International Journal of Advanced Research and Development
ISSN: 2455-4030, Impact Factor: RJIF 5.24
www.advancedjournal.com
Volume 2; Issue 2; March 2017; Page No. 01-05

MGNREGA: A state wise objective comparison

Tushar Kanti Ghara

Joint Director of Public Instruction & State Nodal Officer, All India Survey on Higher Education, Govt. of West Bengal, Bikash Bhavan, Salt Lake City, Kolkata, West Bengal, India

Abstract
Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREAGA) is a centrally sponsored scheme towards providing livelihood security to rural people of India. State authority is the implementing body. The data generated through MGNREGA have been taken for objective comparison of the state's performances. Principal component analysis (PCA) has been used for choosing weights for the variable of the data. The states have been ranked for the years 2006-07 to 2015-16. In 2015, West Bengal is ranked top based the indicator developed.

Keywords: MGNREGA, livelihood security, PCA, indicator, ranking

Introduction

India is among the top five fastest growing economies of the world. The progress on human development in India has not been commensurate with the promise held out by rapid economic growth. An approach paper for 12th five year plan indicates that India will possibly miss the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) targets especially in hunger, malnutrition, maternal and infant mortality. Gender inequalities and vulnerability of a large segment of population are great challenges.

Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA), a Central sponsored wage employment scheme, aims at providing livelihood security to the rural poor. The MGNREGA was implemented in 200 districts, in the first phase, with effect from February 2, 2006 and extended, subsequently, to additional 113 and 17 districts with effect from April 1st 2007 and May 15th 2007, respectively. The remaining districts were included under the Act with effect from April 1, 2008. The objective of MGNREGA is to ensure livelihood security of rural people by guaranteeing at least 100 days of wage employment in a financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work. The Act envisages the following - enhance livelihood security of the rural poor by generating wage employment opportunities in works that develop the infrastructure base of that particular locality; rejuvenate natural resource base of the area concerned; create a productive rural asset base; stimulate local economy for providing wage employment; ensure women empowerment.

In this context, India signed the Millennium Declaration in September 2000, which calls for the eradication of extreme poverty and hunger by halving the number of poor people living on less than a dollar a day and those who suffer from hunger. Thus, the Government of India recognized these goals as a legitimate policy commitment. Further, the Common Minimum Programme of the United Progressive Alliance government came up with commitments that the state had to make to improve the situation of the poor. These commitments were recognized by the Planning Commission as a national common minimum programme to mobilize resources for their implementation. Further, a citizens' charter was formulated by civil society activists (Grassroots Learning and Ways Forward). The UPA government unanimously passed the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) in 2005. This act has been hailed as a major initiative in the Government of India's commitment to providing an economic safety to India's rural poor. 71.9% of India's population still resides in rural areas, therefore the MGNREGA can be thought of as a policy to boost rural income, stabilize agricultural production and reduce the population pressure on urban areas (Basu *et al.* 2005) [8]. Under this Act, any adult willing to do casual labour at the minimum wage is allowed employment on local public works within 15 days, with a limitation of 100 days per household per year at the legal minimum wage. This act was introduced with an aim of improving the purchasing power of the rural people, primarily semi or un-skilled work whether or not they are below the poverty line. Thus, it is not a programme and differs from other schemes because it gives the rural poor the rights to demand that, they be given a job or unemployment allowance. MGNREGA is the first legislation that compels the state to provide a social safety net for the poorest people of this country and seeks to address the urgent issues of hunger and rural distress that afflict large parts of India (Lakshman, 2007) [15].

MGNREGA plays a crucial role as a social change instrument which facilitates changes in the village, making it a significant field to study. Employment in simple words can be defined as an occupation by which a person can earn his living. Indian Village life is a mixture of harmony, tranquility, quietude and innocence. Along with many small and big grass fields, several rivers, chirping of birds, swinging of emerald trees, speaking in a low voice the tale of languishment and love to the big and clear blue sky give a mesmerizing, captivating and bewitching effect to the Indian villages. The heart of India lies in its villages. The village life in India is blessed with its innocence, purity and uncomplicated saga making the village quaint, archaic, mystic yet charming places to rediscover nature.

