

## **Influence of MGNREGA on beneficiaries in Mandi district of Himachal Pradesh**

**Tek Singh<sup>1</sup> and Raj Kumar<sup>2</sup>**

**Abstract:** *Rural development is meant for as structural changes in the socio- economic situation to achieve improved living standard of low-income population residing in rural areas. The National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS) is a flagship poverty alleviation programme under the beneficiary's oriented programme of rural development of the Government of India, which seeks to guarantee at least 100 days of employment every year to the rural poor. The present study is confined to Mandi district of Himachal Pradesh with a view to study the influence of the programme on beneficiaries. This study concludes that under MNREGA the availability of the work and their further willingness to work under MNREGA and their participation with in the village and outside of the village has attained considerable recognition for additional work. Further, the influence of MNREGA on household productive assets, household income, employment opportunities and consumption expenditure indicates an increasing tendency with minor fluctuations in between with an increase in the size of holdings.*

### **Introduction**

Rural development is meant for structural changes in the socio- economic situation to achieve improved living standard of low-income population residing in rural areas. The National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS) is a flagship poverty alleviation programme under the beneficiary's oriented programme of rural development of the Government of India, which seeks to guarantee at least 100 days of employment every year to the rural poor. It seeks to enhance livelihood security by 100 days of employment a year to one member of every rural unemployed family (Sontakki and Ahire, 2011, p. 40).

The programme (act) was dedicated to Mahatama Gandhi, thus renewed as the Mahatama Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, was notified by the Government of India on September, 2005 and was made effective w.e.f. 2<sup>nd</sup> February, 2006. In the 1<sup>st</sup> Phase, the Mahatama Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MNREGA) was introduced in District Chamba and Sirmaur on 2<sup>nd</sup> February, 2006. In second phase MNREGA was started in District Kangra and Mandi w.e.f. 1-4-2007. In the third phase w.e.f. 1-4-2008, it covered all the remaining 8 district of the State. During the year 2014-15 Central share amount to Rs. 28,569.29 lakh and State share amounting to Rs. 3,163.57 lakh have been credited in the State Employment Guarantee Fund Account. The total availability of funds with the Districts is Rs. 33,770.58 lakh is available in the State Employment Guarantee Fund Account against which the funds amounting to Rs. 31,533.94 lakh have been utilized and 132.68 lakh mandays have been

---

<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor, Govt. P.G. College, Mandi, (H.P.).

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Govt. P.G. College, Sarkaghat, Mandi, (H.P.).

**Corresponding author:** Tek Singh can be contacted at: teksingh1177@gmail.com

Any remaining errors or omissions rest solely with the author(s) of this paper.

generated by providing employment to 3,82,250 households (Government of Himachal Pradesh, 2015, p. 144).

There are many issues related to MNREGA. However, it is being implemented in many states in India including Himachal Pradesh. Equally it is being assessed and monitored and evaluated in many parts of the country. In this view this study is proposed to undertake in HP particularly in Mandi district where poverty is still abysmal in many regions.

### **Literature Review**

A general review of literature of the period shows that the researchers were very much interested to study MGNREGA on different aspects. A study by Murugavel (2009) conducted a study entitled “Driver of Rural Economy” based on secondary data for years 2006-2007 to 2008-2009. He concluded that during the first year of implementation in 200 districts, more than 2.10 crore households were employed and 90.5 crore person days were employed. In 2007-08, 3.39 crore households were provided employment and 143.59 crore person days were generated in 330 districts. In last year 2008-09, 4.5 crore households have been provided employment and 215.63 crore person days have been generated across the country. Banerjee and Saha (2010) concluded in Chhattisgarh, the net household income increased in the range of 60 per cent to 70 per cent, while in Jharkhand and Orissa it was 60-70 per cent and 30-40 per cent respectively.

