**Impact of MGNREGS on Rural-Out Migration in Telangana**

**Abstract**

Human migration is the movement of people from one place to another with intentions of settling temporarily or permanently at a new location in the country or outside the country. The movement is often occurs over long distances which is the dominant form of human migration globally. It has a high potential to improve human development, and some studies confirm that migration is the most direct route out of poverty.The migration rate with in India between 2020-2021 was almost 29 percent, which means about 26.5 percent of the population in the rural areas of the country were migrants, while this was about 35 percent in urban areas. Females recorded a higher share of migration rate of 47.9%; with 48% in rural and 47.8% in urban areas. Migration rate for males was 10.7%, with 5.9% in rural and 22.5% in urban areas. Migration in India is on the rise because the unemployment rate in India is high (15 per cent), and there are not enough jobs for people who want a job. In Telangana also as per 2011 census nearly 30% or 307 million of population are migrants, majority of them are marginalized sections of the society i.e. SC/ST/OBC/Women who migrates to Hyderabad city in search of employment. This paper attempts to study the impact of MGNREGS on Rural-Out migration among Gond, Koya, Chenchu and Lambada tribes from selected villages in Telangana for the year 2015-16.
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**Introduction**

Migration is a global phenomenon across the globe, 24 crores of population has migrated from the international level, and around 76 crores population migrated from within the countries; altogether 1 billion population have been located in urban areas as the reason of migration (UNDESA, 2016). At the Global level, every 7th person has migrated; this phenomenon is led to population diversity in most developed nations, whereas internal migration is more frequent in developing countries. The migration have multidimensional ways, such as external and internal, rural to urban, seasonal, voluntary, involuntary, cultural-based, etc. Across the world there are many factors for migration, such as social, economic, political, and environmental, and these are all concerned with push and pull factors. The main push factors are economic, unemployment, crop failure, climate change, rural poverty, unsustainable livelihood, socio-political and cultural, political instability, slavery, bonded labour, inadequate essential services and development based projects, etc., factors of migration. On the other hand, some pull factors also led to the migration, such as searching for work, wealth prospects, industrial innovations, freedom, family reunifications, food security, affordable and accessible urban services, and a favourable climate for the overall development, etc. According to the 2011 Census, the total urban population is 37.7 crores, constituting 31.2 percent of the whole population of India. From 2001 to 2011, the metropolitan cities and towns increased from 5,161 to 7,936. The growth rate of urbanization worked out as about 35.0 percent, which is a result of the additional 2775 towns has increased during the last census period. The cities with more than one million populations have grown from 35 in 2001 to 53 in 2011; these are all around 43.0 percent of India's urban population. The High Power Expert Committee estimated India's urbanization in 2011; by 2031, the total urban population will go up to 60 crores, and the metropolitan cities will go up 87 by the projected growth rate of the urban population. As per the report, the other urban population will increase by about 22.5 crores to the present urban population. The population growth of metropolitan India is mainly by migration and the general population growth together, the urban population will be at a significant level. The HPEC also advocates that the direct migration to urban areas is estimated at about 20 to 25 percent of the total urban population. The main challenges of the urban areas have concerned a housing shortage of 18.78 million at the beginning of the 12 Plan.

**The Economics of Migration in India**

***A. The Political Economy of Migration at the Origin:***

The major economic factor contributing to migration is easily identified as the lack of employment opportunities in rural areas. The employment opportunities, in turn, are related to the locational characteristics of the village in terms of flood or drought proneness of the region; the agricultural calendar of the region, i.e. whether it is irrigated and multiple-cropping is a common practice or whether it is rain-fed or mostly cultivated in one season; its proximity to a city or town, etc. It also has to do with the political economy in the village in terms of land ownership, the concentration of land in the hands of a few would give them a great deal of power and result in the control of these power elites over employment in general.

While the communist parties in India continue to protest on the prevalence of landlordism and landed power in Indian villages, a debate has ensued over the relevance of landlordism today. The debate arose in the context of fragmentation of land through inheritance. It is believed that demography has achieved what land reform could not. Additionally, a fragmentation of land means greater reliance on family labour, thus, reducing the employment opportunities for the landless in agriculture. These groups, thus, also remain deprived of access to capital. Land is an essential asset in the village. There can be two ways in which non-farm employment opportunities can become available in villages. Either the state can provide it or the market. By market, we mean some entrepreneurial initiative in the village. But the skewed ownership of land and social power in the villages result in a fundamentally fragmented market. It is only the landed elites who can undertake such entrepreneurial activities. Thus, they would maintain effective control over non- farm employment too. In this way ownership of land continues to have strong links with power.

