



# The Role Of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Programme (MGNREGP) In Preventing Migration Among The Rural Households: An Overview

Kakarla. Srinivasa Rao,  
Lecturer in Political Science,  
Government Model Degree College,  
Yerragondapalem,  
Prakasam District,  
Andhra Pradesh State.  
India-523327

## Abstract:

A significant target of Mahatma Gandhi Public Provincial Business Assurance Program (MGNREGP) is to check rustic out-relocation. This paper based on a miniature level field examination needs to explore the viability of this program to decrease the power of movement of the provincial unfortunate families to urban regions. The overview region is a mono-editing region however work in the private non-ranch work in the territory is accessible modestly. In addition, the small distances between the surveyed villages and the nearby urban or semi-urban areas indicate that daily migration is inexpensive. Moreover, all of the migrants in our sample villages migrate on a daily basis. The neighborhood ranch, normal private non-ranch wage and the typical compensation rate in the close by metropolitan casual area is more than MGNREGP piece-rate. Subsequently, looking for work here through MGNREGP isn't exogenous yet endogenous in nature. In this research article, it is demonstrated that 'inspiration' is a component which impacts the neighborhood MGNREGP work card holders to get more individual long stretches of work through MGNREGP and the families who could get more individual long stretches of work through MGNREGP are less inclined to relocate from their local town.

**Key Words:** Rural, Labour, MGNREGP, Migration, Endogeneity.

## Introduction:

This paper aims to bring out some key facts and information on the effectiveness of Mahatma Gandhi Public National Rural Employment Guarantee Programme (MGNREGP) in India. It is a government assistance program chiefly for the provincial individuals, whose great goal is to offer hundred days of work to jobless families in their own territory inside a whole bookkeeping year at which the partaking worker will get the public authority proclaimed piece rate after culmination of relegated work inside a solitary individual day. The fact that this business program makes it ordinary through creating work in the neighborhoods lessens the force of provincial to metropolitan movement. Provincial to metropolitan relocation implies development of individuals from rustic regions to metropolitan regions to look for work. The significant

purposes behind this development can be grouped into push and pull factors. A push factor is something that can urge individuals to for the most part get away from an area because of absence of business opportunity or what they can acquire in their own isn't adequate enough for keeping up with the means level of utilization and pull factor is one which urges individuals to move to an area for better possibility landing more generously compensated position. It is normal that MGNREGP might check the push element of movement.

Appropriate extension of MGNREGP in town level can produce adequate non-ranch work nearer to home in fair working condition and can improve both ranch as well as non-ranch wage which can really take a look at relocation for better paid work and business opportunity. There might be another counter contention which will tell that this sort of program might help the poor provincial families to further develop their profit which might be used as relocation cost and there is a plausibility that helping more individual long stretches of work through MGNREGP might support the out-movement of the provincial families. Kumar and Prasanna (2010) had shown that MGNREGP has decreased the misery movement of the rustic workers. Verma (2012) had likewise backed this viewpoint. Be that as it may, both the examinations were finished in the financially in reverse regions where the accessibility of occupation in the private non-ranch area was exceptionally poor. In this present circumstance, the rustic work families had little choice yet needed to look for work through MGNREGP during the agrarian leeway season or need to relocate in the urban regions for endurance purposes. However, our concentrate on region is very unique where private non-ranch business is tolerably accessible during farming lean season and the geological distance between the local rustic region and the close by metropolitan region is little which demonstrates extremely minimal expense of movement. Therefore, among rural households, seeking employment through MGNREGP is not the primary employment opportunity in their own neighborhood, particularly during the agricultural slack season. Subsequently, all out number of individual days looking for work through MGNREGP may not be exogenous however endogenous in nature. On the premise of this foundation, we need to research whether development of MGNREGP in such district can lessen the power of day to day trouble out-relocation of the country unfortunate families. Still presently there is no quantitative review has done in this theme. We here will attempt to do that, where not the cooperation in MGNREGP, yet number of long periods of work under this program in a specific bookkeeping year is considered as 'figure' this 'influence assessment'.