Sinha (2011) conducted a study on the Enhancing the Bargaining Power of the Rural Poor –Mahatma Gandhi NREGA on secondary data for year 2010-11 to assess the performance of MGNREGA to raised the productivity, increased the purchasing power, reduced distress migration and helped in creation of durable assets in rural India. He concluded that up to December 2010, employment provided to 4.1 crore households. Singh (2013) conducted a study on “MGNREGA: 100 days Employment Guarantee in Bundelkhand (M.P)” the study revealed that MGNREGA had not provided 100 days job guarantee to who are willing to do jobs under this scheme. Irregularities also found in implementation of MGNREGA in this area. Like Muster roll was not prepared properly and wages inequalities between women and men. Further, unemployment allowance not provided who want to jobs but jobs were not provided within 15 days of jobs demanding.

Salian and Leelavathi (2014) examined the effects of the MGNREGA women participation in Andhra Pradesh. They find that the women participation is much higher in Andhra Pradesh. They concluded that female wages are much higher in the MGNREGA scheme in Andhra Pradesh than the non-public casual works in the state. Lalthanmawii (2015) conducted the study on “Role of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) for economic development of rural workers: A study in Serchhip block, Mizoram”. The study tried to analyses the socio-economic impact of MGNREGA scheme on the life beneficiaries of Serchhip block, Mizoram. The study examines the earning level of each household and expenditure pattern on food and non-food item. The study revealed that MGNREGA has helped to bring down the level of unemployment and has also reduced the supply of labour to the agriculture. Under MGNREGA the sample beneficiaries have marginally gained in term of better employment opportunities and increased days of employment which has been improving their per capita income and help to lead a better standard of life.

Pandi. S. and Baladhandayutham (2016) conducted a study on the “Impact of MGNREGA on Rural Livelihoods: A Study in Karur Districts of Tamil Nadu based on multi stage sampling technique. They concluded that as poverty is multidimensional, it can be reduced by increasing purchasing power through providing employment. Through the scheme

## Influence of MGNREGA on beneficiaries in Mandi district of Himachal Pradesh

government inject money into the hands of the respondents whom are economically backward and social weaker section in the society. In the same vein, the present study has been conducted in Mandi district of Himachal Pradesh.

### Objectives

The present study has been undertaken to achieve the following objectives:

1. To study the socio-economic profile of beneficiaries sample households by size class of holdings and
2. To know the willingness to work under MNREGA and their participation with in the village and outside of the village.
3. To study the influence or impact of MNREGA on the household assets, income, employment and consumption expenditure among the sample households.

### Data Source and Methodology

In the present study, Mandi district has been undertaken purposively for conducting the present empirical verification on the impact of NREGA, mainly due to the reason that NREGA was started in Mandi district in Phase-II i.e. 1<sup>st</sup> April 2007 as well as this district represent diverse agro-climatic conditions and the physical and financial performance of NREGA are moderate and close to the state average. The study is based on primary data and the required primary data have been collected with the help of pre-tested schedule from 300 sample households of 18 villages during 2007-08 and 2010-11 selected randomly from the two development blocks of the district. With the help of pre-tested schedule information pertaining to age and sex-wise family composition, educational status, consumer units as well as the data regarding know the willingness to work under MNREGA and their participation with in the village and outside of the village, household assets, income, employment and consumption expenditure among rural people before and after have been recorded from all the sample households, during the survey. In the present study the pre and post assistants comparison method has been adopt to examine the study with the help of statistical tools, such as Percentage, Average, and Income generation rate. The difference between pre-assistance income and post-assistance income take as the income generation. The income generation rate has been computed with the help of this formula:

$$Yg = \frac{yt - yr}{yr} \times 100$$

Where, Yg=income generation rate

Yt=post assistance income

Yr=Pre-assistance income (Kaushik, 1993, p.90).

The total number of male, female and children of varying age has been converted into, 'standard' consumption unit's or 'adult man value' by applying the scale of co-efficient suggested by the Indian Council of Medical Research e.g. a family consisting of father, mother and three children aged 10, 8 and 6 years has an 'adult man value' of consumption units of 3.9 (i.e. 1.0+0.8+0.8+0.7+0.6) (Gopalan, Ramshastri and Balasubramanian, 1980. P.10).

Keeping in view of hilly topography and extreme climatic variations in the economy of the region, minimum food requirements are 'necessary' but not 'sufficient' for the survival of mankind. Therefore, in order to work out the value of minimum non-food requirements by

working out the ratios of the total non-food expenditure to the total food expenditure for each holding group (Sastri and Suryanarayana, 1981, pp. 97-116).

