary response variable and group of predictor variables.

The basic difference between these two models is, in logit model, the $\text{logit}(p) \Rightarrow \log(\text{odds}) \Rightarrow \log\left(\frac{p}{q}\right) = a + bX$, where ‘ p ’ is probability of participation of NREGA and ‘ q ’ = $(1 - p)$ is probability of non participation of NREGA and X is the vector of predictor variables.

In both Logit and Probit regression models, participation in NREGA (participation =1, non participation = 0) has been taken as dependent variable, and

household income and household size were taken as independent (predictor) variables. Both the predictor variables are continuous variables.

Table 3.7 shows the Logit and Probit regression coefficients, Wald Statistics and the associated 'P' values. It also reveals the actual relationship between the predictor variables used, and the dependent variable.

Table 3.7 Determinants of participation in NREGA (Logit/probit function)

Variable Name	Logit function			Probit function		
	Coefficient	Wald Statistic	P value	Coefficient	Wald Statistic	P Value
Household Income	0.0002	25.21	0.0000	0.0001	30.936	0.0000
Household size	0.3110	2.055	0.1516	0.1804	2.492	0.1143
R²	0.3689			0.3680		
F value		211.22 on 2 and 248 DF, p – value = 0.000 (2.2e ⁻³⁸)				

The estimated results are almost similar for both models in household level analysis. The coefficients show the expected signs. The value of R² is also found to be low in both the cases, which implies that the data fits the model to some extent but is not considerably, a good fit. It may be on account of the fact that the model does not take into account certain other crucial independent variables (of course for want of data) such as wage differentials between NREGA employment and non- NREGA employment, gender differences in opting for employment, composition of the household size in terms of children, adults and elderly people who cannot be employed and other such.

At the same time, the variable income is found to be statistically significant. It can be interpreted from the table that, at household level, for one unit increase in household income the participation in NREGA works increases by 0.0002 approximately, which indicates the significant influence (at 1% level of significance) of household income. And also, household size has a positive and significant coefficient at (5% level of significance) implying that the larger the household size, the higher the probability of participation in NREGA.

On the whole, it can be concluded that the bigger the house holds size and household income level, the higher the chance of participation in NREGA activities in Kerala region. It is also obvious that larger the size of the household, greater is the

probability of the dependency. In case, the existing labour force happens to be skilled or semi skilled, the choice of employment again may vary i.e., the unskilled may opt for NREGA job opportunities and the relatively skilled may opt for skilled related works.

Summary

Household characteristics show the family size, number of earners, education status and the like. The average size of the household was 3.47 for beneficiary and a little small as 3.15 for non-beneficiary. The average earners were 1.4 in case of beneficiary and 1.6 for non-beneficiary. The percentages of male and female members were found to be more or less equal in case of beneficiary and the percentage of male was around 57 in case of non-beneficiaries. Over 75 percent of the sample households beneficiary as well as non beneficiary belonged to the productive age group of 16-60 years. At aggregate level 66 percent of the sample households studied upto secondary school and nearly 15 percent were graduates.

As regards caste OBC was found to be the dominant community both in the beneficiary and non-beneficiary households representing over 54 percent. The share of SC people was 12 percent in the beneficiary and 4 percent in the non-beneficiary sample households.

At aggregate level around 46 percent of the mandays generated was in the regular and salaried job and 17 percent in the non agricultural casual labour. At aggregate level it was found that nearly 8 percent of the mandays was generated in the NREGA program.

The average household income at aggregate level was around 1 lakh and for non-beneficiary the average income was high at 1.25 lakhs. Between the beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, the coefficient of variation was large in respect of income for agricultural wages, followed by income from regular job.

Also it can be observed that, the F-value of 211.22 on (2, 248) degrees of freedom with 'p' value very close to zero confirms that the fitted model has a good predictive capacity and the model is over all statistically significant.

CHAPTER IV

WORK PROFILE UNDER NREGA, WAGE STRUCTURE AND MIGRATION ISSUES

This chapter attempts to find out nature of the employment of the beneficiary sample households, their wage rates and migration issues and to know whether NREGA was successful in providing 100 days of employment to the rural households.

4.1 Work Profile under NREGA:

The details regarding the number of members employed, number of days employed, wage rates of the workers are depicted in Table 4.1

As could be seen from Table 4.1 that the number of members per household employed during the reference period at aggregate level worked out to 1.07 for Kerala. As regards the sample districts, it was 1.27 in Kasaragod which recorded the highest number employed when compared to other districts. In Kottayam and Palakkad districts, it worked out to 1 each at aggregate level. While analyzing the data across different social groups it was found that in General class there was only one member each worked under NREGA in Kottayam, Palakkad and Wayanad districts. In the OBC category, the highest number of persons per household employed under NREGA was found in Kasaragod district where the number was put at 1.42 followed by Thiruvananthapuram district (1.11). In case of SC households, it is significant to note that the number of person per household got job under NREGA was uniformly only one in all the five sample districts. Turning to ST category it is observed from Table 4.1 that absolutely there was no person per household worked under NREGA in Thiruvananthapuram, Kottayam and Palakkad districts and in the tribal districts of Wayanad and Kasaragod there was only one person got job in each of the two districts. In the OBC category the table shows that on an average 1.25 persons per household were employed under NREGA in Kasaragod district which was found to be the highest number compared to other districts. Similarly, the number of women worked under NREGA was found to be 1.17 in Kasaragod district whereas it was 1.06, 1.04 in Thiruvananthapuram, Wayanad and one each in Kottayam and Palakkad districts respectively. It reveals the fact that in every sample household there was

Table 4.1: The work profile under NREGA (Reference period Jan-Dec 2009)

Characteristics		Thiruvananthapuram	Kottayam	Palakkad	Wayanad	Kasaragod	Kerala
No. of members per hh employed during the year	Aggregate	1.07	1.00	1.00	1.02	1.27	1.07
	General	1.11	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.42	1.3
	SC	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	ST	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	OBC	1.08	1.00	1.00	1.03	1.25	1.07
	Women	1.06	1.00	1.00	1.04	1.17	1.06
No. of days per hh employed during the year	Aggregate	67.52	37.00	75.2	77.17	57.85	63.29
	General	49.47	38.45	81.67	89.8	68.58	58.96
	SC	94.00	33.67	54.83	82.00	53.67	70.63
	ST	0.00	0.00	0.00	81.00	73.00	77.02
	OBC	73.54	36.75	78.18	74.00	51.75	62.84
	Women	74.09	36.56	71.92	69.54	61.58	61.67
Wage rate obtained (Rs)	Aggregate	125.00	125.00	125.00	125.00	125.00	125.00
	General	125.00	125.00	125.00	125.00	125.00	125.00
	SC	125.00	125.00	125.00	125.00	125.00	125.00
	ST	125.00	125.00	125.00	125.00	125.00	125.00
	OBC	125.00	125.00	125.00	125.00	125.00	125.00
	Women	125.00	125.00	125.00	125.00	125.00	125.00
Average distance from residence where employed (Kms)		1.63	1.68	1.53	1.34	1.49	1.53

Source: Department of Rural Development, Government of Kerala.

minimum one woman member worked under NREGA during the reference year. This drives home the fact that women's participation in NREGA so as to supplement their family income.

It may be seen from Table 4.1 that the number of days per household employed during the reference period worked out to 63 at aggregate level in respect of Kerala. At aggregate level the number of days per household got job under NREGA was found to be the highest at 77 in Wayanad district followed by Palakkad district (75.2) and the lowest being 37 in Kottayam district. It is observed from the table that of the different communities of workers the ST people worked for more number of days when compared to other communities in respect of Kerala. The number of days per household of different communities employed during the reference year worked out to 58.96, 70.63, 77.02 and 62.84 for General class, SC, ST and OBC respectively for Kerala. In Wayanad district General class and ST got more days of employment when compared to other four districts and OBC worked for more days in Palakkad district. In case of SC people the mandays generated per household during the reference period was estimated to be the highest at 94.00 in Thiruvananthapuram district.

It is understood from Table 4.1 that on an average per household mandays generated by beneficiary sample respondents during the reference period worked out to 63.29. Thus it is inferred from the analysis that the objective of providing 100 days work per household per year could not be achieved fully and it seems that much more efforts are needed on the part of the government to achieve the goal.

The wage rate as could be seen from the data was uniform at Rs. 125 for both men and woman and across different social groups. The wage rate was fixed by the government of India based on the existing wage rate of Kerala. The wage rates in Kerala always remain high when compared to other states of the country.

The table shows that the distance between residence of the labourers and the work site ranges from 1.34 km to 1.68 km i.e. a worker had to travel a distance of more than a kilometer for job.

4.2 Employment activities, nature of assets created and their durability

The sample households were involved in different activities under NREGA.