Even state initiatives like the NREGS to provide non-farm employment are liable to capture by local powers. In many parts of the country, the landless labourers in villages are in quasi-bonded relations with powerful contractors. In Jharkhand for instance, labourers do not even have the right to manage their own NREGS job-card which is often in the possession of the contractor.

Migration away from villages has two faces. In one scenario, the labourer attempts to get away from these oppressive relations by migrating to a city. In the other scenario, it is these contractors who send the labourers on temporary migration paths. Such migration may be peculiar to specific regions, but very little attention has been paid to it. Thus far, we have spoken mostly of the landless labourer. What about the landed households which have members who have migrated? This too has links with the political economy of land. The fragmentation of land has meant that the demand for labour on the smallholding is sometimes outstripped by the supply of labour. Also, the income generated by the smallholding is insufficient to meet the consumption needs of the household. In this scenario, migration becomes an important strategy for households. It can have two forms. Firstly, it could be a coping strategy and could help meet the consumption needs of the family. Secondly, it could be an accumulative strategy through which the household could acquire new assets and perhaps diversify its activity.

***B. Migration – The Journey***

There have been remarkable improvements to transport infrastructure across the country. While in an earlier times the Indian railways were the predominant mode of transportation and people often migrated to nearby towns by foot. There has now been significant upgrading of the road network connecting different parts of the country. Public transport like buses and various other forms of para-transit such as Lorries, share autos, tempos, jeeps, etc. provide sufficiently inexpensive options for people to travel over small distances. A metropolis like Hyderabad is well connected through these modes with the regions that surround it. These regions attract the largest proportion of migrants to the city, because the transport options make it very viable.

***C. Economic Conditions at the Destination and the Migrants' Propensity to Save:***

Another facet of migration that is getting a great deal of attention is the casualization of migrant labour in cities. This casualization is mostly seen as a consequence of neoliberal policies and the dismantling of PSUs. However, rather than considering it as a consequence of the process of neo- liberalization, casualization must be seen as a strategy that is constitutive of neo liberalization. In recent decades PSUs have consciously outsourced even core functions to contractors. Neo liberalization, then, has a dual impact, whereby people in regions are faced with invigorated threats of dispossession by private companies and the workers in the cities are either facing retrenchment or giving in to increasingly casual modes of work. This understanding of neo- liberalization forms an important backdrop for understanding migration at the present juncture and will inform some of our analyses of the data gathered in this study. Casualization has had several drastic impacts on the lives of workers in the cities. Unstable Employment which often fluctuates on a daily basis is a major consequence. Labourers wait at designated labour platforms for contractors to come pick them up for daily-wage work. Inability to get work at the labour adda for women has forced some of them to engage in sex-work. For heads of the family household, inability to get work would have multiplied effects on the well-being of the family. Unstable employment also makes it impossible for the worker to save except for short-term contingencies; this means a loss of remittance for the family in the place of origin. In this context, one must be wary of romanticizing the positive effects of migration. Contractors in the city can be just as powerful as those in villages. Relations of quasi-bondage are obtained in cities too. The poor economic conditions of workers in cities have several links with the politics that defines the discourse of migration. There are complex ways in which the state and market are co-implicated in the miserable living and working conditions of migrant workers. In the next section, we will look into this politics of migration.

**Objectives**

1. To analyze the migration statistics in India and Telangana.

2. To estimate the migration among the Gond, Koya, Chenchu, and Lambada tribes in

Selected Villages of Telangana before MGNREGS.

3. To estimate the migration and impact of MGNREGS on the Gond, Koya, Chenchu, and

Lambada tribes in selected villages of Telangana after MGNREGS.

**Review of Literature**

**(Dodd et al., 2017)** MGNREGS discouraged rural out-migration by increasing the rural out-migrants’ opportunity cost since the programme provided guaranteed employment primarily during the off-season of agriculture.

