www.ThePharmaJournal.com

# The Pharma Innovation



ISSN (E): 2277-7695 ISSN (P): 2349-8242 NAAS Rating: 5.23 TPI 2022; SP-11(6): 2503-2505 © 2022 TPI

www.thepharmajournal.com Received: 26-04-2022 Accepted: 29-05-2022

Sachchidanand Upadhyay

Teaching Associate, College of Agriculture, CSAUA&T, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India

#### UA Siddiqui

Assistant Professor and Head, Department of Agricultural Extension, CBGAGPG College, BKT, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India

#### VK Singh

Ex. Professor and Head, Department of Agricultural Extension, CSAUA&T, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India

Sanjay Kr. Tripathi Teaching Associate, College of Agriculture, CSAUA&T, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India

#### Raj Kumar

Teaching Associate, College of Agriculture, CSAUA&T, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India

#### **Ragini Dubey**

Teaching Associate, Department of Home Science, CSAUA&T, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India

Corresponding Author Sachchidanand Upadhyay Teaching Associate, College of Agriculture, CSAUA&T, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India

### Constraints analysis of MGNREGA in Sultanpur district of Uttar Pradesh using Garrett ranking technique

## Sachchidanand Upadhyay, UA Siddiqui, VK Singh, Sanjay Kr. Tripathi, Raj Kumar and Ragini Dubey

#### Abstract

The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) is an Indian employment guarantee scheme. The act was introduced with objective of developing the purchasing power of the rural household. The objective of the study is to evaluate the constraints faced by the MGNREGA beneficiaries in their work and work site. The study was conducted in one purposively selected district Sultanpur of Uttar Pradesh to identify the suggestions given by respondents in MGNREGA programme. One block from Sultanpur district *viz.*, Dubeypur was selected, From selected block five villages were selected randomly. Ten beneficiaries who involved in MGNREGA scheme from each village were selected purposively. Thus, the total of 50 respondents who actively involved in MGNREGA programme. Garrett' ranking technique was adopted to analyze the constraints as perceived by the respondents in MGNREGA programme. Finally the study concluded that the most important constraints faced by the MGNREGA beneficiaries were the MGNREGA provide low wages than market wages ranked first with Garrett mean score of 64.18, followed by not getting work in needed time with Garrett mean score of 61.84.

Keywords: Constraints, MGNREGA, Garrett' ranking technique

#### Introduction

The success of a welfare state can be judged by the fact that efforts have been made to ensure the development of the person standing at the last rung of the socio-economic system. Most of the population in India lives in rural areas, employment is not available in rural areas so rural population is migrating to the city for employment the central government has given employment to people in rural areas to stop this migration. This has been possible only through NREGA scheme. The NREGA scheme was passed on 2 October 2005. The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) is an Indian employment guarantee programme. It provides a legal guarantee for 100 days of employment in every financial year to adult members of any rural household willing to do public work related unskilled manual work at the statutory minimum wages. The act was enacted by legislation on August 25, 2005 with the developing the purchasing power of the rural household, primarily semi or unskilled work to people in rural India, whether they are below the poverty line. It was first started in India on 2 February 2006 in a village named Anantapur in Bandawali district of Andhra Pradesh. Initially this scheme was implemented in about 200 districts. Later it was implemented all over India on 1st April 2008. On 31 December 2009, the name of this scheme was changed to Mahatma Gandhi National Employment Guarantee Scheme (Annual Report, 2006-07)<sup>[3]</sup> and (Annual Master Circular, 2020-21)<sup>[5]</sup>.

Its main objective is to provide employment to the people living in the village and increase their work force so that the people living in the village can get employment in the village itself instead of going to the city (Annu *et al.*, 2017).

Employment is very less even in the Rabi season because in this season (at the time of sowing) very few farmers call laborers because most of the farmers are able to do their work with less labor due to broadcasting method. They show willingness to work in the crop, because due to excessive sunlight at the time of harvesting, their interest in working remains low, despite the higher Rabi wages compared to Kharif the interest in work remains low (T.chandra *et al.*, 2020)<sup>[6]</sup>.

#### Methodology

For this study, Dubeypur block in Sultanpur district has been selected and the Probability sampling was used for the selection of villages. In this block, five villages *viz.*, Purey Harikant, Pakdi, Delhi Mubarakpur, Ahimane and Mohaddipur were selected with the background of more worksite participation of beneficiaries in MGNREGA work. With this regard, 10 MGNREGA Workers from each village have been selected based on simple random sampling method, thus comprise the sample size of 50 beneficiaries. The number of respondents for each of the selected villages was chosen by simple random sampling method. The village wise Respondents' details for the study were furnished in Table 1.

 Table 1: Village wise Respondents' details for the study were furnished

Block	Village	Respondents
	Pure Harikant	10
	Pakdi	10
Dubeypur	Delhi Mubarakpur	10
	Ahimane	10
	Mohaddipur	10
Total	05	50

#### **Garrett Ranking Technique**

This technique was used to analyse the constraints faced by

the MGNREGA beneficiaries. To find out the most significant constraints faced by the respondent, Garrett's ranking technique was applied. According this method, participant was asked to specify the rank for all constraints and the results of such ranking have been converted into score value with the help of the following formula: According to Henry Garret (1969) ranking method, the percentage score is computed as

Percentage Score = 
$$\frac{100(R_{ij}-0.5)}{N_j}$$

Where,

 $R_{ij}$  = Rank, ith item, jth individual

 $N_j$  = number of items Ranked by jth individual

With the help of Garrett's table given by Garrett and Woodworth (1969), the per cent position of each rank estimated was converted into scores. For each constraint, the scores of individual respondents was added together and divided by the total number of the respondents. These mean scores for all the constraints were arranged in descending order; the constraints were accordingly ranked.