Due to difference in the efficiency of male, female, children and old person standard mandays have been worked out in the present study by attaching the 'proper co-efficient of efficiency' i.e., one woman day (WD) has been treated equal to 0.75 mandays (MD), one child day (CD) has been treated equal to one old person day (OD) and both are considered equal to 0.50 MD, i.e., 1 WD=0.75 MD, 1 CD= 1 OD=0.50 MD (Ghosh, 1977, p.90).

## Results and Discussion

### Socio-Economic Characteristics of the Sample Household

In the present empirical study there are 300 sample households and it consists 1464 males, females and children. Out of the total 300 sample households, 180 households fall in the category of marginal farmers having land area less than one hectare, 80 households fall in the category of small farmers having land 1-2 hectares and the remaining 40 households falls in the category of medium farmers having land area 2-4 hectares. (see Table 1).

**Table 1: Socio-Economic Characteristics of the Sample Households**

S.No.	Particulars	Among the sample households.			
		Marginal Holdings	Small Holdings	Medium Holdings	All Holdings
1.	Total Number of Sample Household	180	80	40	300
2.	Total number of family members	838	396	230	1464
3.	Average size of family	4.66	4.95	5.75	4.88
4.	Percentage of Family workforce				
	(a) Male	301 (67.8)	130 (64.68)	80 (71.42)	511 (67.5)
	(b) Female	287 (72.84)	133 (68.2)	81 (68.64)	501 (70.86)
	(c) Total	588 (70.17)	263 (66.41)	161 (70.00)	1012 (69.12)
5.	Percentage of Dependents	250 (29.83)	133 (33.59)	69 (30.00)	452 (30.88)
6.	No. of Consumer Units	721.5	340.4	195.7	1257.6
7.	Literacy Percentage				
	(a) Male	374 (83.30)	176 (85.02)	100 (88.50)	650 (84.53)
	(b) Female	312 (80.21)	155 (82.01)	98 (83.76)	565 (81.29)
	(c) Total	686 (81.86)	331 (83.58)	198 (86.09)	1215 (82.99)

**Note:** Figures in parenthesis indicate percentages.

## Influence of MGNREGA on beneficiaries in Mandi district of Himachal Pradesh

The average size of family has been worked out 4.66, 4.95 and 5.75 on the marginal, small and medium size of holdings respectively. The average size of family among all the sample households together came out 4.88 as compared to the average size of family at the State level as a whole i.e. 4.97 according to 2001 census and 4.60 according to 2011 census, while the average family size in Mandi District is 4.50 according to 2011 census (Government of Himachal Pradesh, 2003, p. 26). Thus, as the farm size increases the average size of family also increases. It happened due to the prevalence of joint family system among the larger holding groups. Due to difference in the efficiency of male, female, children and old person standard mandays have been worked out in the present study by attaching the 'proper co-efficient of efficiency' the standard, mandays have been worked out 605.2, 279.2 and 158.2 on the marginal, small and medium size of holdings respectively. Among all the land holdings together the standard mandays came out to be 1042.7. Literacy percentage is the lowest on the marginal size of holdings and shows an increasing tendency with an increase in the size of holdings. The percentage of dependents is the highest on the small size of holdings group (i.e. 33.59 percent) as compared to the other class of holdings, followed by medium size of holdings group (i.e. 30.00 percent) and marginal holdings (i.e. 29.83 percent). Among all the holding groups together the percentage of dependents came out 30.88. Thus, the percentage comparison of labour force shows a decreasing tendency with an increase in the size of holdings whereas, contrary to it, the percentage of dependants shows an increasing tendency with minor fluctuation an increase in the size of holdings.

### **Distribution of Availability and Willingness of Family Members for Additional Work (Weekly) - Sex/Category Wise**

Sample households were also questioned to know the availability of the work in the village under MNREGA and their further willingness to work under MNREGA and their participation with in the village and outside of the village. Their responses were further recorded on the following types of engagement under MNREGA that are regular full time (RF), regular part time (RP), casual (C), seasonal regular (SR) and seasonal part time (SP). Male-female wise responses under different category of land holdings for availability and willingness of family members for additional work (weekly) have been presented in the Table 2.