**P M Honnekeri et al (2012)** have made a study in two villages in Gulbarga district of Karnataka to examine the impact of MGNREGS on rural – urban migration. Sixty households have been surveyed to examine the living conditions of the poor and it is noted that employment security is provided by the MGNREGS. The study concludes by asserting that MGNREGS is capable of discouraging rural urban migration by providing means of livelihood in the villages through wage employment.

**Shah V D et al (2011)** have made an assessment of MGNREGS with respect to employment generation, rural - urban migration, asset creation, determinants of participation and implementation in 5 districts of Gujarat. The study shows that migration is discouraged to some extent though low wages and employment days encourage some households to migrate to other places. Increase in food consumption of the beneficiaries of MGNREGS is noted and the quality of assets created has been poor due to lack of proper planning and maintenance. More than 43 90 percent of the respondents have stated that the assets are useful to the village community and MGNREGS provides scope for infrastructural development of the village.

**P M Honnekeri et al (2012)** have made a study in two villages in Gulbargadistrict of Karnataka to examine the impact of MGNREGS on rural – urban migration. Sixty households have been surveyed to examine the living conditions of the poor and it is noted that employment security is provided by the MGNREGS. The study concludes by asserting that MGNREGS is capable of discouraging rural urban migration by providing means of livelihood in the villages through wage employment.

**Methodology and Data**

For this study the data is collected both from primary and secondary sources. The secondary data sources used for the study includes the information available on the official website of MGNREGA ([www.mgnrega.nic.in](http://www.mgnrega.nic.in)), my own Ph D resesearch thesis for all India data and ww.mgnrega.telangana.nic.in for Telangana state data and for selected districts, mandals are collected. The selection of districts is done on the basis of the tribes and concentration of that tribe’s population. In case of Gond, this tribe is concentrated more in Adilabad district and it is selected for the study on Gond tribe. In case of Koya tribe, it is concentrated more in Khammam district and is far from the mainstream society, and this district is selected for Koya tribe. In case of Chenchu tribe it is a primitive tribal group and they are concentrated in Nallamala forest area which is in Mahabubnagar district and it is selected. In case of Lambada tribe they are more in Warangal district in the ITDA area of Kothaguda and this district is selected for the study on Lambada tribe.

**Table 1 State wise Number of persons who Migrated-Out for Work & Employment**

**in India as per Census - 2011 (Migrant Workers)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.No** | **State** | **Persons** | Males | Females |
| 1 | ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS | **52,129** | 47,229 | 4,900 |
| 2 | **ANDHRA PRADESH** | **37,37,316** | 30,51,811 | 6,85,505 |
| 3 | ARUNACHAL PRADESH | **1,19,244** | 93,441 | 25,803 |
| 4 | ASSAM | **5,72,064** | 4,93,877 | 78,187 |
| 5 | BIHAR | **7,06,557** | 5,39,176 | 1,67,381 |
| 6 | CHANDIGARH | **2,06,642** | 1,91,668 | 14,974 |
| 7 | CHHATTISGARH | **10,21,077** | 8,65,897 | 1,55,180 |
| 8 | DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI | **63,779** | 60,588 | 3,191 |
| 9 | DAMAN & DIU | **73,782** | 70,592 | 3,190 |
| 10 | GOA | **1,15,870** | 99,913 | 15,957 |
| 11 | **GUJARAT** | **30,41,779** | 26,85,190 | 3,56,589 |
| 12 | HARYANA | **13,33,644** | 11,47,374 | 1,86,270 |
| 13 | HIMACHAL PRADESH | **2,96,268** | 2,36,454 | 59,814 |
| 14 | JAMMU & KASHMIR | **1,22,587** | 1,00,680 | 21,907 |
| 15 | JHARKHAND | **8,24,259** | 7,24,065 | 1,00,194 |
| 16 | KARNATAKA | **28,87,216** | 23,67,901 | 5,19,315 |
| 17 | KERALA | **7,13,934** | 5,59,263 | 1,54,671 |
| 18 | LAKSHADWEEP | **6,135** | 5,375 | 760 |
| 19 | MADHYA PRADESH | **24,15,635** | 20,27,884 | 3,87,751 |
| 20 | **MAHARASHTRA** | **79,01,819** | 68,19,915 | 10,81,904 |
| 21 | MANIPUR | **22,750** | 16,441 | 6,309 |
| 22 | MEGHALAYA | **52,797** | 38,769 | 14,028 |
| 23 | MIZORAM | **62,828** | 45,688 | 17,140 |
| 24 | NAGALAND | **1,10,779** | 88,923 | 21,856 |
| 25 | NCT OF DELHI | **20,29,489** | 18,98,884 | 1,30,605 |
| 26 | ODISHA | **8,51,363** | 7,14,603 | 1,36,760 |
| 27 | PUDUCHERRY | **70,721** | 60,366 | 10,355 |
| 28 | PUNJAB | **12,44,056** | 10,60,487 | 1,83,569 |
| 29 | **RAJASTHAN** | **17,09,602** | **14,45,847** | **2,63,755** |
| 30 | SIKKIM | **46,554** | 38,703 | 7,851 |
| 31 | **TAMIL NADU** | **34,87,974** | 27,74,086 | 7,13,888 |
| 32 | TRIPURA | **92,097** | 74,594 | 17,503 |
| 33 | **UTTAR PRADESH** | **31,56,125** | 25,91,421 | 5,64,704 |
| 34 | UTTARAKHAND | **6,17,094** | 5,50,465 | 66,629 |
| 35 | WEST BENGAL | **16,56,952** | 14,29,130 | 2,27,822 |
|  | **INDIA** | **4,14,22,917** | **3,50,16,700** | **64,06,217** |