Whereas an Indian village economy is largely dependent on the agriculture where one person or few persons own the land and other villagers work as labourers in their lands. Members of both social classes are largely unaware of the true nature of their situation, of the reality of the relationship between ruling and subject classes. Members of the ruling class assume that their particular interests are those of society as a whole, members of the subject class accept this view of reality and regard their situation as part of the natural order of things (Haralambos and Herald, 2006). In this modern era the state has some responsibilities towards its citizens. The character of the modern state, according to Laski, is determined largely by forces such as the rise of property of the working class and the class consciousness which has been generated by the industrial revolution. Further he added that the state cannot leave the individual alone but must become an instrument for securing the general welfare on the largest scale possible. It is an association to protect the interests of men as citizens. It is an agent of the society, a coordinating agency or a public service corporation. The individual is associated with the state in one form or the other and whatever be the character of the state, he would like to secure himself against the inevitable costs of life (Vermani, 1996). Hence, facilities against sickness and old age, the cost of education, fixation of wages and working hours in industries, giving free meals to school children, providing employment to the people etc. are required to be provided by the state. The Indian Constitution, in the Directive Principles of State Policy, had already emphasized that ensuring what is now called "decent work" for all should be a crucial focus of state policy. Thus, Article 41 of the Directive Principles states that "The State shall, within the limits of its economic capacity and development, make effective provision for securing the right to work, to education and to public assistance in cases of unemployment, old age, sickness and disablement, and in other cases of undeserved want." Similarly, there is attention to the conditions of work and the level of wages in Articles 42 and 43, which state that "The State shall make provision for just and humane conditions of work and for maternity relief... The State shall endeavour to secure, by suitable legislation or economic organization or in any other way, to all workers, agricultural, industrial or otherwise, work at living wage, conditions of work ensuring a decent standard of life and full enjoyment of leisure and social and cultural opportunities".

Rights are the condition in which the people get an opportunity for all round development. According to Harold Laski, "Rights are those conditions of social life without which no man can be his best self'(ibid). Rights create an environment in which individual feels empowered, becomes self-confident and develops him or her in the all aspects of life.

Considering the size and scope of the programme implementation, it is necessary for the policy makers and implementers to know the benefits and impacts of such development intervention. Issues and challenges limiting the effective implementation of the programme at the grass-root level could be diagnosed through a detailed micro-level data analysis. The broad aims of research studies under MGNREGA should be- (i) Evaluation of the efficacy and effectiveness of the programme vis-à-vis its objective; (ii) Critical assessment of the policies, procedures and practices to reach conclusions especially on appropriate modifications required; (iii) Assessment of the performance of various institutions under the Act; (iv) Documentation of best practices for replications.

In this communication, a number of factors have been considered to analysis the implementation of MGNREGA projects for the states of India. Attempt has been taken to get an indicator based on all considered factors. The weights have been estimated. Thus the states have been compared and classified.

Data

With an aim to compare the states of India, the published data from different reports on NREGA and MGNREGA for the period 2006-07 to 2015-16 for the states have been collected. 28 states have been considered - Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Goa, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Odisha, Punjab, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Tamil Nadu, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand and West Bengal. The following variable have been considered - Number of households who have demanded employment(X01), Number of households provided employment(X02), Person days in lakhs of percentage of Women participation(X03), Average person days per Household(X04), Number of Households Availed 100 days of Employment(X05), Number of asset creation projects completed through rural connectivity(X06), Number of asset creation projects completed through Flood Control and Protection(X_{07}), Number of asset creation projects completed through Water Conservation and Water Harvesting(X_{08}), Number of asset creation projects completed through Drought Proofing(X_{09}), Number of asset creation projects completed through Micro Irrigation Works(X_{10}), Number of asset creation projects completed through Provision of Irrigation facility to Land Owned by(X_{11}), Number of asset creation projects completed through Renovation of Traditional Water bodies(X_{12}), Number of asset creation projects completed through Land Development(X_{13}), Number of asset creation projects completed through Any Other activity Approved by MRD(X_{14}), Number of asset creation projects completed through Bharat Nirman Rajiv Ghandhi Sewa Kendra(X_{15}), Total number of asset creation project Works Completed(X_{16}), Percentage of asset creation project Works Completed(X_{17}), Percentage of Expenditure Against Total Available Fund(X_{18}), Percentage of Expenditure on Wages(X_{19}), Percentage of Expenditure on Material(X_{20}), Percentage of Administrative Expenditure(X_{21}). Therefore, it leads to 28x21 data matrix for each of the years 2006-07 to 2015-16.