**Table 4.2: The activity in which employed under NREGA and the quality of assets created
(Reference period – Jan-Dec 2009)**

		(% of household)					
Characteristics		Thiruvananthapuram	Kottayam	Palakkad	Wayanad	Kasaragod	Kerala
Name of the activity under which employed	Rural Connectivity	100	78.95	70	97.5	95.12	88.5
	Flood control and protection	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Water conservation and water harvesting	0	21.05	5	0	0	5
	Drought proofing	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Micro irrigation works	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Provision of irrigation facility to land owned by (Panchayat)	0	0	2.5	0	4.88	1.5
	Renovation of traditional water bodies	0	0	17.5	0	0	3.5
	Land development	0	0	5	2.5	0	1.5
Any other activity approved by the Min of Rural Development		0	0	0	0	0	0
Quality of the assets created through NREGA activities	Very Good	73.17	65.79	92.5	77.5	80.49	80.5
	Good	26.83	34.21	5	22.5	19.51	19
	Bad	0	0	2.5	0	0	0.5
	Worst	0	0	0	0	0	0
Average unemployment allowance received by the household for not getting work under NREGA after registration (Rs per hh)		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Source: Department of Rural Development, Government of Kerala.

It is evident from the table that rural connectivity work was found to be the major work under NREGA which consumed major chunk of 88.5 percent of the labourers. The percentage of workers involved in activities such as renovation of traditional water bodies, promotion of irrigation facility to land and land development accounted for 3.5, 1.5, and 1.5 respectively. It is significant to note that all the sample households were employed in rural connectivity works in Thiruvananthapuram district. In Wayanad and Palakkad districts also this particular activity consumed 97.5 percent and 95.12 percent respectively. In Kottayam district about 21 percent of the sample households worked in water conservation and water harvesting activity. In Palakkad over 17 percent of the sample households were employed in the renovation of tradition water bodies. Thus it is observed from the analysis that rural connectivity was the dominant activity where over 85 percent of the workers were engaged in Kerala.

With regard to quality of assets created through NREGA activities, about 80 percent of the beneficiary sample households were of the opinion that the quality of assets created was found to be very good in Kerala and 19 percent opined that it was good and only 0.5 percent viewed it as bad. But no sample households observed that the assets created were worst.

The quality of assets according to the opinion of 92.5 percent of the sample households in Palakkad district was very good. In Kasaragod district a little over 80 percent of the sample households reported that the quality of assets created was very good. About 34 percent of the sample households in Kottayam district were of the opinion that the quality of assets created was found to be good and a minimum of 5 percent of the beneficiary sample households in Palakkad district observed that the assets crated under NREGA was found to be good.

It could be understood from Table 4.2 that no beneficiary sample households got unemployment allowance for not getting work under NREGA after registration. It doesn't mean that all the registered households were given employment immediately. But the fact was that they were employed elsewhere and not sitting idle awaiting the NREGA work. Hence, neither unemployment allowance was claimed nor paid by the authorities.

4.3 Impact of NREGA on Migration:

It is usual that workers will move form their native village to other places in search of employment. One of the objectives of NREGA is to retain the labourers in their villages by providing them 100 days of employment. It is quite interesting to note that there was virtually no migration incident in the sample district in Kerala which shows that all the sample households got sufficient employment opportunity in their native areas.

Table 4.3: The Migration incidents recorded during the Reference period – Jan-Dec 2009

Characteristics		Thiruvananthapuram	Kottayam	Palakkad	Wayanad	Kasaragod	Kerala
No. of members migrated from the village because of not getting work under NREGA even after registration (per household)		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
No. of out-migrated members returned back to village because of getting work in NREGA (per household)		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
In the case some members returned back to the village to work under NREGA where were they earlier working (% of returned members)	Nearby village	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Nearby town	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Same district	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Same state	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Other state	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Other country	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
In the case some members returned back to the village to work under NREGA which activity earlier working in (% of returned members)	Const/manufacturing /mining	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Trading/services and transport	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Private work/self business	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Other government work	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Agriculture labour	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Any other	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Year in which shifted (% of shifted hh)	Shifted last year	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Shifted before last year	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Is your family better off now compared to previous occupation (% of shifted hh)		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

4.4 – Wage differential in different activities among beneficiaries and non – beneficiaries

This is to highlight the difference that existed in the wage rates across wag, activities and across gender groups in both beneficiary and non-beneficiary sample households. The details are presented in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Wage differentials among different activities

Occupation		Beneficiaries		Non Beneficiaries		Aggregate	
		Average	CV	Average	CV	Average	CV
Wage rate in agricultural casual labours (Rs)	Male	225.35	20.83	252.78	17.44	227.98	20.69
	Female	193.72	23.79	226.25	32.04	196.74	24.84
Wage rate in non agri casual labour (Rs)	Male	277.65	15.99	285.00	11.10	278.62	15.38
	Female	239.43	23.62	250.00	6.73	239.72	23.26
Wage rate in public programmes (Rs)	Male	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Female	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wage rate earned by migrant workers (Rs)	Male	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Female	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wage rate under NREGA (Rs)	Male	125.00	0.00	NA	NA	125.00	0.00
	Female	125.00	0.00	NA	NA	125.00	0.00
Any other work (Rs)	Male	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Female	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

It is observed from table 4.4 that the average wage rate of all other activities was much higher than the wage rate under NREGA which stood at Rs.125 for both male and female. The average wage rate at aggregate level in non-agricultural labour was found to be high at Rs.278 for male and Rs.240 for female. The average rate at aggregate level in agricultural labour was Rs.228 for men and Rs.197 for a woman which was higher than the wage rate under NREGA. The CV indicates that the variation in the average wage rate at aggregate level across activities across gender was moderate, revolving around 15 to 25 percent. The variation in the average wage rate in agriculture labour for male was higher in case of beneficiary as the CV worked out to nearly 21 percent whereas the same for non-beneficiary was about 17 percent. With regard to average wage rate in non agricultural casual labour for beneficiary the variation was found to be minimum as the CV worked out to 6.7 percent for the non beneficiaries whereas it was little high at about 24 percent in case of beneficiary. Thus it is observed from the data that wage rate under NREGA was lower compared to wage rate in other activities.

Summary:

Work profile, wage structure and migration issues are discussed in this part.

The number of members per household employed during the reference period at aggregate level was 1.07 in respect of Kerala. It was found from the study that in every sample household there was minimum one women member worked under NREGA during the reference period which shows the fact that women participation in NREGA so as to supplement their family income.

The number of days per household employed during the reference period was about 63 at aggregate level in respect of Kerala and it was around 70 for SC and 77 for ST communities in Kerala.

The wage rate was uniform at Rs.125 for both men and women and across different social groups.

Rural connectivity work was found to be the major work under NREGA in Kerala which consumed major chunk of 88.5 percent of the labourers.

Majority of the sample households reported that quality of assets created was very good. No beneficiary households got unemployment allowance. Migration incidence was found to be nil in the sample districts.

CHAPTER V

THE FUNCTIONING OF NREGA – CERTAIN QUALITATIVE ASPECTS

The NREGA besides providing minimum 100 days employment to the households also aims at bringing out some useful qualitative aspects of life. This chapter highlights the qualitative aspects such as assets holding, status of borrowing financial position of households and the related aspects.

5.1 Household Assets Holding

The assets holding details of the beneficiary and non-beneficiary sample respondents are shown in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1: Assets Holdings

(Rs. per household)

Nature of Asset	Beneficiaries	Non Beneficiaries	Aggregate
Land	4,16,815.64 (45.09)	6,75,531.9 (42.89)	4,70,679.5 (43.74)
House Property	3,12,358.6 (33.79)	5,50,000 (34.92)	3,60,877.1 (33.54)
Live Stock	3,262.53 (0.35)	4,062.5 (0.26)	3,342.52 (0.31)
Agricultural Implements	51,000 (5.52)	30,000 (1.90)	44,000 (4.09)
Consumer assets	29,827.97 (3.22)	89,615.38 (5.69)	44,679.62 (4.15)
Business assets	11,000.8 (1.19)	72,500 (4.60)	33,334.22 (3.09)
Ornaments	61,290 (6.63)	1,18,000 (7.49)	82,993.83 (7.71)
Utensils	-	-	-
Others	38,750 (4.19)	35,200 (2.23)	36,214.29 (3.36)
Total	9,24,305.5 (100)	15,74,910 (100)	10,76,061 (100)

It is evident from the table that on an average the value of assets possessed by sample households at aggregate level was Rs.10.76 lakhs. The total value of assets owned by a beneficiary sample household accounted for nearly Rs.9.24 lakhs whereas it was Rs.15.75 lakhs for non-beneficiary household. It shows that the economic condition of non-beneficiary sample households was better than the beneficiary sample households. The land owned by a beneficiary household was valued at Rs.4.17 lakhs, whereas it was Rs.6.75 lakhs for non-beneficiary household. At aggregate level

per household value of house property possessed by the non-beneficiary household was much higher than that of the beneficiary household. The house property value was Rs.5.50 lakhs whereas it was Rs.3.12 lakhs per beneficiary household. It could be seen from Table 5.1 that consumer assets found an important place in the total assets of the sample respondents. The value of consumer assets of a non-beneficiary household was Rs.89 thousand which was 3 times higher than the same possessed by the beneficiary sample households. Ornaments were the next important assets owned by the sample respondents. The value of ornaments owned by a beneficiary sample households was Rs.61,290 whereas the same possessed by a non-beneficiary household was almost double that of beneficiary household. The average value of agricultural implements worked out to Rs.51,000 and Rs.30,000 for beneficiary and non-beneficiary household respectively and at aggregate level it was Rs.44,000.