It is clear from the table that majority of the respondents among all holding groups together expressed their desire to work with in the village. Their percentage accounted 37.34 for regular full time (RF), followed by 30.34 for regular part time (RP), 16.00 for casual ©, 13.00 for seasonal part time (SP) and 10.33 for seasonal regular (SR) respectively. Further among all holdings together, males responded for their highest willingness i.e. 28.67 per cent for RF, followed by 10.67 per cent for C, 9.67 per cent for RP, 4.33 per cent for SR and 3.67 per cent for SP, whereas females responded their highest willingness i.e. 20.67 per cent for RP followed by 9.33 per cent for SP, 6.33 per cent for SR and 5.33 per cent for C respectively. Willingness to work out side of the village, by all holding groups together respondents responses came out 15.66 per cent for RF, followed by 14.00 per cent for SP, 12.00 per cent for C, 10.67 per cent for RP, and 10.00 per cent for SR. Among all the holdings together males responded their highest willingness i.e. 12.33 per cent for RF, followed by 10.00 per cent for C, 8.33 per cent for SP, 7.67 per cent for RP and 7.00 per cent for SR, whereas females responded their highest willingness i.e. 5.67 per cent for SP followed by 3.33 per cent for RF, 3.00 per cent each for SR and RP and 2.00 per cent for C respectively.

Among the marginal holdings group the percentage of respondents for willingness of work with in the village has been worked out the highest i.e. 25.00 for RF followed by 18.33 for RP, 7.67 for C, 6.67 for SP and 6.00 for SR respectively. Among the marginal holdings group males responded, their highest willingness i.e. 20.00 per cent for RF followed by 5.00 per cent each for RP and C, 2.67 per cent for S Rand 1.67 per cent for SP, whereas females responded their highest willingness i.e. 13.33 per cent for RP, followed by 5.00 per cent each for RF and SP, 3.33 per cent for S Rand 2.67 per cent for C respectively. On the other hand, among marginal holdings group the percentage of respondents for willingness to work out of village has been worked out the highest i.e. 8.33 per cent for SP, followed by 7.33 per cent for RF, 6.33 per cent for C and 5.00 per cent each for RP and SR respectively. Among marginal holdings group males responded, their highest willingness i.e. 5.33 per cent for R F followed by 5.00 per cent each for C and SP, and 3.33 per cent each for RP and SR, whereas, females responded their highest willingness i.e. 3.33 per cent for SP, followed by 2.00 per cent for RF, 1.67 per cent for RP and SR and 1.33 per cent for C respectively.

Further, among the small holdings group the percentage of respondents for willingness to work with in village has been worked out the highest i.e. 8.67 per cent for RF followed by 8.00 per cent for RP, 5.67 per cent for C, 4.67 per cent for SP and 4.33 per cent for SR respectively. Among small holdings group males responded, their highest willingness i.e. 6.00 per cent for RF followed by 4.00 per cent for C, 3.33 per cent for RP, 1.67 per cent for SR and 1.33 per cent for SP whereas, females responded their highest willingness i.e. 4.67 per cent for RP followed by 3.00 per cent for SP, 2.67 per cent each for RF and SR and 1.67 per cent for C respectively. Among the small holdings group the percentage of respondents for willingness to work out of village has been worked out the highest i.e. 5.67 per cent for SP to be followed by 5.00 per cent for RF, 4.00 per cent for RP, 3.67 per cent for C, and 2.67 per cent for SR respectively. Among small holdings group males responded their highest willingness i.e. 3.67 per cent for RF followed by 3.33 per cent for SP, 3.00 per cent for C, 2.67 per cent for RP and 2.00 per cent for SR, whereas females respondents expressed their highest willingness i.e. 2.33 per cent for SP followed by 1.33 per cent each for RF and RP and 0.67 per cent each for C and SR respectively.