Analysis

The data is for 10 years on 21 variables over 28 states. For each year, it is 29x21 data matrix.

Define X_{ijk} = data on kth variable for jth states and ith year; i=06,07,…, 15, k=01, 02,…, 21 and j= state.

The X_{ijk} variables may have different distributions. The distributions are not known. Again, the distributions may vary from year to year.

Define $Z_{ik} = (X_{ijk} – Min(X_{ijk} \text{ on } j))/(Max(X_{ijk} \text{ on } j) – Min(X_{ijk} \text{ on } j))$; for every i, k. So Z_{ik}'s are in (0,1) for every i, k. For

fixed i, there are 28x21 data matrix on Z. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with varimax has been used (using statistica 13.0) to estimate weights. Factor loadings for 21 variables have been considered as weights as in all the years more than 90% variability have been reduced. So, 10 models have been derived for 10 years. Each model expression is an indicator for the states for that particular year.

The indicator for ith year, for fixed j, is $I(i) = \sum w_{ik}Z_{ik}$; i = 06, 07, …., 15; where w_{ik} is the PCA varimax factor loading for kth variable in ith year.

The models, for fixed jth state, are.

for 2006, $I(06) = 0.571071*Z_{0601} + 0.555747*Z_{0602} - 0.124486*Z_{0603} - 0.076671*Z_{0604} + 0.108143*Z_{0605} + 0.735139*Z_{0606} + 0.898392*Z_{0607} + 0.003554*Z_{0608} + 0.55808*Z_{0609} + 0.688618*Z_{0610} + 0.033133*Z_{0611} + 0.630595*Z_{0612} - 0.016294*Z_{0613} + 0.284122*Z_{0614} + 0.356979*Z_{0616} + 0.153852*Z_{0617} + 0.229783*Z_{0618} + 0.268844*Z_{0619} + 0.068168*Z_{0620} - 0.033289*Z_{0621}$;

for 2007, $I(07) = 0.545879*Z_{0701} + 0.551121*Z_{0702} + 0.057552*Z_{0703} + 0.423694*Z_{0704} + 0.792421*Z_{0705} + 0.493045*Z_{0706} - 0.048462*Z_{0707} + 0.546663*Z_{0708} + 0.426577*Z_{0709} + 0.040633*Z_{0710} + 0.939263*Z_{0711} + 0.254657*Z_{0712} + 0.192240*Z_{0713} - 0.042033*Z_{0714} + 0.507076*Z_{0716} + 0.814767*Z_{0717} + 0.687637*Z_{0718} + 0.922061*Z_{0719} + 0.433825*Z_{0720} - 0.112637*Z_{0721}$;

for 2008, $I(08) = 0.838311*Z_{0801} + 0.838232*Z_{0802} + 0.215259*Z_{0803} + 0.293238*Z_{0804} + 0.949973*Z_{0805} + 0.519751*Z_{0806} - 0.019643*Z_{0807} + 0.380330*Z_{0808} + 0.409407*Z_{0809} + 0.171790*Z_{0810} + 0.740842*Z_{0811} + 0.506640*Z_{0812} + 0.253983*Z_{0813} - 0.015688*Z_{0814} + 0.566239*Z_{0816} + 0.939030*Z_{0817} + 0.937987*Z_{0818} + 0.916141*Z_{0819} + 0.737647*Z_{0820} - 0.102361*Z_{0821}$