5.2 Household status on borrowing and their financial vulnerability

Borrowing by the sample households is presented in Table 5.2

**Table 5.2: Borrowings by sample households
(Rs. per household)**

Occupation		Beneficiaries	Non Beneficiaries	Aggregate
Source of Loan	Institutional loan (banks)	96,170.89 (28.18)	92,857.14 (100)	95,901.2 (35.03)
	Traders-cum-Money Lenders	26,333.33 (7.72)	0.00	16,800 (6.14)
	Commission Agent	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Landlord/Employer	70,000 (20.51)	0.00	42,000 (15.34)
	Friends/Relatives	1,48,750 (43.59)	0.00	1,19,000 (43.48)
	Others	0.00	0.00	0.00
Purpose of Loan	Daily Consumption	99,166.67 (5.44)	0.00	96,842.11 (15.38)
	Social Ceremony	59,769.92 (3.28)	0.00	56,790.42 (9.02)
	Purchase of land, livestock or other assets	80,909.09 (4.44)	85,000 (27.42)	82,187.5 (13.06)
	Consumer durables	78,461.54 (4.30)	0.00	64,500.53 (10.25)
	Construction of house	1,29,166.7 (7.08)	2,00,000 (64.52)	1,41,666.7 (22.50)
	Health treatment	62,500 (3.43)	25,000 (8.06)	56,250 (8.93)
	Others	1,50,000 (8.23)	0.00	1,31,250 (20.85)
Rate of Interest (Percent per annum)		10.53%	10.00%	10.59%

The table 5.2 shows that beneficiary sample households borrowed from different sources, whereas the non-beneficiary sample respondents borrowed only from banks. At aggregate level as evident from the table a sample respondent borrowed an amount of Rs.96 thousand from bank. The loan borrowed by the sample beneficiary household on an average worked out to Rs.96 thousand and the same for non-beneficiary sample household it was Rs.93 thousand. The beneficiary sample households borrowed from unorganised sources such as traders cum money lenders, Land lord/Employer and Friends and relatives. Of the different sources the average loan amount taken from friends and relatives by the sample beneficiary respondents stood high at 44 percent. The money borrowed from landlord/employer and Trade cum money lenders worked out to 21 and 7 per cent respectively. The analysis shows that the financial position of non-beneficiary sample households was good when compared to beneficiary sample households.

It is also observed from Table 5.2 that the beneficiary sample households borrowed money for daily consumption, social ceremony, purchase of land, livestock or other assets, consumer durables, construction of house, health treatment and some other purposes. The average amount borrowed for other purposes by beneficiary sample households stood high at Rs.15,000. The money borrowed for construction of house by the beneficiary sample household accounted for 7 per cent and for non-beneficiary household it was 65 per cent. The average loan amount taken by the beneficiary sample household for daily consumption purpose was 5 percent and for social ceremony it was 3 percent. The data shows that the non-beneficiary did not borrow for these two purposes. The average amount of loan borrowed by the beneficiary and non-beneficiary sample households for purchase of land, livestock and other assets worked out to 4 and 27 per cent respectively. Both beneficiary and non-beneficiary sample households borrowed money for health treatment and the average amount was 3 per cent and 8 per cent respectively.

The rate of interest for the loan was Rs.10.59 percent at aggregate level. The rate of interests for non-beneficiary sample household worked out to 10.00 percent which was bit lower than the 10.53 percent of beneficiary sample households.

**Table 5.3: Household strength on borrowing and other household assets
(% of households)**

Occupation	Beneficiaries	Non Beneficiaries	Aggregate
Doing wage work to those whom they are indebted	17.5	0.00	14
Availability of Co-operative credit society in village	90	76	87.2
Family member being member of such society	64	48	60.8
Availability of informal credit society/SHG in village	85.5	62	80.8
Family member being member of such society	68	48	64
Having account in a bank/post office/other institution	95	70	90
Having any stocks/bond/shares/other similar assets	3.5	12	5.2
Having life insurance policy	57.5	68	59.6

Some questions were asked to ascertain the household strength on borrowing and other household assets of the beneficiary and non-beneficiary sample households which are given in Table 5.3.

It could be seen from the table that 17.5 percent of beneficiary sample households were doing wage work to those whom they were indebted whereas none of the non-beneficiary was found in this category. Among the beneficiary sample households 90 percent reported that cooperative credit society was available in their villages and in non-beneficiary sample households 76 percent reported the same. The table shows that 64 percent of the beneficiary and 48 percent of the non-beneficiary sample households were members of such society. It may be seen from Table 5.3 that 85.5 percent beneficiary and 62 percent non-beneficiary sample households reported that informal credit society and SHG were available in their villages and in which 68 percent of the beneficiary and 48 percent of the non-beneficiary sample households were members. The data show that 95 percent of the beneficiary sample households had accounts in bank, post office and other institution and in case of non-beneficiary it was 70 percent. The stocks, bonds, shares and other assets possessed by the non-beneficiary sample households accounted for 12 percent whereas only 3.5 percent of the beneficiary sample households possessed these assets. It is evident from the table that 68 percent of non-beneficiary sample households had life insurance policy whereas in case of beneficiary sample households 57.5 percent had insurance policy.

Thus the analysis reveals the development in financial inclusion from the point of view of NREGA programme in Kerala.

5.3 Some Qualitative aspects of NREGA

Apart from quantitative aspects there were a number of qualitative aspects involved in the NREGA. Qualitative aspects such as issuance of job cards, work application, payment of wages, worksite facilities, monitoring of work are examined here.

5.3.1 Issuance of Job cards and works Application

It is understood from Table 5.4.1 that all the sample respondents reported that no fee or bribe was given to obtain the job card and work application which is considered to be a welcoming feature in the execution of programme. About 9 percent of the sample households reported that entries were not made in their job cards even though they had worked under NREGA. Irregularities like incomplete or missing entries and record of fake information were reported by about 12 per cent. Over written entries and blank or partly blank signature columns were reported by nearly 15 percent.

It could be seen from Table 5.4.1 that 77 percent of the job card holders kept their cards with them and 21 percent of the sample households answered that they kept the job card with the Sarpanch. A meagre one percent each of the sample respondents kept the card with the contractor and the gram rojar sevak respectively.

About 75 percent of the sample beneficiaries were reported to have employed in response to an application for work and got a dated receipt for their application. Of the total sample households 66 percent reported that they got work within 15 days of application and the remaining 34 percent replied in the negative. As discussed earlier no sample respondents got unemployment allowance. The answer to all the questions are in the affirmative is an encouraging aspect of the performance of NREGA.

5.3.2 Payment of Wages and related issues

With regard to wage rates all the sample households reported that there was equal wage for both men and women. About 99 percent of the sample beneficiaries answered that wages were paid on daily-wage basis. A majority of 86 percent of the sample households reported that the work was measured by individual's work. Team measurement and collective measurement of work were reported by 13 percent and 1 percent respectively.