### **Sample selection:**

The current review depends on the overview of families in the Macherla Mandal of 13Parganas locale of Andhra Pradesh, India, one of the country's 250 financially most in reverse environment in 2019 (Service of Panchayati Raj, 2022). Normal individual days produced through MGNREGP in the South 13Parganas locale were 17.16 in 2019-20, 20.32 in 2020-21 and 32.12 in 2021-22 separately. The Macherla Mandal has 13villages. In our miniature level review, we have unevenly picked ST Colony blocks of that region. From that block we have picked three gram panchayats, Mutyalampadu, Nagulavaram and Pasuvemula, randomly. We have selected three gram-shansads, each of which is essentially a village, at random from each gram panchayat. During the hour of picking them, two significant angles were thought of: (i) the agrarian

economy of the villages and (ii) the accessibility of occupation in the confidential homestead and non-ranch area within the towns and in the outer world for example in different towns as well as in the close by metropolitan or semi-metropolitan region of the local towns. The villages' agro climatic conditions were observed to be identical. A large portion of the occupant families are either little or negligible ranchers or rustic work families and has BPL card. Every one of the ranchers develops their own property in the blustery season. In any case, in the winter because of significant expense of development and absence of accessibility of own family workforce, a decent level of the minimal and little rancher families are not continuously able to develop. During that time, they have three choices: (i) work in the private non-ranch area, (ii) work through MGNREGP and (iii) move to the close by town region (Macherla Town) where they can have work principally as development laborer on regular routine. So, we guarantee that work open doors and different pay structures in the example towns are practically same. Consequently, the test towns can be called homogeneous in nature with regards to business valuable open doors. From the authority site of MGNREGP, we have distinguished the families of every gram shansad who selected themselves in this work program preceding the monetary year 2021-22 in light of the fact that in our examination, monetary year 2021-22 (from April 2021 to Walk 2022) was picked as reference period and this purposive testing guarantees that all the picked families can look for work through MGNREGP in the whole reference period. It emerged from the authority site of MGNREGP that before the monetary year 2021-22, on a normal 60 families enlisted themselves under this business program in each example town.

Thus from these families, we have haphazardly picked around 35 families from every gram shansads. Complete example size of our family is 314. All the example families are either provincial work family or minor/little rancher family. The field review was finished between May 2022 to July 2022. This time span is picked with the goal that we can get essential financial data including individual long stretches of various sorts of work of the example families in the monetary year 2021-22 keeping the review time frame as least as could really be expected. It would be ideal for it to be moreover noticed that appropriate development of this work program in our example towns had begun fundamentally from the monetary year 2021-22. Prior to that, the majority of households received no more than 25 individual workdays. In any case, in the reference period 172 out of 314 example families got in excess of 45 man long periods of business. Again out of 172 example families, 30 families could figure out how to get full 100 days of work. Other than that there are 1149 enrolled families who looked for no individual day work in the whole reference period through this program. Hence, we see the presence of wide heterogeneity in a similar district among the test families during the hour of getting work through MGNREGP. It's important to note that the term "household" is used as a unit in this impact evaluation.

### **Research Methodology:**

Migration decision is here treated as 'binary response' and takes the value either 1 or 0. It is considered as 1 when we observe daily migration of any member of the sample household at least once in the entire reference period. Otherwise it is considered as '0'. We have to consider a set of explanatory variables which contain various household specific characteristics and on the basis of the estimation of



Probit model, we want to identify the factor(s) which can influence the migration decision of a household. But the parameter estimates of the original Probit model will be biased if at least one explanatory variable becomes endogenous. To tackle this problem we have to take the help of Instrumental variable estimation in the Probit model. We have to carefully take the instrumental variable of the endogenous explanatory variable of the original probit model in such a way that the instrument is correlated with the endogenous explanatory variable and uncorrelated with the error term of the original Probit model. The Eq. (1) is the original probit model and Eq.(2) actually explains the possible explanatory variables which can influence the 'endogenous' explanatory variable of Eq.(1).

$$MIGR_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 AFM_i + \alpha_2 NREGSDAY_i + \alpha_3 BPL_i + \alpha_4 EDU_i + \alpha_5 LANDSIZE_i + \alpha_6 TNONFARM_i + \mu_i \dots \text{Eq.(1)}$$

In Eq.(1) we consider 'NREGSDAY' as endogenous explanatory variable. There should be one variable in Eq. (2) which should not be in Eq.(1). So we have Eq. (2) which is narrated below.  $NREGSDAY = \beta_0 + \beta_1 MOTIVATION_i + \beta_2 LANDSIZE_i + \beta_3 BPL_i + \beta_4 TNONFARM_i + \epsilon_i \dots \text{Eq. (2)}$