for 2009, $I(09) = 0.916529*Z_{0901} + 0.914542*Z_{0902} + 0.127097*Z_{0903} + 0.128304*Z_{0904} + 0.846320*Z_{0905} + 0.670562*Z_{0906} + 0.084792*Z_{0907} + 0.109705*Z_{0908} + 0.525954*Z_{0909} + 0.254018*Z_{0910} + 0.660084*Z_{0911} + 0.570868*Z_{0912} + 0.345591*Z_{0913} + 0.183025*Z_{0914} + 0.488308*Z_{0916} + 0.918272*Z_{0917} + 0.910971*Z_{0918} + 0.880384*Z_{0919} + 0.800024*Z_{0920} - 0.163027*Z_{0921}$;

for 2010, $I(10) = 0.418215*Z_{1001} + 0.424919*Z_{1002} + 0.093628*Z_{1003} + 0.014401*Z_{1004} + 0.374342*Z_{1005} + 0.134124*Z_{1006} + 0.981008*Z_{1007} + 0.203794*Z_{1008} + 0.963787*Z_{1009} + 0.755521*Z_{1010} + 0.825716*Z_{1011} + 0.763207*Z_{1012} + 0.104366*Z_{1013} + 0.072487*Z_{1014} + 0.852898*Z_{1015} + 0.029750*Z_{1016} + 0.777413*Z_{1017} + 0.550570*Z_{1018} + 0.585022*Z_{1019} + 0.828156*Z_{1020} + 0.027817*Z_{1021}$;

for 2011, $I(11) = 0.545712*Z_{1101} + 0.547373*Z_{1102} - 0.263507*Z_{1103} - 0.088261*Z_{1104} + 0.252468*Z_{1105} + 0.939442*Z_{1106} + 0.541370*Z_{1107} + 0.457357*Z_{1108} + 0.211250*Z_{1109} + 0.640243*Z_{1110} + 0.902686*Z_{1111} + 0.311347*Z_{1112} + 0.649467*Z_{1113} + 0.964311*Z_{1114} - 0.024461*Z_{1115} + 0.874045*Z_{1116} + 0.082184*Z_{1117} - 0.029173*Z_{1118} - 0.027883*Z_{1119} + 0.027883*Z_{1120} - 0.019718*Z_{1121}$;

for 2012, $I12) = 0.352045*Z_{1201} + 0.325596*Z_{1202} - 0.241482*Z_{1203} - 0.128559*Z_{1204} - 0.063408*Z_{1205} + 0.848671*Z_{1206} + 0.276767*Z_{1207} - 0.017640*Z_{1208} - 0.044830*Z_{1209} - 0.018444*Z_{1210} + 0.461873*Z_{1201} - 0.000888*Z_{1212} + 0.128495*Z_{1213} + 0.960258*Z_{1214} + 0.060177*Z_{1215} + 0.399815*Z_{1216} + 0.037094*Z_{1217} - 0.060984*Z_{1218} - 0.033050*Z_{1219} + 0.033050*Z_{1220} + 0.281709*Z_{1221}$;

for 2013, $I13) = 0.647118*Z_{1301} + 0.623468*Z_{1302} - 0.268982*Z_{1303} - 0.086131*Z_{1304} + 0.209985*Z_{1305} + 0.870151*Z_{1306} + 0.188958*Z_{1307} + 0.202654*Z_{1308} + 0.358378*Z_{1309} - 0.015353*Z_{1310} + 0.643102*Z_{1311} + 0.089014*Z_{1312} + 0.382058*Z_{1313} + 0.932870*Z_{1314} + 0.125336*Z_{1315} + 0.714677*Z_{1316} + 0.123729*Z_{1317} + 0.081550*Z_{1318} - 0.035045*Z_{1319} + 0.035045*Z_{1320} + 0.155888*Z_{1321}$;

for 2014, $I14) = 0.268328*Z_{1401} + 0.252674*Z_{1402} - 0.039133*Z_{1403} + 0.186818*Z_{1404} + 0.287207*Z_{1405} + 0.724327*Z_{1406} + 0.028928*Z_{1407} + 0.631119*Z_{1408} + 0.673360*Z_{1409} + 0.013006*Z_{1410} + 0.925450*Z_{1411} + 0.010569*Z_{1412} + 0.861456*Z_{1413} + 0.500792*Z_{1414} + 0.097367*Z_{1415} + 0.822911*Z_{1416} + 0.312855*Z_{1417} + 0.108047*Z_{1418} - 0.109743*Z_{1419} + 0.109743*Z_{1420} - 0.138237*Z_{1421}$;