**Table 5.4.1: Qualitative questions related to functioning of NREGA
(Percentage of hh)**

	Description	Yes	No	Not sure
Job card issuance	Paid any fees/ charges or bribe to get an job card	0.00	100.00	0.00
	The amount paid for job card (Exorbitant)	0.00	0.00	0.00
	The amount paid as bribe (exorbitant)	0.00	0.00	0.00
Irregularity in the job card	No entries were made, even though the job card holder(s) had worked on NREGA	8.5	85.5	6
	Some entries were incomplete or missing or fake information was entered	11.5	85.5	3
	Some entries had been over-written	7	91.5	1.5
	The signature column was blank or partly blank	14.5	84	1.5
Where was the card generally kept	With the card holders	77	0.00	0.00
	With Sarpanch or Sachiv	21	0.00	0.00
	With contractor	1	0.00	0.00
	With the gram rojgar sevak	1	0.00	0.00
	Elsewhere	0.00	0.00	0.00
Work application	Are you employed in response to an application for work	74.5	25.5	0.00
	If applied, did you get a dated receipt for the application	74	26	0.00
	If applied, did you get work within 15 days of application	66	34	0.00
	In case of failure to provide work within 15 days, is unemployment allowance paid	0.00	100.00	0.00
Payment of Wages	Are the wage rates same for men and women	100.00	0.00	0.00
	Wage rates higher for men	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Wage rates higher for Women	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Wage paid on "daily-wage" basis	98.5	0.00	0.00
	Wage paid on "piece-rate/task-wage" basis	1.5	0.00	0.00
Measurement of work	Work was measured by individual's work	86	0.00	0.00
	Work was measured by team measurement	13	0.00	0.00
	Work was measured by collective measurement	1	0.00	0.00
Period of wage payment	Wages were paid within a fortnight	65	0.00	0.00
	Wages were paid within a month	32.5	0.00	0.00
	Wages were paid more than a month	2.5	0.00	0.00
	Wages were paid after one year	0.00	0.00	0.00
Who made the wage payment	Sarpanch or Sachiv	2	0.00	0.00
	Post office	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Bank	98	0.00	0.00
	Representative of line department	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Other government official or any other	0.00	0.00	0.00
In case wage payment made in the bank	Bank account was on Self's name	100	0.00	0.00
	Spouse's name	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Parent's name	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Children's name	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Individual account	99.5	0.00	0.00
	Joint account	0.5	0.00	0.00
	Did bank follow usual procedure of banking	98.5	1.5	0.00

Contd...

**Table 5.4.1: Qualitative questions related to functioning of NREGA
(Percentage of hh)**

	Description	Yes	No	Not sure
In case wages were not paid through bank	Wages paid in front of all labourers	8	92	0
	Wages paid on the work site	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Wages paid in Panchayat Bhawan	4.5	0.00	0.00
	Wages paid on other public/private place	95.5	0.00	0.00
	Wages paid on some one's private residence	0.00	0.00	0.00
Complaints regarding wage payment	There were delays in wage payments	16.5	66	17.5
	Wage paid less than the minimum wage	58.5	31	10.5
	Wage paid less than asked for sign/thumb impression	6.5	64.5	29
	Task was too much compared o the wages paid	9	50.5	40.5
	Faced problems in accessing post office/bank accounts	30	60	10
	On what basis wages were calculated not clear	7.5	60	32.5
	Others	0.00	0.00	0.00
Details of worksite facilities	A Board/GP member gave details of the sanctioned amount, work dimensions and other requisite details	10	60	30
	The worksite had drinking water facility	64	7	29
	Worksite had shade for periods of rest	100.00	0.00	0.00
	Worksite had child care facility	100.00	0.00	0.00
	Worksite had first aid kit/medicines	100.00	0.00	0.00
Monitoring	Was there any authority to monitor the functioning of the NREGA administration	90.5	9.5	0.00
	Any complaint lodged relating to worksite etc., to the Gram Panchayat, Programme Officer or other officials	0.00	71.5	28.5
	If yes, was any action taken on your complaint	0.00	0.00	0.00
Economic usefulness of the work	Work is very useful to the villagers	98.5	1.5	0.00
	Work is quite useful to the villagers	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Work is not particularly useful to villagers	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Work is useless for the villagers	0.00	0.00	0.00
Nature of assets and their durability in which the interviewee involved	The structure created may last up to one year	94.5	0.00	0.00
	The structure created may last up to five year	5.5	0.00	0.00
	The structure created may last up to ten year	0.00	0.00	0.00
	The structure created may last more than ten year	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Is it worth creating the structure	92	2.5	5.5
	Was the structure created adequate	91	0.00	0.00
	No, structure needed more attention to be able to last long	9	0.00	0.00

Contd...

**Table 5.4.1: Qualitative questions related to functioning of NREGA
(Percentage of hh)**

	Description	Yes	No	Not sure
How has NREGA has affected labour migration	Did any your family members of the family migrated	NA	NA	NA
	If yes, only one member of the family migrated	NA	NA	NA
	More than on e member of the family migrated	NA	NA	NA
	Are wages higher in city or other states than NREGA	NA	NA	NA
	Any family members migrated back to village to work under NREGA	NA	NA	NA
	If yes, only one member of the family migrated back	NA	NA	NA
	More than on e member of the family migrated back	NA	NA	NA
	Any family members migrated back to village to work under NREGA	NA	NA	NA
	If yes, only one member of the family migrated	NA	NA	NA
	More than on e member of the family migrated	NA	NA	NA
Respondents' awareness about NREGA Implementation	Are respondent aware about NREGA implementation	90	6.5	3.5
	Right to apply for work and get employed within 15 days	73	13	14
	The work application procedure	74	6.5	14.5
	Right to minimum wages	87	7.5	5.5
	The level of minimum wages	0.00	0.00	0.00
	The wage calculation method	78	5.5	16.5
	Right to the unemployment allowance	63	4	33
	Minimum worksite facilities(drinking water, first aid)	69.5	5	25.5
	Mandatory availability of muster rolls at the worksite	92	1.5	6.5
The list of permissible works under the NREGA	73	6	21	
Potential benefits of NREGA	NREGA enhanced food security	42.5	21	36.5
	NREGA provided protection against extreme poverty	48	26	26
	NREGA helped to reduce distress migration	18	34.5	47.5
	NREGA helped to reduce indebtedness	7.5	22	70.5
	NREGA gave greater economic independence to women	44	21	35
	NREGA generated purchasing power at local economy	35.5	32.5	32
Questions related to food security	Did you family get full two meals throughout year 2009	94.5	5.5	0.00
	Family did not get sufficient food for one month	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Family did not get sufficient food for two month	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Family did not get sufficient food for above two month	0.00	0.00	0.00
	How did you cope with the situation – take loan	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Catch fish/rat/crab etc.	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Near/ sometimes starvation/ take meal only once	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Begging	0.00	0.00	0.00
Any other	0.00	0.00	0.00	

According to 65 percent of the sample households, wages were paid within a fortnight and about 32 percent reported that wages were paid within a month. A very small percent (3) of the sample households replied that wages were paid more than a month after the work.

It is interesting to note that barring 2 percent of the sample respondents all the sample households got the wages through bank which may be considered as a special feature of the programme in Kerala. It could be seen from Table 5.4.1 that the Sarpanch made the wage payment to 2 percent of the sample beneficiaries.

Another important point to be noted is that 99.5 percent of the wage payments were made in the individual's account in the bank and a meagre 0.5 percent was made in joint account. Around 99 percent of the sample households reported that the banks followed usual procedure of banking.

As could be seen from Table 5.4.1 that nearly 96 percent of the sample households reported that wages were paid on other public/private places and about 4 percent answered that wages were paid in Panchayat Bhawan.

There were complaints on payment of wages. About 58 percent of the sample households reported that they were paid wages less than the rate prescribed for the work under NREGA. Similarly delays in the payment of wages were reported by 16 percent of the sample households. According to the opinion of 9 percent of the sample households their task was too much compared to the wages paid. Table 5.4.1 shows that 30 percent of the sample households faced problems in accessing post office/bank accounts.

5.3.3 Worksite facilities and economic usefulness of the work

The implementing agency was expected to provide worksite facilities to the workers so as to achieve the objectives. As seen from Table 5.4.1 that 60 percent of the sample households reported that details regarding the sanctioned amount, work dimensions and other requisite details were not given by a board or GP member and only 10 percent had positive answer. The remaining 30 percent were not sure of it. A majority of 64 percent reported that the work site had drinking water facility and only 7 sample households replied in the negative. It is worth mentioning that all the sample households invariably reported that their worksite had shade for taking rest, child care facility and had first-aid kit / medicines.

5.3.4 Monitoring of work

It is observed from Table 5.4.1 that there were authorities to monitor the work under NREGA. Nearly 90 percent of the sample households reported that there were authorities to monitor the functioning of the NREGA administration and only about

10 percent replied in the negative. With regard to lodging of complaint with the authorities on matters relating to work site etc nearly 72 percent replied in the negative and about 28 percent were not sure of it.

5.3.5 Nature of assets created and their durability

The qualitative aspects of the NREGA include creation of assets. It is observed from Table 5.4.1 that nearly 95 percent of the sample households opined that the assets created may last upto one year and about 5 percent held the view that it may last upto 5 years. Thus it is inferred from the analysis that the durability of the assets was not good. It is to be noted here that no sample households expected that the assets created may last upto 10 years or more than 10 year. A majority of 92 percent of the sample households held the view that it was worth creating the structure and a satisfactory level of 91 percent opined that the structure created was adequate.

5.3.6 Labour migration and NREGA

As discussed in the previous chapter the data reveals that NREGA did not affect migration of labour. All the sample households reported that there was no labour migration due to NREGA work.