Source: Data on Seasonal Migrants, Ministry of Labour & Employment, based on Censes 2011

Table 1 gives details of seasonal migration of people state wise during 2010-11 based on censes 2011. All India wide the number of people who migrated was **4, 14, 22,917 out of which 3, 50, 16,700 are males and 64, 06,217 are females, makes it clear that males constitutes larger portion of total migration. In India Maharashtra states is top in migration with** 79, 01, 819 of which **68, 19,915** are males and 10, 81,904 are females, followed by **Andhra Pradesh** with a huge persons of **37, 37, 316** of which **30,51,811** are males and **6,85,505** are females. The **Manipur** is being a small state stood at least place in migration with a persons of 22,750. Telangana state was a part of erstwhile state of Andhra Pradesh having a big number of migrations from rural to urban areas during the study period.

**Table: 2 Employment Generation (Person Days) under MGNREGA at All India Level**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Employment Generated (Person Days) (in crore)** |
| 2006-07 | 90.5 |
| 2007-08 | 144 |
| 2008-09 | 216 |
| 2009-10 | 284 |
| 2010-11 | 257 |
| **2011-12** | **211** |
| 2012-13 | 230 |
| 2013-14 | 220 |
| 2014-15 | 166 |
| **2015-16** | **235** |
| 2016-17 | 236 |
| 2017-18 | 234 |
| **Compound Annual Growth Rate** | **8.63** |

Source: MGNREGA website

In the above table 2 we can examine the generation of employment person days at all India level from the inception of the Act 2006-07 to 2017-18. In the year 2006-07 it was 90.5 crore person days of employment was generated and it increased to 234 crore person days of employment during 2017-18 financial year. It can also be observed that there is 8.63 compound annual growth rates of person days of employment over the 12 years period of time. This can be understood that these yearly person days of employment might have reduced the rural to urban migration in the country. In the above table 1, it reveals that **4.14 persons migrated to other places in search of employment for the year 2011-12, either temporarily or permanently, at the same period the MGNRGS provided 211 crores of person days of employment which makes it clear that migration has come down to that extent. The same can be understand for the financial year 2015-16 i.e. 235 crores of person days generated through MGNREGS in the country with an annual growth rate of 8.63. This can be negatively interlinked with MGNREGS person days and migration in the country.**

**Migration in Telangana**

 About 21 per cent of the Telangana state’s population was in urban areas in 1971, this has grown by 38.9 per cent which is the highest in urban population growth across the country which has been revealed in the Socio-Economic Survey 2019. Successive governments have failed to provide employment opportunities to the rural population despite implementing several schemes. Explaining rural trends, the report said that as per 2011 Census, 1.36 crore, i.e., 38.9 per cent of the state’s total population of 3.5 crore, now lives in urban areas.