for 2015, $I15) = 0.399533*Z_{1501} + 0.367438*Z_{1502} + 0.037445*Z_{1503} + 0.035298*Z_{1504} + 0.189801*Z_{1505} + 0.269031*Z_{1506} + 0.139247*Z_{1507} + 0.613388*Z_{1508} + 0.850356*Z_{1509} + 0.100531*Z_{1510} + 0.834523*Z_{1511} + 0.349603*Z_{1512} + 0.286926*Z_{1513} + 0.098604*Z_{1514} + 0.169590*Z_{1515} + 0.664971*Z_{1516} + 0.054785*Z_{1517} + 0.038795*Z_{1518} - 0.032935*Z_{1519} + 0.032658*Z_{1520} - 0.289377*Z_{1521}$.

It is to note that for the years 2006-07 to 2009-10, variable X15 has not been consider due to non-significant variability. One can consider the same with zero weight.

Table 1: showing the values of the indicator for all the years

State	I(06)	I(07)	I(08)	I(09)	I(10)	I(11)	I(12)	I(13)	I(14)	I(15)
Andhra Pradesh	2.9680	5.3442	6.2075	7.7453	8.8949	1.2697	0.8232	2.0887	0.7220	0.4689
Arunachal Pradesh	-0.0415	0.3540	0.2718	0.0318	0.0777	-0.1311	0.0327	0.0427	-0.0292	0.0502
Assam	1.1396	1.2868	1.4532	1.3264	0.6973	0.3108	0.5255	0.7531	0.7080	0.3274
Bihar	2.2650	2.4594	2.6703	2.9166	2.2672	0.2684	0.4746	1.6373	1.6667	1.5949
Chhattisgarh	1.2597	3.1934	2.5771	1.8410	1.6506	1.2681	1.1020	1.5966	1.3721	0.5995
Goa	0.0000	0.0000	-0.1020	-0.0655	0.1222	-0.1996	0.0192	-0.1643	0.0065	0.0085
Gujarat	0.0987	0.5409	0.9591	1.7693	0.8394	0.5601	0.6065	0.5475	0.9417	-0.0024
Haryana	-0.0067	0.3594	0.3932	0.2074	0.1976	0.2349	0.0322	0.2923	0.2923	0.0764
Himachal Pradesh	0.5202	0.4853	0.8315	0.8232	0.5728	0.4434	0.2470	0.6865	1.1055	0.5968
Jammu and Kashmir	0.1273	0.2556	0.3308	0.3306	0.4387	0.0901	0.1995	0.6629	0.2344	0.3033
Jharkhand	1.2848	2.4324	2.3104	1.7698	1.5732	0.8070	0.7573	1.2142	1.8697	1.2061

Karnataka	1.2598	1.0784	1.1307	3.7242	2.8702	1.1184	0.4352	1.2681	1.7550	2.4799
Kerala	-0.0810	0.4475	1.1078	1.2293	1.2478	2.5245	0.7302	1.0649	0.7900	1.2009
Madhya Pradesh	3.4689	7.2140	6.6658	5.5720	4.3794	2.1468	1.5840	3.5393	5.7983	2.6075
Maharashtra	0.2457	0.4898	0.8306	0.4762	0.3990	0.2140	0.2367	0.8338	2.3639	1.3859
Manipur	-0.1073	0.2952	0.8350	0.6061	0.3160	-0.0424	0.0503	0.2086	0.0914	-0.0998
Meghalaya	0.0159	0.3253	0.4064	0.3519	0.2609	-0.0016	-0.0087	0.1096	0.1770	0.0405
Mizoram	-0.0351	0.2293	0.5487	0.3768	0.2129	-0.0345	0.0759	0.1985	0.4541	-0.0059
Nagaland	-0.0655	0.1107	0.6629	0.6678	0.3880	0.0152	-0.0093	0.2160	0.1677	0.1189
Odisha	1.5030	1.3219	1.1888	1.1973	1.7920	1.0519	0.8732	1.7145	1.7810	1.4928
Punjab	-0.0275	0.2523	0.2634	0.2588	0.2101	0.0690	0.1305	0.2497	0.2681	0.1194
Rajasthan	0.9536	3.3284	7.6689	6.4332	2.9250	0.9637	1.3494	2.0441	2.1083	1.3216
Sikkim	-0.0558	0.2630	0.3271	0.2376	0.1176	-0.1026	0.0238	0.0070	0.2319	-0.0055
Tamil Nadu	0.3127	1.1824	2.2544	2.8344	1.9396	1.4320	0.7158	1.6764	1.8402	2.5567
Tripura	0.0848	0.8310	1.3735	1.1409	0.6359	0.9861	0.2623	1.0943	0.8824	0.9551
Uttar Pradesh	5.0278	4.9026	6.1672	8.0114	5.7875	7.3282	3.3921	4.5573	2.6978	3.2768
Uttarakhand	0.3379	0.4487	0.4878	0.5237	0.4280	0.1682	0.0409	0.4877	0.4087	0.2479
West Bengal	3.0713	2.8093	2.3121	3.2272	2.5490	2.8264	1.4213	3.4887	2.7481	4.1472