5.3.7 Respondents' awareness about NREGA implementation

The awareness of the stake holders of the programme is an important thing for the success of any programme. Out of the total sample households 90 percent reported that they were aware of NREGA implementation. The awareness of right to apply for work and get employed within 15 days, awareness of the work application procedure, right to minimum wages were reported by 73 percent 74 percent and 87 percent respectively. It is evident from Table 5.4.1 that nobody was aware of the level of minimum wages. The awareness of wage calculation method was reported by 78 percent and right to unemployment allowance by 63 percent. A majority of 92 percent of the sample households were aware of the mandatory availability of muster rolls at worksite. Over 70 percent of the sample beneficiaries were aware of the list of permissible works under NREGA.

5.3.8 Potential benefits of NREGA

The NREGA intends to create potential benefits to the rural masses. It is observed from Table 5.4.1 that about 42 percent of the sample households were of the opinion that NREGA enhanced food security whereas 21 percent had negative opinion. About 37 percent were not sure that whether NREGA enhanced food security. It is understood from the data that 48 percent of the respondents held the view that NREGA provided protection against extreme poverty and 26 percent gave a negative reply. Only 18 percent of the sample respondents opined that NREGA helped to reduce distress migration and the opinion of about 35 percent was negative. About 47 percent were not sure of it. A very small percentage of 7.5 sample respondents reported that NREGA helped to reduce indebtedness. Contrary to this nearly 70 percent reported that NREGA did not help to reduce indebtedness. The opinion of 44 percent of the sample beneficiaries was that NREGA gave greater economic independence to women. About 35 percent of the sample households reported that NREGA generated purchasing power at local economy.

5.3.9 NREGA and food security

The main purpose of the NREGA was to enhance food security. A vast majority of 95 percent of the sample respondents reported that their families got full two meals throughout the year 2009. None of the sample households reported that families did not get sufficient food for one month, two months or more than two months. Hence, it is inferred that the sample households were satisfied with the programme and did not take loan or catch fish, crab or begging as such situation did not arise.

5.4 Quantitative questions related to NREGA functioning

Some quantitative questions pertaining to the functioning of NREGA is presented in Table 5.4.2

**Table 5.4.2: Quantitative Questions related to NREGA Functioning
(Percentage of hh)**

Q.1	If you paid some amount to get job card: how much for job card and how much bribe (Out of those who paid)		
Answer	No fees/bribe paid for job card – 100%		
Q.2	If the job card is not kept with you, what is the reason for that?	Details	
		With Sarpanch or Sachiv	21
		With Contractor	1
Q.3	If there is any authority who monitors the functioning of NREGA then describe the details?	With the gram rojar sevak	1
		Gram Panchayat	40
		BCO	30
Q.4	Program Officer	30	
Q.4	If you lodged any complaints give details		
Answer	No complaints of any type was lodged – 100%		
Q.5	Provide description of the work and its starting date?		
Answer	About 75% of work started during the year 2009 and the rest was started in the previous year 2008		
Q.6	Provide details of family member migrated to city after the implementation of NREGA and why?		
Q.7	Provide detail of family member migrated back to village to work in NREGA and why?		
Q.8	Provide detail of family member migrated to city with dissatisfaction of NREGA and Why?		
Answer	No member of the family migrated – 100%		

It is observed from the table that no sample respondents paid any fee or bribe for obtaining the job card. Out of the total sample households 23 percent did not keep the job card with them and which was kept with the sarpanch (21%) contractor (1%) and gram rojar sevak (1%). These card holders reported that they kept the card with the above said persons for fear of loss. The activities under NREGA were monitored by Gram Panchayat, BDO and Programme officer.

All the sample households reported that they did not lodge any complaint with the authorities. With regard to the NREGA activities the sample respondents reported that 75 percent of the works were started during 2009 and the remaining in 2008.

As already mentioned no migration incident took place due to NREGA work. It is observed from Table 5.4.2 that no member of the sample household's family migrated.

5.5 Potential Benefits of NREGA

There were potential benefits involved in the NREGA. As could be seen from Table 5.4.3 that according to 95 percent of the sample households the NREGA enhanced food security and only 5 percent replied in the negative.

**Table 5.4.3: Details on the Potential Benefits of NREGA
(Percentage of hh)**

Q.1	NREGA enhanced food security
Answer	Yes – 95% , No – 5%
Q.2	NREGA provided protection against extreme poverty
Answer	Yes - 48% , No – 26 % , Not sure – 26%
Q.3	NREGA helped to reduce distress migration
Answer	Yes – 18%, No – 34.5%, Not sure – 47.5%
Q.4	NREGA helped to reduce indebtedness
Answer	Yes – 7.5% , No – 22% , Not sure – 70.5%
Q.5	NREGA gave greater economic independence to women
Answer	Yes – 44% , No – 21% , Not sure – 35%

One of the goals of NREGA was to provide protection against extreme poverty which according to 48 percent of the sample households was in the affirmative. Opposite view was held by 26 percent and another 26 percent were not sure of it.

It is understood from Table 5.4.3 that 18 percent of the sample households reported that NREGA helped to reduce distress migration and about 35 percent opined that it did not reduce distress migration and nearly 48 percent were not sure of it. Only about 8 percent of the sample households reported that NREGA helped to reduce indebtedness whereas 22 percent replied in the negative. It may be seen from Table 5.4.3 that 44 percent of the sample respondents were of the opinion that NREGA gave greater economic independence to women whereas 21 percent did not accept this view and the remaining 35 percent were not sure of it.

5.6 Quantitative Questions Related to food security

There are certain questions related to food security which are presented in Table 5.4.4.

Table 5.4.4: Quantitative Questions Related to Food Security (Percentage of hh)

Q.1	Do you feel that you family does not have sufficient food for the whole of year		
Answer	Only 5% of family does not have sufficient food for the whole of year because of lack of work.		
Q.2	Have you faced any deprivation other than food insufficiency explains? if yes, explain		
Answer	Nil.		
Q.3	What were the main difficulties you and your family faced during the last year?		
Answer	30% of families suffered from insufficient income to meet the expenditure.		
Q.4	What is the most important thing your house hold lacks	Details	Percent
		Own house	20
		Medical-Health facility	20
Q.5	What is the suggestion for amelioration	No response	60
		Creation of new employment opportunities	25
		Enhancement of Wage rate	63
Q.6	Any suggestions to improve NREGA functioning	Transportation facilities	12
		Increase work	20
		Increase wages	70
		Suitable timings for NREGA work	6.5
		New types of works should be added	3.5

The data shows that only 5 percent of the sample household's family didn't have sufficient food for the whole year because they didn't get sufficient work. Further it is observed from Table 5.4.4 that the sample households didn't face any other deprivation than food insufficiency.

The analysis reveals that 30 percent of the families of the sample households suffered from insufficient income to meet the expenditure. It is understood from Table 5.4.4 that 30 percent of the sample households didn't have owned house and 20 percent lacked medical facility. Creation of new employment opportunities, enhancement of wage rate and transportation facilities were some of the suggestions put forth by 25 percent, 63 percent and 12 percent of the sample households respectively.

Suggestions were sought from the workers for the better functioning of the NREGA. Increase the work was the suggestion given by 20 percent of the sample

households whereas 70 percent suggested for increasing the wages. Suitable timing for NREGA work was suggested by 6.5 percent and 3.5 percent of the sample respondents suggested that new type of works should be added.

Summary:

Qualitative aspects are analysed in this section. As regards assets holding the sample households at aggregate level possessed assets worth Rs.10.76 lakhs

The beneficiary households borrowed from different sources due to their poor economic condition whereas the non beneficiary households borrowed only from banks. On an average the beneficiary sample households borrowed nearly Rs.96,000 and the non beneficiary borrowed nearly Rs.93000. The beneficiary sample households borrowed money for daily consumption, social ceremony, purchase of land, livestock, consumer durables, construction of house and health treatment.

Around 17 percent of the beneficiary sample households were doing wage work to those whom they were indebted. Cooperative credit societies were available in the sample villages and over 50 percent of the sample households were members of the society. Similarly SHG and informal credit societies were available in the sample villages.

As regards keeping accounts, 95 percent of the beneficiary households had accounts in bank, post offices and other financial institutions.

CHAPTER VI

NREGA IMPACT ON VILLAGE ECONOMY

The purpose of implementing NREGA was to provide basic livelihood facilities to the rural masses. The village economy would improve only when the livelihood position of the village people improves. In this chapter an analysis is made based on the primary data collected from the village authorities to assess the impact on village economy after the implementation of the NREGA.