Further, among the medium holdings group, the percentage of respondents for willingness with in village came out highest 4.00 per cent for RP followed by 3.67 per cent for RF, 2.67 per cent for C and 1.67 per cent for SP respectively. Among medium holdings group males responded, their highest willingness came out 2.67 per cent for RF followed by 1.67 per cent for C, 1.33 per cent for RP and 0.67 per cent for SP, whereas among females responded, their highest willingness i.e. 2.67 per cent for RP followed by 1.00 per cent each for RF, C and SP respectively. Among the medium holdings for expressing willingness to work outside village, respondent's responses came out the highest 3.33 per cent for RF to be followed by 2.33 per cent for SR, 2.00 per cent for C and 1.67 per cent RP respectively. Among medium holdings group males responded their highest willingness i.e. 3.33 per cent for RF followed by 2.00 per cent for C and 1.67 per cent each for RP and SR, whereas, females responded their highest willingness i.e. 0.67 per cent for SR.

Influence of MGNREGA on beneficiaries in Mandi district of Himachal Pradesh

**Table 2: Sex/Category- Wise Distribution of Availability and Willingness of Family Members for Additional Work (Weekly) among Sample Households**

S.N	Place	Marginal Holdings			Small Holdings			Medium Holdings			All Holdings		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
<b>A. Within Village</b>													
1.	RF	60 (20.00)	15 (5.00)	75 (25.00)	18 (6.00)	8 (2.67)	26 (8.67)	8 (2.67)	3 (1.00)	11 (3.67)	86 (28.67)	26 (8.67)	112 (37.34)
2.	RP	15 (5.00)	40 (13.33)	55 (18.33)	10 (3.33)	14 (4.67)	24 (8.00)	4 (1.33)	8 (2.67)	12 (4.00)	29 (9.67)	62 (20.67)	91 (30.34)
3.	C	15 (5.00)	8 (2.67)	23 (7.67)	12 (4.00)	5 (1.67)	17 (5.67)	5 (1.67)	3 (1.00)	8 (2.67)	32 (10.67)	16 (5.33)	48 (16.00)
4.	SR	8 (2.67)	10 (3.33)	18 (6.00)	5 (1.67)	8 (2.67)	13 (4.33)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	13 (4.33)	18 (6.00)	31 (10.33)
5.	SP	5 (1.67)	15 (5.00)	20 (6.67)	4 (1.33)	10 (3.33)	14 (4.67)	2 (0.67)	3 (1.00)	5 (1.67)	11 (3.67)	28 (9.33)	39 (13.00)
<b>B. Outside of the Village</b>													
1.	RF	16 (5.33)	6 (2.00)	22 (7.33)	11 (3.67)	4 (1.33)	15 (5.00)	10 (3.33)	0 (0.00)	10 (3.33)	37 (12.33)	10 (3.33)	47 (15.66)
2.	RP	10 (3.33)	5 (1.67)	15 (5.00)	8 (2.67)	4 (1.33)	12 (4.00)	5 (1.67)	0 (0.00)	5 (1.67)	23 (7.67)	9 (3.00)	32 (10.67)
3.	C	15 (5.00)	4 (1.33)	19 (6.33)	9 (3.00)	2 (0.67)	11 (3.67)	6 (2.00)	0 (0.00)	6 (2.00)	30 (10.00)	6 (2.00)	36 (12.00)
4.	SR	10 (3.33)	5 (1.67)	15 (5.00)	6 (2.00)	2 (0.67)	8 (2.67)	5 (1.67)	2 (0.67)	7 (2.33)	21 (7.00)	9 (3.00)	30 (10.00)
5.	SP	15 (5.00)	10 (3.33)	25 (8.33)	10 (3.33)	7 (2.33)	17 (5.67)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	25 (8.33)	17 (5.67)	42 (14.00)

RF = Regular Full Time, RP= Regular Part Time, C= Casual, SR= Seasonal Regular, SP= Seasonal Part Time.

**Note:**

1. The figure in the parenthesis denotes the percentage of the people out of total (300) of category for type of work required, households.
2. Because of the multiple views of the people the percentage sum is not be equal to hundred.