Table 2: showing the ranks of the states for all the years

State	RI(06)	RI(07)	RI(08)	RI(09)	RI(10)	RI(11)	RI(12)	RI(13)	RI(14)	RI(15)
Andhra Pradesh	4	2	3	2	1	6	7	4	16	15
Arunachal Pradesh	24	20	26	27	28	27	23	26	28	22
Assam	10	10	10	12	14	15	12	15	17	16
Bihar	5	7	5	7	7	16	13	8	10	6
Chhattisgarh	9	5	6	9	10	7	5	9	11	13
Goa	20	28	28	28	26	28	26	28	27	24
Gujarat	17	14	15	11	13	13	11	18	13	25
Haryana	21	19	23	26	25	17	24	20	20	21
Himachal Pradesh	12	16	17	16	16	14	16	16	12	14
Jammu and Kashmir	16	24	24	23	17	20	18	17	22	17
Jharkhand	7	8	8	10	11	12	8	11	6	10
Karnataka	8	12	13	5	5	8	14	10	9	5
Kerala	27	18	14	13	12	3	9	13	15	11
Madhya Pradesh	2	1	2	4	3	4	2	2	1	3
Maharashtra	15	15	18	20	19	18	17	14	4	8
Manipur	28	22	16	18	21	25	21	23	26	28
Meghalaya	19	21	22	22	22	23	27	25	24	23
Mizoram	23	26	20	21	23	24	20	24	18	27
Nagaland	26	27	19	17	20	22	28	22	25	20
Odisha	6	9	12	14	9	9	6	6	8	7
Punjab	22	25	27	24	24	21	19	21	21	19
Rajasthan	11	4	1	3	4	11	4	5	5	9
Sikkim	25	23	25	25	27	26	25	27	23	26
Tamil Nadu	14	11	9	8	8	5	10	7	7	4
Tripura	18	13	11	15	15	10	15	12	14	12
Uttar Pradesh	1	3	4	1	2	1	1	1	3	2
Uttarakhand	13	17	21	19	18	19	22	19	19	18
West Bengal	3	6	7	6	6	2	3	3	2	1

RI(i) = rank of I(i) over the states; i = 06, 07, …, 15
R(i,i') = the rank correlation between ith and i'th year ranks of the indicators RI(i)'s i.e. between RI(i) and RI(i)'s; i,i' = 06, 07, …., 15.
The rank correlation over the years are R(06,07) = 0.755, R(07,08) = 0.855, R(08,09) = 0.904,
R(09,10) = 0.941, R(10,11) = 0.781, R(11,12) = 0.791, R(12,13) = 0.851, R(13,14) = 0.773 and
R(14,15) = 0.761.
In 2006, the top 4 states were Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, West Bengal and Andhra Pradesh. In 2007, the top state was Madhya Pradesh followed by Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan. In 2008, the top states were Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh. In 2009, the top ordered states were Uttar Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh. In 2010, the top 4 states were Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan. In 2011, the top-ranking states were Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, Kerala and Madhya Pradesh. In 2012, the top performing states were Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, West Bengal and Rajasthan. In 2013, the higher performing 4 states were Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, West Bengal and Andhra Pradesh. The same in 2014 were Madhya Pradesh, West Bengal, Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh. In 2015, West Bengal placed in top followed by Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and then Tamil Nadu. Thus, West Bengal, Uttar Pradesh are more consistent performer as compared to other states. The top 5 states with average ranks are Uttar Pradesh (1.9), Madhya Pradesh (2.4), West Bengal

(3.9), Rajasthan (5.7) and Andhra Pradesh (6.0). West Bengal is an improver states from year to year.