#### Steps involved in Henry Garrett ranking

Respondents are asked to rank among the "n" number of constraints				
+				
Calculate how many respondents have given 1 <sup>st</sup> to n <sup>th</sup> ranks given for each constraint				
¥				
Calculate the percent position				
Ļ				
Percent position = 100 (R <sub>ij</sub> -0.5)/N <sub>j</sub> ; R <sub>ij</sub> -1 <sup>st</sup> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 3 <sup>rd</sup> , 4 <sup>th</sup> ,nth ranks; Nj= Total ranks given by 50				
respondents (n)				
+				
Find Garrett value for each percent position from Henry Garret table				
1				
Multiply Garret value with the respondents of respective ranks				
↓				
Calculate the Garret score by summing all the values for each constraint				
1				
Calculate the Average score, Average score = Garret score / Total no. of respondents				
÷				
Based on the average score ranking is given in descending order				

Fig 1: Steps involved in Henry Garrett ranking

The respondents were asked to rank the nine constraints identified as 1, 2, 3, 4 .....9 in order to know their preference in the selection of constraint. The calculated percentage position for the rank 1, 2, 3,.....9 and their correspondent

Garrett table. For constraints, the total score is calculated by multiplying the number of respondents ranking that constraint as 1, 2, 3..... and 9. Similar analysis was done by (Balasubramaniam *et al.* 2022)<sup>[1]</sup> & (Dhanavandan, 2016)<sup>[2]</sup>.

Rank	Percent position = 100 (R <sub>ij</sub> -0.5)/N <sub>j</sub>		Garrett value	
1	100*(1-0.5)/9	5.555556	81	
2	100*(2-0.5)/9	16.66667	70	
3	100*(3-0.5)/9	27.77778	62	
4	100*(4-0.5)/9	38.88889	56	
5	100*(5-0.5)/9	50	50	
6	100*(6-0.5)/9	61.11111	45	
7	100*(7-0.5)/9	72.22222	39	
8	100*(8-0.5)/9	83.33333	32	
9	100*(9-0.5)/9	94.4444	20	

Table 2: Percent positions and their corresponding Garrett value

#### **Results and Discussion**

**Table 3:** Ranking of constraints faced by MGNREGA Beneficiaries

S. No.	Constraints	<b>Total Score</b>	<b>Total Garrett Score</b>	Score Rank
1.	Lack of proper knowledge of the program	1937	38.74	9 <sup>th</sup>
2.	Not getting work in needed time	3106	62.12	2 <sup>nd</sup>
3.	No security in their worksite and work	3092	61.84	3 <sup>rd</sup>
4.	The MGNREGA provide low wages than market wages	3209	64.18	1 <sup>st</sup>
5.	Irregular employment	2836	56.72	4 <sup>rth</sup>
6.	No extra benefits from the Govt.	2706	54.12	5 <sup>th</sup>
7.	Inadequate work-site facilities (first aids, sanitary, shade & Creche (children))	2328	46.56	8 <sup>th</sup>
8.	Lack of transparency in execution in local implementing agency	2485	49.7	7 <sup>th</sup>
9.	Lack of unity among the beneficiaries for grievance redresses	2508	50.16	6 <sup>th</sup>

Table 3 showed that the MGNREGA provide low wages than market wages was the most severe constraints as perceived by respondents and ranked first with garret mean score of 64.18 followed by not getting work in needed time with garret mean score of 62.12. No security in their worksite and work was ranked third with Garrett mean score of 61.84 followed by irregular employment, no extra benefits from the Govt., Lack of unity among the beneficiaries for grievance redresses, Lack of transparency in execution in local implementing agency, inadequate work-site facilities (first aids, sanitary, shade & Creche (children)) and lack of proper knowledge of the program were the other major constraints as perceived by farmer with Garrett score of 56.72, 54.12, 50.16, 49.7, 46.56, and 38.74, respectively.

#### Conclusion

In this study it was found that the major constraints faced by the MGNREGA beneficiaries were the MGNREGA provide low wages than market wages, not getting work in needed time, no security in their worksite, irregular employment, no extra benefits from the Govt, lack of unity among the beneficiaries for grievance redresses, lack of transparency in execution in local implementing agency. In case of registered family have the right to get 100 days of employment in a particular financial year, but maximum of the respondents say that 100 days of employment is not available, the reason for this was found to be lack of detailed information about the act insufficient work allocation and jointly addressing their demands due to the lack of harmony and unity among the participants which was due to the involvement of some political elements. The scheme provides safe and secure employment opportunities to the women without any discrimination on the basis of caste, colour, religion, and gender.

#### References

1. Balasubramaniam P, Sriram N, Shanjeeika V, Mohanraj V, Divya G. Constraints faced by officials of Mahatma

Gandhi national rural employment guarantee Act, The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2022;11(3):1494-1497.

- 2. Dhanavandan S. Application of garret ranking technique: Practical approach, International Journal of Library and Information Studies. 2016;5(1):135-140.
- 3. Government of India, Annual Report, 2006-07. Department of rural development. Retrieved from www.rural.nic.in
- Gora AD, Joshi Madhuri, Radhika Tanwer. Problems perceived by the women workers under MGNREGA in Jaipur District of Rajasthan, India, International Journal of current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2017;6(8):3591-3596.
- 5. Government of India, Annual Master Circular, 2020-21. Department of rural development. Retrieved from www.nrega.nic.in
- Chandra Kala T, Mabel Sulochana R. Problems faced by the mahatma gandhi national rural employment guarantee scheme women workers in vilavancode taluk of Kanyakumari district, Mukt Shabd Journal. 2020;9(4):2347-3150.