At first, we need to legitimize the use of Instrumental variable in the first Probit model. In the event that we can do that really at that time we can draw the derivations. The factors utilized in Eq. (1) and Eq.(2) are described beneath:  $MIGR \Rightarrow$  This is sham ward variable of Eq.(1). The idea of this variable has proactively made sense of previously. So here, 'MIGR' can take any of the two qualities 1 or '0'. In our field overview, it is seen that the traveler worker is really an everyday transient worker who lives in his/her local town yet go external the town essentially to local metropolitan regions to take care of business in the casual area (principally in development area) on everyday schedule. On a normal 148 out of the 314 example families announced that before 2011-12 no less than one individual from every family relocated to the close by metropolitan region as everyday traveler for better pay and work, yet presently the size descended to 68. The everyday pay pace of the transient workers in various metropolitan casual area in the reference period was between Rs.180 to Rs.250 which is a lot higher than neighborhood private nonfarm wage and per-individual day MGNREGP piece rate. That's what we know whether MGNREGP is appropriately extended, then one can expect that the willing families can look for more individual long stretches of work locally. Therefore, we must determine whether this expansion in the sample villages can lessen the rate of rural participating household migration.

$AFM \Rightarrow$  Absolute number of grown-up people (between age 18 and 50) in each example families. It is normal that the chance of movement might be a lot higher among the test families which comprises of more number of grown-up working individuals.

NREGSDAY indicates the total number of man-days households worked under MGNREGP during the 2011–12 fiscal year. In our example, on a normal, the families are looking for 49 person days of work through MGNREGP. Because of heterogeneity among the families during the hour of getting work through MGNREGP, there might exist something like one variable which can impact the choice of the example country families during the hour of looking for business through this work program. So in Eq. (1), NREGSDAY is thought of as endogenous regressor of Eq. (1)

$BPLDUMMY_i = >$  Regardless of whether the  $i$ th family has a place with BPL class. It is treated as Sham Variable and takes the worth 1 in the event that the family is a BPL card holder or '0' in any case.

It is anticipated that BPL cardholder households will be more likely to relocate to the nearby urban area in search of better-paying jobs or to utilize MGNREGP to obtain additional person-days of employment. In our examination, out of 314 example families, 290 families (92%) have a place with BPL class.

$EDU_i \Rightarrow$  Training level (estimated with regards to long periods of tutoring) of the top of the  $i^{th}$  respondent family.

$LANDSIZE_i \Rightarrow$  Size of land claimed by the  $i^{th}$  respondent family. Responsibility for demonstrates financial prosperity of a country family. We have already mentioned that the majority of the landowners in our sample belong to the "marginal farmer" class. It is anticipated that landholding families may be less likely to seek employment through MGNREGP in their own neighborhood or to relocate to a nearby urban area in search of better-paying work. Only 28 of the 314 sample households in our investigation belonged to the landholding class, and all of them were marginal farmer households. The excess families are landless.

$TNONFARM =$  The total number of person-days that the members of the respondent households worked outside of agriculture, with the exception of MGNREGP, during the entire reference period in the neighborhood. We have proactively referenced that 'NREGSDAY' is here thought to be as an endogenous logical variable of Eq. (1). Yet, we accept that the leftover informative factors of Eq. (1) are uncorrelated with ' $\mu$ '. Subsequently the diminished type of condition of 'NREGSDAY' is written in Eq. (i). Presently as 49 out of 314 upsides of 'NREGSDAY' is zero, we need to take the assistance of blue-penciled relapse or 'Tobit' model (which is really a cross breed between a norm relapse model and a parallel decision model) during the hour of assessing Eq. (ii). The example towns are generally mono-editing towns and the development is done mostly in the blustery season, i.e., between June to October. In this period MGNREGP works are not finished. Most of the agrarian workers in our overview on a normal could organize around 50 man long periods of work yearly from horticultural exercises. In this period, the agrarian work families like to do agrarian exercises in their homegrown territory and give less significance on movement. Therefore, from October to March, a willing job-card holder can apply for work through MGNREGP. Work in the private non-ranch area in the example towns is tolerably accessible consistently and on a normal, an example family can benefit 80 individual long stretches of work in the whole reference period from neighborhood private non-ranch area. Other than that, it has likewise emerged from our field examination that a family without looking for any individual day work through MGNREGP cans most extreme profit around 130 man-days from private non-ranch work in his/her local and close by town in the whole reference period ii. So a country worker without looking for work through MGNREGP and without relocation can organize most extreme 180 man-long stretches of work every year. Therefore, rural households in the sample villages face unemployment in the absence of MGNREGP.