6.1 Infrastructure available in the village

The infrastructure available within the village is presented in Table 6.1

Table 6.1 Infrastructure available within the village (Figures in %)

	Within village	Nearest village	If nearest village, Average distance (kms)
Road connectivity	100	0	0.0
Railway connectivity	50	50	9.2
Landline or mobile connectivity	100	0	0.0
Post Office	100	0	0.0
Co-operative credit society	100	0	0.0
Regional Rural Bank	80	20	6
Commercial Bank	70	30	4.5
Agricultural Produce Market	50	50	7
Self Help Group Centre	80	20	10
School Primary	100	0	0.0
School secondary	100	0	0.0
School Higher Secondary	90	10	2.5
Primary Health centre	80	20	3
Hospital/Dispensary	90	10	3
Gram Panchayat Office	90	10	6.5
Fair Price Shop	70	30	5.5
Any Other	0	0	0

It is evident from Table 6.1 that all the selected villages had road connectivity. In case of railway connectivity 50 percent of the selected villages had the facility and for the rest the facility was available in the nearest village at an average distance of about 9 km. All the villages were well connected with landline or mobile phone. Similarly all the villages had post office. It is evident from Table 6.1 that cooperative credit societies were functioning in all the selected villages. Regional rural banks

were available in 80 percent of the villages whereas in 20 percent of the villages the facility was available in the nearest village the average distance of which was 6 km. The table reveals that 70 percent of villages had commercial banks and 30 percent of the selected villages didn't have commercial banks which were available in the nearest village. Agricultural produce market was available in 50 percent of the selected villages. Self help group centers were available in 80 percent of the sample villages and for the remaining 20 percent of the villages the facility was available at a distance of 10 kms. in the nearest village.

It is significant to point out that all the villages had primary and secondary schools. It may be seen from Table 6.1 that higher secondary schools were available in 90 percent of the villages. Primary health centres were available in 80 percent of the villages and 20 percent of the villages had to go to the nearest village for availing this facility. Similarly 90 percent of the sample villages had hospital dispensaries. The table 6.1 shows that Gram Panchayat offices were located in 90 percent of the villages and 70 percent of the villages had fair price shop

6.2 Changes in occupational structure in the selected villages

There were some changes in the occupational structure which are shown in Table 6.2

Table 6.2 Occupational structure (% of households)

S.No.	Occupation	Reference period	
		2009	2001
1	Cultivators	21.22	27.25
2	Agricultural Labour	37.47	59.6
3	Household Small Industry	6.69	2.94
4	Other Manufacturing./mining	8.35	-
5	Construction	11.96	5.04
6	Trade, Commerce and Business	5.11	5.04
7	Transport and Communication	4.11	0.08
8	Other Services	5.09	0.08
9	Total	100.00	100.00

It is observed from the Table 6.2 that of the total households 27.25 percent were cultivators which decreased to 21.22 percent in 2009. As regards agricultural labour households, the number decreased from 59.6 percent in 2001 to 37.47 percent in 2009. There was sizeable increase in the household small industry from 2.94 percent in 2001 to 6.69 percent in 2009. Sample households in the construction sector increased from 5.04 percent in 2001 to 11.96 percent in 2009. With regard to trade,

commerce and business there was a marginal increase. There was considerable increase in transport and communication from 0.08 percent to 4.11 percent and similar increase was witnessed in other services also. Thus construction sector provided large employment opportunities followed by other service activities.

6.3 Effect of NREGA on wage rates in the selected villages

An attempt is made here to find out whether any change in the wage rate had taken place due to the implementation of the NREGA. The wage rates for different activities are given in Table 6.3

Table 6.3 Wage rates for different activities (average of all villages) – Rs.

Activity		Reference period (2009)		Before NREGA (2005)	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
Prevailing Agricultural Wages		268.5 (39.48)	203.5 (51.87)	192.5	134
Prevailing Non Agricultural Wages		330.56 (39.18)	215.625 (38)	237.5	156.25
Construction		358.33 (39.84)	253.125 (68.75)	256.25	150
Mining		325 (62.5)	325 (116.67)	200	150
Other skilled work	Electrician	355.83 (49.82)	212.5	237.5	-
	Plumber	350 (47.37)	175	237.5	-
	Pump-set boring	316.67 (5.56)	200	300	-

Note: Figures in bracket indicate percentage change during 2005-2009

Table 6.3 shows huge disparities in the wage rate across male and female and prior to the implementation of NREGA and after the implementation of NREGA. The average wage rate for agricultural operations for male was Rs.192 against a lower wage of Rs.134 for female prior to the introduction of NREGA which substantially increased to Rs.268 and Rs. 203 for male and female respectively during the reference period 2009. In percentage term the increase was of the order of 39 and 52 for male and female respectively. Similarly there was a considerable increase in the non-agricultural wages after the implementation of NREGA. It could be seen from Table 6.3 that the non-agricultural wage for men and women increased by 39 percent and 38 percent respectively during the reference period compared to 2005 i.e before the NREGA. As regards construction work the wage rate for male and female workers

increased by over 39 percent and 68 percent respectively after the introduction of NREGA. It is observed from Table 6.3 that there was noticeable increase in the wage rate for mining work during the reference year 2009. When compared to 2005 i.e before NREGA, the wage rate increase was as high as 62 percent and 116 percent for male and female workers respectively during the reference year 2009. As evident from Table 6.3 there was substantial increase in the wage rate for skilled works like electrical, plumbing and pump-set boring after the introduction of NREGA. It is important to note here that no women workers were found in these activities. Another welcoming feature is that there was steep increase in the wage rate incase of female workers when compared to male during the reference period 2009.

6.4 Impact of NREGA on charges for agricultural operations:

The changes in wage rate for agricultural operations due to the implementation of NREGA are presented in Table 6.

It could be observed from Table 6.4 that there was a marked increase in the wage rate of all the agricultural activities due to the implementation of NREGA. There was over 113 percent increase in the wage rate for ploughing during the reference period compared to 2001 and 60 percent increase compared to 2005 i.e., before NREGA. In case of weeding the wage rate increased over 73 percent during the reference period 2009 compared to 2005 and 180 percent compared to 2001. A comparison of wage rate between 2001 and 2005 shows that the percentage increase during the reference period 2009 was very high for activities such as ploughing, levelling, weeding, transplanting and harvesting of paddy. The table reveals the fact that charges for agricultural operations increased even before the introduction of NREGA but the point to be noted is the increase was substantially very high after the implementation of NREGA. Thus, the scheme made an impact on the charges for agricultural operations.

**Table 6.4 Prevailing labour charges for agricultural operations
(Average of all villages) (Rs/day)**

Activity	Reference period 2009 (Percentage change during (2001-2009) and (2005-2009))	Before NREGA	
		2005 (Percentage change during 2001-2005)	2001
Ploughing	320 (113.33)(60.00)	200 (33.33)	150
Leveling	340 (94.29)(51.11)	225 (28.57)	175
Weeding	220 (180.86)(73.68)	126.67 (61.71)	78.33
Paddy transplanting	221.43 (128.28)(57.04)	141 (45.36)	97
Harvesting of wheat	-	-	-
Harvesting of paddy	257.14 (125.23)(53.52)	167.5 (46.71)	114.17
Harvesting of grams	-	-	-
Harvesting of pigeon pea	-	-	-
Harvesting of ragi	-	-	-
Harvesting of jowar	-	-	-
Harvesting of maize	-	-	-
Cane-cutting	-	-	-
Harvesting other crops	200 (166.67)(60.00)	125 (66.66)	75
	-	-	-
Digging of potatoes	-	-	-
Threshing of paddy	200 (100.00)(33.33)	150 (50.00)	100
Threshing of wheat	250 (100.00)(25.00)	200 (60.00)	125
Winnowing of wheat/paddy	300 (100.00)(50.00)	200 (33.33)	150

Note: Figures in the brackets indicate percentage change during the mentioned period

6.5 The changes in the village economy after the implementation of NREGA

It was expected that the implementation of NREGA would bring about changes in village economy by way of eradicating starvation due to unemployment, creating assets, infrastructure development, wage increase and the like. Therefore, qualitative questions were put forth to the respondents to study the changes in the village economy which are presented in Table 6.5.1

**Table 6.5.1 Qualitative questions on changes in the villages during last one year
(% of hh)**

Description	Yes	No	Not sure
Was there shortage of agricultural wage labour at some point during last year	35	65	0.0
After implementation of NREGA has there been a shortage of agriculture labour	70	30	0.0
After implementation of NREGA the cost of production in agriculture increased by 10 percent because of scarcity of labour	10	5	0.0
Cost increased by 20 percent		0.0	0.0
Cost increased by 20 to 50 percent	50	0.0	0.0
Cost increased by 50 to 75 percent	35	0.0	0.0
Cost increased by 100 percent	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cost increased by more than 100 percent	0.0	0.0	0.0
After implementation of NREGA labour who migrated earlier to town/city are coming back to work in the village	30	0.0	0.0
More labour is migrating from the village as wage rate in the town is higher than wage rate under NREGA or other activities in the village	55	0.0	0.0
Some labour has come back to work in NREGA but others are moving to the town/city because of wage differential	0.0	0.0	0.0
There is no change in labour migration by NREGA activities	15	0.0	0.0
After NREGA change in wages of casual labourers has increased	99.5	0.0	0.0
After NREGA change in wages of casual labourers has decreased	0.0	0.0	0.0
After NREGA change in wages of casual labourers remained same	0.5	0.0	0.0
The trend of people living in village and going to work outside daily has increased	80	20	0.0
The trend of people living in village and going to work outside for longer period has increased	5	95	0.0
Has living standard improved in you village since the introduction of NREGA	80	20	0.0
After NREGA have you witnessed increase in household consumption in village	93	7	0.0
After NREGA have you witnessed more children are now going to the school	40	60	0.0
After NREGA have you witnessed change in trend of attached labour in agriculture	75	25	0.0
After NREGA have villagers' awareness towards Government Schemes increased	90	10	0.0