**Table 3: Per Household Average Net Change in the Value of Assets, Income, Employment and Consumption Due to the Implementation of MGNREGA**

S.No.	Items	Marginal Holdings	Small Holdings	Medium Holdings
<b>A. Household Assets*(Rs.)</b>				
A <sub>1</sub>	Value of Assets before the implementation of MGNREGA	387555.81	1479099.31	3013604.47
A <sub>2</sub>	Value of Assets after the implementation of MGNREGA	437575.31	1580111.48	3380821.00
A <sub>3</sub>	Net Change in the value of household Assets(A <sub>2</sub> -A <sub>1</sub> )	50019.49 (12.90)	101012.2 (6.82)	367216.53 (12.18)
<b>B. Household Annual Income** (Rs.)</b>				
B <sub>1</sub>	Household Income before the implementation of MGNREGA	63329.15	113289.17	179471.53
B <sub>2</sub>	Household Income after the implementation of MGNREGA	66880.93	117721.14	184009.03
B <sub>3</sub>	Net Change in Household Income(B <sub>2</sub> -B <sub>1</sub> )	3551.78 (5.60)	4431.97 (3.91)	4537.50 (2.52)
<b>C. Household Employment***(Standard Mandays)</b>				
C <sub>1</sub>	No. of mandays employed before the implementation of MGNREGA	479.51	822.89	1170.61
C <sub>2</sub>	No. of mandays employed after the implementation of MGNREGA	505.90	863.18	1211.86
C <sub>3</sub>	Net Change in Household employment(C <sub>2</sub> -C <sub>1</sub> )	26.39 (5.50)	40.29 (4.89)	41.25 (3.52)
<b>D. Household Consumption Expenditure (Rs.)</b>				
D <sub>1</sub>	Consumption expenditure on Food items before the implementation of MGNREGA	2570.59	3529.85	4537.07
D <sub>2</sub>	Consumption expenditure on Food items after the implementation of MGNREGA	3750.97	5239.02	6728.46
D <sub>3</sub>	Net Change in expenditure on Food items(D <sub>2</sub> -D <sub>1</sub> )	1180.38 (47.04)	1709.17 (46.76)	2191.39 (45.73)
D <sub>4</sub>	Consumption expenditure on Non- Food items before the implementation of MGNREGA	1314.01	2236.15	3111.16
D <sub>5</sub>	Consumption expenditure on Non- Food items after the implementation of MGNREGA	2016.22	3404.41	4768.7
D <sub>6</sub>	Net Change in expenditure on Non- Food items(D <sub>5</sub> -D <sub>4</sub> )	702.21 (52.96)	1168.26 (53.24)	1657.54 (54.27)
D <sub>7</sub>	Consumption expenditure on Food & Non- Food items together before the implementation of MGNREGA	3884.6	5766.00	7648.23
D <sub>8</sub>	Consumption expenditure on Food & Non- Food items together after the implementation of MGNREGA	5767.19	8643.43	11497.16
D <sub>9</sub>	Net Change in expenditure on Food & Non- Food items together (D <sub>8</sub> -D <sub>7</sub> )	1882.59 (48.46)	2877.43 (49.90)	3848.93 (50.32)

**Note:** Figure in brackets is percentage change in value.

\*Household Assets include land, livestock, buildings, agricultural implement, machinery etc.

\*\* Household income includes income from agricultural and non-agricultural sources.

\*\*\* Household employment includes employment provided in both agricultural and non-agricultural activities.

### **Impact of MGNREGA on the Household Assets, Income, Employment and Consumption**

The per household net change in the value of household assets, income, employment and consumption due to the implementation of MGNREGA has been presented in table 3. This table clearly indicates that the percentage increase in the value of household productive assets, household income, employment opportunities and consumption expenditure indicates an increasing tendency with minor fluctuations in between with an increase in the size of holdings. The percentage increase in the value of household assets has been worked out 12.90, 6.82 and 12.18 per cent on the marginal, small and medium- size of holding groups respectively, whereas the percentage increase in household income accounted for 5.60, 3.91, and 2.52 per cent on the marginal, small and medium size of holdings respectively. This variation in different category of household is due to their consumption and saving differences.