According to the Socio Economic Survey report, Telangana is one of the fastest urbanising states in the country, along with rapid economic transformation. Urban centres have become epicentres for industrial and service-oriented business activity, robust transportation, civic facilities and availability of skilled workforce. Hyderabad alone accounts for a lion’s share of the state’s urban population and has become a growth centre for the state. In addition, cities like Warangal, Nizamabad and Karimnagar are fast changing, adding to the urban landscape of the state. The report stated that urban local bodies in the state were completely neglected and most active developmental and infrastructure projects were taken up by the municipal corporation, especially in Hyderabad.

Majority of Telangana districts especially Karimnagar, Nizamabad, Adilabad, Warangal, Mahabub nagar , have witnessed due to extensive severe unemployment in rural areas forced migration to Bombay, Nagpur and Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates (UAE). Beginning from the second half of the 1980s, people from the Telangana region migrated to the Gulf as a response to the perpetual droughts, lack of irrigable water and the consequential agricultural distress, as well as the heightened naxalism and police encounters. The Gulf oil boom of the 1970s and the tremendous infrastructural development in the region spurred the demand for labour that acted as a pull factor. Since then, the migration of people of all ages, classes and skill levels from the Telangana region to the Gulf is uninterrupted.

Emigration is not often a blissful affair, even though most people migrate voluntarily to the Gulf land of plenty to materialise their dreams of becoming rich, buying land, building secure houses, and saving money for a better future for their family and children. It is necessary to equip and empower them to deal with the complications that may arise at all stages of migration.

Poverty, unemployment, lack of opportunities, local entrepreneurial environment and debt from agriculture force many to seek jobs in Gulf countries. Expatriates from Telangana mostly work in low-paid, semi and low-skilled unorganised sectors of construction, retail, driving, sanitation and domestic work. A few work in the skilled sectors of care services, hospitality and hotel management as well.

### ****Return and Re-migration****

Unlike the earlier waves of return migration during the Gulf War (1990s), the oil crisis and the economic depression (2000s), or the labour nationalisation (2010s), the pandemic-induced return is unprecedented. The prospect of re-migration is bleak, especially for the low-skilled, with Gulf labour markets moving forward with rigorous migrant labour reduction programmes as a response to the economic fragility, demographic transition and rising unemployment among natives. Parallelly, India is going through an alarming phase of rising unemployment and declining economic growth. It is in this context that these jobless migrants are returning, feeling dejected and disillusioned. It is estimated that over 75,000 migrant workers in the Gulf from across Telangana are terminated from their jobs and hurriedly returned without procuring salary arrears and end-of-service benefits such as bonus, PF, gratuity, and so on.

The unsettled to the lack of alternative livelihood opportunities and a supportive reintegration and rehabilitation policy, many returnees, especially between the age group of 20 and 45 years are left with no option other than to re-migrate to the Gulf. The majority of the people who cannot re-migrate to gulf are settled with MGNREGS employment in their villages with 100 days of employment. This can be understood from the selected tribes, from selected villages of Telangana.

**Table 3: Occupational Details of Respondents**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Occupation** | **Beharanguda**  **/Kundel Pahad (Gond)** | **Gummadidoddi**  **(Koya)** | **Yerrapenta**  **(Chenchu)** | **Ootai Thanda**  **(Lambada)** |
| **Labour** | **26** | **0** | **74** | **19** |
| **Agricultural Farmer** | **46** | **73** | **1** | **15** |
| **Artisan** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **2** |
| **Landed Agricultural Labour** | **0** | **2** | **0** | **38** |
| **Others** | **3** | **0** | **0** | **1** |
| **Total** | **75** | **75** | **75** | **75** |

Source: Field survey 2015-16.

Table 3 gives the details of occupational distribution of respondents in four selected villages in the Telangana. Out of 300 respondents in four villages majority of them are labour and agricultural farmers. In Beharanguda /Kundel Pahad villages of Adilabad district the Gond tribe respondents are 75 and out of them 46 are agricultural farmers and 26 are labour. InGummadidoddi village of Khammam district the Koya tribe respondents are 75 and out of them 73 are agricultural farmers and 2 are Landed Agricultural labour. InYerrapentavillage of Mahabubnagar district the Chenchu tribe respondents are 75 and out of them 74 are labour and only one is agricultural farmer. InOotai Thandavillage of Warangal district the Lambada tribe respondents are 75 and out of them 19 are labour 15 are agricultural farmers, 2 are Artisans and 38 are Landed agricultural labour the tribe having variety of occupations. Overall the majority of the respondents of four tribes are labourers or agricultural farmers with meagre incomes and are forced to migrate for different places in the country in search of better employment.