Shortage of agricultural wage labour at some point during last year was reported by 35 percent of the respondent households whereas 70 percent reported that there was shortage of agricultural labour after the implementation of NREGA. This was considered as the negative aspect of NREGA. Again this scarcity of agricultural labour according to 10 percent of sample households led to increase in the cost of production of agriculture by 10 percent whereas 50 percent reported that cost increased by 20 to 50 percent and 35 percent of the respondent households reported that agricultural production cost increased by 50 to 75 percent. Another favorable impact of the NREGA according to 30 percent of the sample households was that labourers who once migrated to town/city went back to work in the village after the implementation of NREGA. Contrary to this, more labourers migrated from the village as wage rate in the town was higher than wage rate under NREGA or other activities in the village as reported by 55 percent of the respondent households. There

was no change in labour migration by NREGA activities as reported by 15 percent of the households. According to 99.5 percent of the respondent households wage of casual labourers increased after the introduction of NREGA and only 0.5 percent of the sample households reported that the wages of casual labourers remained the same. A majority of (80%) the sample households reported that the trend of people living in village and going to work outside daily increased but on the contrary going to work outside for longer period increased was reported by only 5 percent of the sample households. As observed from Table 6.5.1 that 80 percent of the respondent households replied that their living standard in the village improved since the introduction of NREGA. As reported by 93 percent of the sample households the household consumption in village increased after the implantation of NREGA. Less than 50 percent of the sample respondents reported that they witnessed more children went to school after NREGA and majority of the households (60%) replied in the negative. According to 75 percent of the sample households there was change in trend of attached labour in agriculture. It is significant to note that the villagers' awareness towards Government schemes increased as reported by vast majority of 90 percent of the respondent households.

Some quantitative questions about the functioning of NREGA are given in Table 6.5.2

1. The shortage of labour was experienced in almost all the months of the year except May and June.
2. The shortage of labour was felt in the months of May and June during the reference period.
3. The housing facilities increased as reported by 26.5 percent of the respondent households. According to 70 percent of the sample households food and non food consumption increased since the introduction of NREGA. Another factor showing the improvement in the standard of living was better access to health facilities as reported by 3.5 percent of the sample households.

Table 6.5.2 Quantitative questions about the functioning of NREGA

Q1.	Was there a shortage of agricultural wage labour at some point during last year/ If so in which months?
Ans.	Yes, - Jan., Feb., March, April, July, Aug., Sept., Oct., Nov., Dec.
Q2.	After implementation of NREGA has there been a shortage of agriculture labour? If yes in which years/months?
Ans.	Yes - 2009 May-June
Q3.	Give details of change in wages of casual labour during the last 5 years after NREGA
Ans.	Wages of casual labour increased in all the sample districts.
Q4.	In what way the standard of living improved in your village since the introduction of NREGA?
Ans.	Since the income of the workers increased they spent more on food and non-food items. Their housing and health facilities also improved. Since more women participated in the programme their family income increased.
Q5.	In what way the household consumption improved in your village since the introduction of NREGA
Ans.	Majority of the people got full two meals through out the year and their housing, health facilities and clothing improved.
Q6.	In what way NREGA had impacted the children education
Ans.	Education awareness was very high in Kerala even before the introduction of NREGA. NREGA enabled the workers to enroll their children in good schools as they were able to spend on education.
Q7.	In what way NREGA has impacted the trends of attached labour in agriculture
Ans.	About 75% of families witnessed change in trends of attached labour in agriculture
Q8.	In what way NREAG has improved villagers' awareness towards NREGA and other Government schemes
Ans.	TV, Radio, Newspaper, Panchayat raj institutions and Gram Sabha discussion among participants
Q9.	Your suggestions to improve the implementation of NREGA for the benefits of both labourers as well cultivators?
Ans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agricultural development work should be taken up. • NREGA work should begin in the lean season • Wage rate should be enhanced. • 100 days of employment limit should be increased. • Payment should be on time. • Proper supervisor and coordinators are essential for the successful implementation of the scheme.

Summary

The programme made some favourable impact on the village economy. The study reveals that all the selected villages had road connectivity and 50 percent of the villages had railway connectivity. All the villages were well connected with landline or mobile phone. Post offices, Cooperative credit societies were available in the villages. Primary and Secondary schools were available in all the villages and 90 percent of the villages had higher secondary schools. Primary health centres were available in 80 percent of the villages. Agriculture labour households decreased from 59.6 percent in 2001 to 37.47 percent in 2009. The study shows that cultivator households decreased from 27.25 percent in 2001 to 21.22 percent in 2009 and same trend reflected in the agricultural labour also. The percentage of households in construction side increased substantially from 5.04 percent in 2001 to 11.96 percent in 2011. There were visible changes in the wage rate for different activities between the period 2005 and 2009. There was over 39 percent increase each in the agriculture, non-agriculture and construction wages for male workers after the introduction of NREGA when compared to 2005 and for female the increase was still higher. A sea change took place in the wage rate for all agricultural operations.

Answers to qualitative questions reveal that the shortage of agriculture labour was more after the introduction of NREGA. The shortage of agricultural labour according to the opinion of sample respondents led to increase in the cost of production to the tune of 10 to 75 percent. Over 80 percent of the respondent households reported that the living standard in the village improved after the introduction of NREGA.

CHAPTER – VII

CONCLUDING REMARKS AND POLICY SUGGESTIONS

7.1 Introduction

In India, population explosion and the concomitant growth of rural workforce are the issues in the employment scenario of our country. It is a major challenge to India as it has to absorb the abundant people for better and productive means. High incidence of poverty and unemployment in rural India is a matter of great concern. The low rate of growth of agriculture sector also affects the rate of creation of employment opportunities in rural areas. Labour intensive technology is better for labour surplus countries like India with potential to boost employment opportunities as well as income of rural people. It is observed that majority of the poor in rural areas of the country largely depend on the wages earned through unskilled casual manual labour.

The market for agricultural labour is a function of economic, social and demographic variables rather than mere wage rate. In choice of technology, labour intensive technology is better for labour surplus countries like India with potential to boost employment opportunities as well as income of the rural people. Poverty and the prevalence of inequalities of income between rural and urban and between the rich and the rural poor are the serious issues in the country. In the rural areas, the economic activities are irregular with pronounced seasonal fluctuations leading to periodic entry and withdrawal from the labour force, especially on the part of marginal labourers, often women, who shift back and forth between what is reported as domestic work and gainful work.

The adverse effects of globalization are large enough to justify an immediate policy response, under the form of additional labour market regulation and more generous social security programmes, supplemented by sanctions for those countries that fail to comply. The immediate effect of globalization on the labour market is on salaried employment, wage earners and the poor. In the absence of adequate and timely availability of other types of employment in the rural area, agricultural labour is the major form of employment opportunity. In the rural areas, the pattern of employment has changed due to modern technology and non-farm employment.

The key to employment planning in India can, therefore, be seen to lie in raising the productivity of the agricultural sector. Prime Minister Manmohan Singh stated that there must be greater flexibility in labour markets without automatic endorsement of hire and fire; the growth and increasing the employment elasticity of growth is a concern and employment has to come from agro-processing, rural industries and informal sectors; India has a labour cost advantage but skills need improving; there must be social security and the draft Employment Guarantee Act is a beginning. His speech mentions that 67 per cent of the work force is illiterate or semi-literate and only 5 per cent workers in the 20-24 age-groups have job skills. There can be no quarrel with the proposition that literacy, training and skill up-gradation are needed. But it raises a policy question: who will do this vocational training?

With an objective to alleviate rural poverty and unemployment several employment generation programmes were introduced by the Government of India. Special mention may be made of several programmes in this regard, such as Rural works Programmes, Employment cum Production Scheme, Food for work Programme for the upliftment of the downtrodden and yet another pace setter in the structural frame work of planning was the minimum needs programme and the revised list of 20 point programme. These programmes lay particular stress on providing health care, housing and education and nutrition facilities to the poor, particularly to the scheduled castes and tribes.

The Employment Guarantee Act gives a legal guarantee of employment in rural areas to anyone who is willing to do casual manual labour at the statutory minimum wage. Any adult who applies for work under the Act is entitled to being employed on public works within 15 days. In the Act the National Advisory Council, guaranteed employment is subject to an initial limit of 100 days per household a year, which may be raised or removed over time. EGA would enable most poor households in rural India to cross the poverty line.