Conclusion

The states of India has been compared based on the indicator derived based the data of MGNREGA. The indicator for the states has been derived for each of the years 2006-07 to 2015-16. The ranking has been made for each year. Not of the states has achieved the same progression. 5 states - Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan along with West Bengal have showed good performances. West Bengal is most consistent performer and top in 2015-16. More detailed analysis like district-wise within state may also be taken for objective administrative analysis and policy faming.

References

1. Ahuja, Ram. Social Problems in India, Jaipur and New Delhi: Rawat Publications. 2003, 43-44. www.geo.mtu.edu. www.un.org
2. Annual Report. Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India. 2009-10, 65-67.
3. Annual Report. Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India, 2010-11, ix.
4. Annual Report. Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India. 2011-12, 82-83,85.
5. Annual Report. Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India. 2012-13, 92-93.
6. Arunachalam P. Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Programme and Poverty in India, New Delhi: Serial Publication, 2011, 2-3.
7. Bagchi KK. Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) as Right to Employment, Delhi: Abhijeet Publications. 2011, 84-85.
8. Basu, Arnab K, Nancy H. Chau, Ravi Kanbur. The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act of India, processed, Department of Applied Economics and Management, Cornell University, Ithaca NY, 2005.
9. Chaarles IJ, Murugan JM. Mahatma Gandhi national rural employment Gurantee ACT, 2005 MGNREGA: issues and challenges; International journal of physical and social sciences. 2012, 2:6.
10. Datta, Sanjay. Implementation and performance of rural poverty eradication programmes: a comparative study of EGS and SGRY in Nashik district, Shivaji University, Kolhapur. 2005-2010. 23-24. www.nrega.nic.in
11. Department of Rural Development, Government of India, New Delhi. Annual Report. 2006-07, 14.
12. Gangopadhyay D, Mukhopadhyay AK, Singh Pushpa: Rural Development: A strategy for poverty alleviation in India, Delhi: Science and Technology. 2008; 2:19 www.nrega.nic.in
13. Ghosh, Jayati. The case for employment guarantee, accessed, 2004. at http://www.hindu.com
14. Keshlata, Fatmi CSN. The contribution of MGNREGA in the empowerment of the scheduled tribes through poverty alleviation and rural development in the Sheopur District of Madhya Pradesh: An analytical study, international journal of humanities and social science Invention, 2015; 4(2):58-71. Www.ijhssi.org
15. Lakshman, Nirmala. The hundred day's basket, The Hindu dated accessed, 2007. at http://www.thehindu.com
16. Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Programme and Poverty in India, New Delhi: Serial Publication, 2011, 2-3.
17. Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, Census of India, 2011. En.wikipedia.org
18. Ministry of home affairs, Government of India, Census of India 2011 Ahuja, Ram, Social Problems in India, Jaipur and New Delhi: Rawat Publications, 2003, 27.
19. Ministry of rural development, government of India, Annual Report. 2007-08, 2-3.
20. Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India, Annual Report, 2008-09, 6.
21. Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India, 72-74.
22. Mtetwa, Edmos, Dziro, Charles, Takaza Stella. Poverty and Rural Development; Tapping from the grassroots, International Journal of Humanities and social science invention. 2013; 2(5):2.
23. Pamecha S, Sharma I. Socio-Economic Impact of Mgnrega-A Study Undertaken among Beneficiaries of 20 Villages of Dungarpur District of Rajasthan, International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications. 2015; 5(1):1-4. www.ijsrp.org.
24. Shrivastava, Divya. The Development of Scheduled Tribes in Madhya Pradesh, New Delhi: Gyan Publisher, 2000, 7. www.nrega.nic.in