Consequently, during the hour of taking choice on movement, the accessibility of occupation in neighborhood non-ranch area in person-days might make an effect on the choice of the family to move or potentially to look for work through MGNREGP.

MOTIVATION<sub>i</sub> => It is additionally here treated as Fake variable. Inspiration alludes to the mental interaction that immediate way of behaving and decides its force and perseverance. During the field investigation, the head of the sample household was asked if they would rather seek employment through MGNREGP<sub>iii</sub>. throughout the reference period in the absence of private non-farm employment. We have taken the worth of the spurious variable as 1 in the event that the response was certifiable, in any case '0' <sub>iv</sub>. Based on our field research, three major factors that can influence the MOTIVATION' of the sample rural households when they seek employment through MGNREGP were identified:

1. MGNREGP is an interest based strategy. Here the gig candidate ought to get work in somewhere around 15 days subsequent to applying for work. During the hour of orchestrating business, the chosen individual from neighborhood gram sanshad ought to assume a significant planning part. Be that as it may, the drive of the nearby chosen part to organize work isn't symmetric for all segments. Once in a while, ordinary visit to panchayat office (in some cases it is a long way from house and a worker might need to forfeit one individual day business) to get work under MGNREGP is required which diminishes the inspiration of the gig card holders to look for work under this scheme <sub>v</sub>. This in a roundabout way demonstrates a need of faithfulness to nearby ideological group which is currently in power in neighborhood panchayat. 2. We have found bunch development among the male work searchers during the hour of looking for work through MGNREGP and all the gathering individuals are especially propelled to work under MGNREGP. The gathering is framed among the healthy work searchers whose actual work limit is high and homogeneous in nature. The local panchayat also encourages the formation of this informal group. In every individual day, each occupation searcher needs to dig 50 cubic feet soil. A gathering of five people need to dig 250 cubic feet soil which assists the nearby specialist with estimating the size at a time. Healthy homogeneous individuals structure bunch based on assumption that all the gathering individuals will give equivalent work to finish one individual day work rapidly. Peer checking among the gathering individuals is additionally seen here however the installment is made based on piece rate. After finishing of work, the people can go for another work or can do two man days work in a solitary day<sub>vi</sub>. This co-activity among the gathering individuals assist them with procuring two man days MGNREGP wage in a solitary day.

2. In some cases provincial work families need to partake in MRGREGP on the grounds that they want to finish one individual day work committing less exertion. In fact, in the private nonfarm sector, a laborer must work at least 8 hours per day and must put in a lot of effort throughout, whereas in MGNREGP, one can earn one person-day piece rate by digging 50 cubic feet of soil with much less effort than in the previous job.

**Results and Discussions:** If the two error terms mentioned in Eq.(1) and Eq.(2),  $\mu_i$  and  $\varepsilon_i$  are correlated, then to get consistent estimate of Eq.(1) we have to estimate Eq.(1) and Eq.(2) jointly. To do that we have to apply instrumental variable (IV) estimation in the bivariate probit model mentioned in Eq. (1). We know that a good IV should satisfy two basic conditions: (i) it should influence the outcome variable 'NREGSDAY' mentioned in Eq.(2) and (ii) it should not affect the migration decision of a sample household vii. It was tested that 'MOTIVATION' is not influencing the migration decision of a household or total person-days of employment of the sample households in nonfarm sector but plays an important role on 'NREGSDAY'. In this model 'MOTIVATION' is used as an instrument of 'NREGSDAY' viii. We have to run a Tobit regression in Eq.(2) on the number of person-days of work through MGNREGP of each sample household and then use the estimate to run probit regression in Eq.(1) to investigate if more participation in MGNREGP create any impact on daily migration decision of the rural participating households. Statistical significance of the estimated value of the correlation between  $\mu_i$  and  $\varepsilon_i$  which is here presented as  $\hat{\rho}$  can establish the necessity of application of Instrumental Variable in the linear probit model described through Eq.(1) in our investigation. The results of our econometric exercises are presented in Table-1 below.