The percentage increase in employment opportunities in terms of standard mandays has been worked out 5.50, 4.89 and 3.52 per cent on the marginal, small and medium size of holdings groups respectively. Due to the implementation of the MGNREGA the percentage increase in the household consumption expenditure on food - items has been worked out 47.04, 46.76 and 45.73 per cent on the marginal, small and medium size of holdings respectively, whereas the percentage increase in household consumption expenditure on non-food items came out 52.96, 53.24 and 54.27 per cent among the marginal, small and medium size of holdings respectively.

The percentage increase in the household consumption expenditure on food and non-food items together has been worked out 48.46, 49.90 and 50.32 per cent among the marginal, small and medium size of holding groups respectively. The better off households falls on medium size of holding group on account of high literacy percentage and sound sources of household income have been benefited the most least better off households falling in the category of smaller size of holdings due to uneconomic size of holdings benefited the least from the implementation of MGNREGA.

### **Concluding Remarks**

Thus, from the above discussion it can be concluded that under MNREGA family members expressed their willingness for additional work (weekly) within village and outside the village. In addition, a change in the value of household assets, income, employment and consumption expenditure has been recorded. The net change in the above variables shows that the better off households falls on medium size of holding group on account of high literacy percentage and sound sources of household income have been benefited the most, least better off households falling in the category of smaller size of holdings due to uneconomic size of holdings benefited the least from the implementation of MGNREGA. However, MNREGA has a positive influence on beneficiaries.

### **References**

- Banerjee, Caustav and Saha, Partha (2010), "The NREGA, the Maoists and the Development Woes of the Indian State", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XLV, No. 28, Mumbai, pp. 42-47.
- Ghosh, B. N. (1977), "Disguised Unemployment in Underdeveloped Countries with Special Reference to India", Heritage Publishers, New Delhi, p.90.

- Gopalan, C., Rama B. V. Sastri and Balasubramanian S. C. (1980), "The Nutritive Value of Indian Foods", The Indian Council of Medical Research, National Institute of Nutrition, Hyderabad, p.10.
- Government of Himachal Pradesh, (2015), "Economic Survey of Himachal Pradesh", Economics and Statistics Department of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla, p. 144.
- Government of Himachal Pradesh, (2003), "Statistical Outline of Himachal Pradesh", Department of Economic and Statistics, Shimla, p. 26.
- Kaushik, A. C. (1993), "Income Generating Effects of Rural Credit: A Case Study of IRDP in Haryana", *Journal of Rural Development*, Vol. XII, No. 1, Hyderabad, p.90.
- Lalthanmawii (2015), "Role of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) for economic development of rural workers: A study in Serchhip block, Mizoram", *International Journal of Management and Development Studies*, Vol. 4, No.3, pp. 266-269.
- Murugavel, D. Muthamizh, Vendan (2009), "Driver of Rural Economy", *Kurukshetra*, Vol. 58, No. 2, New Delhi, pp. 15-18.
- Pandi, Jagadeesh and Baladhandayutham, S.K. (2016), "Impact of MGNREGA on Rural Livelihoods: A Study in Karur Districts of Tamil Nadu", *International Journal of Management and Development Studies*, Vol. 5, No.3, pp. 42-48.
- Salian, Prasanna V. and Leelavathi D.S. (2014), "MGNREGA and Women Participation in Andhra Pradesh: Performance and Challenges", *International Journal of Management and Development Studies*, Vol. 3, No.5, pp. 3-17.
- Sastry, S.A.R. and Suryanarayana, T. (1981), "Optimum Diet and Poverty Line in Employment, Poverty and Public Policy", Sardar Patel Institute of Economic and Social Research, Ahmedabad, pp. 97-116.
- Singh, Surendra (2013), "MGNREGA: 100 days Employment Guarantee in Bundelkhand (M.P.)", *International Journal of Management and Development Studies*, Vol. 2, No.4, pp. 3-10.
- Sinha, B.K. (2011), "Enhancing The Bargaining Power of The Rural Poor Mahatma Gandhi NREGA", *Kurukshetra*, Vol. 59, No. 5, New Delhi, pp. 40-43.
- Sontakki Bharat S. and Ahire, Laxman M. (2011), "From the Ground Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme: Boon or bane to Indian Agriculture"? *Kurukshetra*, Vol. 59, No.6, New Delhi, p. 40.