The EGA is an opportunity to create useful assets in rural areas. In particular, there is a massive potential for labour-intensive public works in the field of soil erosion, restoration of tanks, protection of forests, and related activities. Guaranteed employment is likely to change power equations in the rural society, and to foster a more equitable social order. In many states, people work at below the statutory minimum wage, which is rarely enforced the ground realities of rural employment.

So, many non-poor agricultural workers could switch from existing agricultural employment to the NREGA.

The Government of India passed the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) in September 2005, with a broad 'national consensus'. This was hailed as a 'historic piece of legislation' and 'People's Act'. The Act provides for the enhancement of livelihood security of the household in the rural areas by providing at least one hundred days of guaranteed wage employment in every financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual labour. It is noted that NREGA envisaged a paradigm shift 'From Programme to Act', compared to the different Wage Employment Programmes (WEP) operating in the country since 1980. The Act came into force initially in 200 districts, and later extended to another 130 districts. The remaining 266 districts were notified under the NREGA with effect from April 11, 2008.

7.2 Main Objectives of the Study

The Study was conducted with the following broad objectives

7. Measure the extent of manpower employment generated under NREGA, their various socio-economic characteristics and gender variability in all the districts implementing NREGA since its inception in Kerala.
8. To compare wage differentials between NREGA activities and other wage employment activities.
9. To study the effect of NREGA on the pattern of migration from rural to urban areas.
10. To find out the nature of assets created under NREGA and their durability.
11. Identification of factors determining the participation of people in NREGA scheme and whether NREGA has been successful in ensuring better food security to the beneficiaries.
12. To assess the implementation of NREGA, its functioning, and to suggest suitable policy measures to further strengthen the programme.

7.3 Data base and Methodology

The study was based on both primary and secondary data collected from Kerala state. Five districts one each from the North, South, East, West and Central location from Kerala were chosen as sample districts for the present evaluation work

following the guidelines of the Coordinating Centre. Two villages in each sample district were selected for an in depth study. In each sample village 20 beneficiaries and 5 non-beneficiaries were randomly selected. Altogether the sample population was 250. A well structured questionnaire was used to collect the required primary data.

7.4 Main Findings of the study

The results of the study are presented in this part

Table 7.1 Performance of NREGA in Kerala 2008-09 to 2010-11 at glance

S. No.	Indicators	Unit	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	Growth rate
1	Cumulative No. of HH issued job cards	No.	2414517	2898047	2915700	82.81
2	Cumulative No. of HH demanded employment	No.	642455	959535	1186356	54.15
3	Cumulative No. of HH provided employment	No.	640188	956790	1175816	54.45
4	Cumulative Person days generated	No.	15623723	34035275	48034457	32.53
5	Cumulative No. of HH completed 100 days of work	No.	11244	43724	67970	16.54
6	Total Expenditure	Rs. In Lakhs	22011.69	47068.11	70325.63	31.30
7	Total No. of works completed	No.	26035	98105	104489	24.92

- The cumulative number of job cards issued to the households in Kerala increased markedly registering a growth rate of 82.81percent during the study period.
- The cumulative number of households demanded employment increased substantially recording a growth rate of 54.15 percent.
- The cumulative number of households provided employment registered a growth rate was 54.15 percent.
- The cumulative number of person days generated increased accounted for over 275 percent.

- The cumulative number of households completed 100 days of work registered a growth rate of 16.54 percent.
- The expenditure on all activities under NREGA drastically increased accounting for a growth of rate of 31.30 percent.
- The total number of works completed accounted for a growth rate of 24.92 percent.
- Of the total number of households issued job cards the share of SC and ST accounted for 13.9 percent and 3.7 percent respectively during 2008-2009 which marginally declined to 12.6 percent and 3.2 percent during 2009-2010 and remained the same in 2010 -2011.
- Out of the total person days generated, the share of SC accounted for about 16 percent during 2008-2009, 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 whereas the share of ST workers came down from 7.6 percent in 2008-2009 to 3.1 percent during 2010-2011.
- The average size of sample households worked out to 3.47 for beneficiary and little small at 3.15 for non-beneficiary respectively.
- The average number of earners was 1.4 in case of beneficiary and 1.6 for non-beneficiary sample households
- Over 75 percent of the sample households, beneficiary as well as non-beneficiary, belonged to the productive age group of 16-60 years.
- At aggregate level 66 percent of the sample households studied upto secondary school and nearly 15 percent were graduates.
- The caste OBC was found to be the dominant community both in the beneficiary and non-beneficiary households representing over 54 percent. The share of SC was 12 percent in the beneficiary and 4 percent in the non-beneficiary sample households.
- At aggregate level nearly 8 percent of the mandays were generated under NREGA
- The average household income at aggregate level was around 1 lakh.
- The number of members per household employed during the reference period in Kasaragod district was 1.27 and in Kottayam and Palakkad districts it accounted for 1 each at aggregate level.

- Kasaragod district had the highest number of members (1.27) per household employed during the reference period compared to other districts.
- The highest number of persons (1.42) of the OBC category per household employed under NREGA was also found in Kasaragod district.
- The number of persons per household got job under NREGA in case of SC category accounted for 1 in all the five sample districts.
- In case of ST only one person per household got job under NREGA only in Wayanad and Kasaragod districts.
- In every sample household there was minimum 1 woman member worked under NREGA during the reference year.
- The number of days per household employed during the reference period worked out to 63 at aggregate level in respect of Kerala.
- On an average per household mandays generated by beneficiary sample household was about 63 during the reference year.
- The NREGA wage rate was uniform at Rs.125 for both men and women.
- Rural connectivity work was found to be the major activity under NREGA accommodating nearly 89 percent of the labourers.
- According to 80 percent of the beneficiary sample households the quality of assets created was found to be very good.
- No beneficiary sample households got unemployment allowance.
- No migration incident took place in the sample districts.
- The total value of assets owned by beneficiary sample household accounted for about Rs.9.25 lakhs whereas for non-beneficiary sample households it was over Rs.15 lakhs.
- The assets were in the form of land, house property, consumer assets, ornament and agricultural implements.
- The loan borrowed by a sample beneficiary household on an average accounted for about Rs.96,000 and it was around Rs.93,000 for non-beneficiary households.
- Ninety five percent of the beneficiary households had accounts in bank, post office and other financial institutions.
- All the selected villages had road connectivity and 50 percent of the village had railway connectivity.

- All the villages were well connected with landline or mobile phone.
- Post offices, cooperative credit societies were available in the villages.
- Primary and secondary schools were available in all the villages and 90 percent of the villages had higher secondary schools.
- Primary health centres were available in 80 percent of the villages.
- Agriculture labour households decreased from 59.6 percent in 2001 to 37.47 percent in 2009.
- There was over 39 percent increase in the agriculture, non-agriculture and construction wages for male after the introduction of NREGA compared to 2005 and for female the increase was still higher.
- There was shortage of labour in the villages after the introduction of NREGA.
- The shortage of labour led to increase in the cost of production of agriculture to the order of 10 to 75 percent.
- The living standard in the village improved after the introduction of NREGA.

7.5 Policy suggestions

- There was vociferous demand for increase in the wage rate as Kerala is noted for higher wage rate both in agriculture and non farm sectors. Hence, the wage rate for NREGA activities should be enhanced to Rs.200 per day taking into account the growing rate of inflation and market wages. Participation with the beneficiaries and implementing agencies revealed the fact that the minimum number of days work should be increased from the existing 100 days.
- Lack of training to NREGA staff was observed as a reason for not achieving the desired results. Further the Panchayat staff member has to look after the NREGA work in addition to his/her other regular on going scheme work. Because of this he/she may not pay full attention to the NREGA activities. Therefore adequate steps should be taken to impart training to the staff to get full benefit of the programme and Gram Panchayat should appoint staff exclusive for implementing the NREGA work so as to make it more effective and for better coordination.
- Sufficient technical persons including overseers should be posted in the Gram Panchayat to ensure the quality of work.
- Labourers should be protected by giving them insurance facility.

- Expansion of activities under NREGA is advocated and while selecting the activities regional requirements should be kept in mind.
- The scheme should be made more viable so that more works could be undertaken. Further the filed survey and discussion with the officials revealed that steps should be taken to explore the possibility of working on private lands.
- Weak communication system among panchayat, workers and bank was noticed during the survey. Hence, it is essential that proper coordination among these would make the programme worthwhile and successful.
- It is advisable to prepare the work plan before the lean season so as to start the work during slack season. This would enable the workers to work as agriculture labourers and thus preventing the agriculture sector from acute labour scarcity.
- The social audit has to be made effective so as to ensure assets creation as well as proper accountability at all levels.