**Table 4: Details of Migration Before and After MGNREGS**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Details** | **Beharanguda**  **/Kundel Pahad (Gond)** | | | | **Gummadidoddi**  **(Koya)** | | | | **Yerrapenta**  **(Chenchu)** | | | | **Ootai Thanda**  **(Lambada)** | |
| **Before**  **NREGA** | | **After**  **NREGA** | | **Before**  **NREGA** | | **After**  **NREGA** | | **Before**  **NREGA** | | **After**  **NREGA** | | **Before**  **NREGA** | **After**  **NREGA** |
| Male | 30 | 15 | | 5 | | 4 | | 23 | | 3 | | 50 | | 20 |
| Female | 35 | 10 | | 3 | | 2 | | 22 | | 2 | | 50 | | 20 |
| Total | 65 | 25 | | 8 | | 6 | | 45 | | 5 | | 100 | | 40 |
| **Migration**  **Reduction** | **---** | **40** | | **---** | | **2** | | **---** | | **40** | | **---** | | **60** |
| Places of  Migration | 1.Hyderabad  2.Mumbai | | | | 1.Chattisgarh  2. Mumbai. | | | | 1.Chennai  2.Rajesthan | | | | 1.Hyderabad  2.Maharastra | |

Source: Field survey 2015-16.

Table 4 gives the information about the migration details among the selected four tribes in selected villages. The total persons out migrated before the start of MGNREGA scheme from the four villages are 218, out of which 65 persons out migrated from Beharanguda and Kundelpahad villages of Gond tribe, 8 persons from Gummadidddi of Koya tribe, 45 persons from Yerrapenta village of Chenchu tribe and 100 persons from Ootai thanda village of Lambada tribe. Out of this 218 migrated persons, 113 male persons and 105 are female persons. The lambada tribe respondents were used to go for out migration more among the four tribes with roughly 100 persons which includes 50 male and 50 female. But after the start of MGNREGA scheme this out migration has come down to 76 persons from all the four households. Some of the out migrated people have stopped to go outside of the village in search of employment because of the MGNREGA is providing 100 days of employment for rural household in a year at minimum wage rate. This made the tribal people to reduce out migration along with agricultural related works in their lands like land leveling, stone clearance, and bush clearance. Gattula nirmanam, band plantation etc. made indirect additional income. There are about 142 out of 300 respondents who came back to villages from out migration from the four tribes. From Gond tribe about 40 respondents who came back from out migration, in Koya tribe this out migration is very less and 2 respondents who came back from, in case of Chenchu tribe this number is 40, both male and female respondents who came back from out migration, and in case of Lambada tribe the out migration is very high and it has come down in the same manner reduced from 100 persons to 40 persons witnessed 60 persons have come back to village from out migration. All these tribal people prefer to go for out migration to places like Hyderabad, Mumbai, predominantly and Chennai, Rajasthan, Chhattisgarh, Maharashtra.

**Summary and Conclusion**

The migration is a global issue spread over to all the countries irrespective of the development status of the economies. The migration may be in search of livelihood or for better employment. In the 21st century migration has become a common issue to become rich or to get better employment thanks to LPG reforms across the world. At all India level the number of people who migrated was **4.14 crores as per 2011 census and MGNREGS has generated 211 crores of person days of employment which can be understood that this might have reduced migration in the country.** In Telangana also majority of the poor and marginalised sections of the people usually migrates to Hyderabad and to gulf countries in search of better employment especially from rural areas. But due to unfavourable conditions in the migrated countries due to various reasons most of them have returned to their villages and settled by enrolling for MGNREGA works. Among the 4 selected tribes from 4 selected villages also a total of 142 out of 300 respondents have returned back to their villages due a guarantee of 100 days of employment with minimum wage in a year without additional cost of expenditure at outside their homes in the cities. So the MGNREGS has undoubtedly changed the rural scenario of the country by providing more than 100 days of employment, creation of assets, minimum wages, and reduced the migration.
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