Table- 1: The Results of The Probit model calculated on the basis of Instrumental Variable Estimation:

Dependent Variable: MIGR		
Name of the Explanatory Variable	Value of the Co-efficient	Value of the Marginal Coefficient
TNONFARM	-.0069* (.0026)	-.0028
AFM	.112** (.059)	.0374
NREGSDAY	-.223* (.04)	-.0076
BPL	.81 (.598)	.205
EDU	.137** (.0711)	.456
LANDSIZE	.161** (.081)	.0535
CONSTANT	-1.789* (.557)	
$\hat{\rho}$	-1.405* (.594)	
Wald $\chi^2(6)$	44.47*	

The standard errors are given in the parenthesis.

'\*'=> critical at 1% level and '\*\*'=> huge at 5% level, '\*\*\*'=> Importance at 10% level Our outcome lays out the way that  $\hat{\rho}$  is genuinely critical. Consequently, in our effect assessment, utilization of instrumental variable in the Probit model referenced in Eq. ( 1) was essential since it is laid out that complete individual long stretches of looking for work through MGNREGP is endogenous in natureix. The Wald test presumes that there exists endogeneity in one of the covariates utilized in Eq.(1) and it is here 'NREGSDAY'.

The relapse results referenced in the Table-1 shows the accompanying outcomes:

(i). During the entire reference period, households with more person-days of employment through MGNREGP are less likely to relocate to nearby urban areas in search of better-paying jobs. It is additionally



demonstrated that main the 'propelled' families (as described previously) look for more individual long stretches of work through this administration business program. This is the main aftereffect of our 'influence assessment'. In fact, during the field investigation, a significant portion of the sample households (approximately 78 percent) stated that the availability of MGNREGP jobs in their own neighborhood discouraged them from searching even in nearby urban areas for employment. It was additionally emerged from our field examination that , scarcely any individual long stretches of guaranteed work in their own territory chiefly in the farming leeway season are sufficient to convince not many country families in our study district to 'remain back' in their own region. Subsequently, it is demonstrated that extension of this business program can lessen the power of provincial to metropolitan movement by giving work to the poor country individuals nearer to home at respectable working circumstances.

(ii). It is additionally demonstrated from Table-1 that the example families who could get more individual long stretches of work in the nearby private non-ranch area are less inclined to move in the metropolitan regions.

(iii). The sample households with a greater number of adult family members have a higher probability of at least one working member migrating

(iv). Advanced education level of the top of the family, higher will be the likelihood of movement of no less than one working individual from the family to the metropolitan region for better paid work.

(v). Additionally, it is established that landholding families are more likely to relocate to the urban area in search of better-paying employment. We have proactively referenced that a large portion of the land proprietors are peripheral ranchers (however this gathering involves just 9% of our example families). A significant number of marginal farmer households prefer not to cultivate their land during the lean season due to the high cost of cultivation, particularly in the winter, and the lack of family labor. During this time, they either lease out their land or leave it uncultivated and migrate to the urban area for employment, where the pay is not only better than what he can get in his native village but also immediate.

When compared to the previous two reference periods, the sample households' intensity of migration has decreased during our reference period, as previously mentioned. According to the parameter estimates of the various explanatory variables mentioned in Equation (1), expansions in private sector employment and non-farm employment in our survey regions are the two primary causes of that.

### **Conclusion:**

MGNREGP is basically a social security net given by the public authority of India starting around 2005. One of the superb goals of MGNREGP is to check out-movement of the rustic workers through producing neighborhood non-ranch business basically during the horticultural lean season. It emerged from our field examination that this work program has turned into a significant wellspring of nearby business. In our review region just set number of families, basically has a place with landless farming work families have an intension of relocation to the close by metropolitan region. Countless example families had revealed that extension of this business program turns out beneficial revenue for themselves and can decrease the vulnerability in the neighborhood work market during the hour of looking for work. So they are currently



ready to remain with their family as opposed to being getting away from their family for endurance purposes. Resource creation through MGNREGP additionally helps the work families to get private homestead and nonfarm work all through the year especially in the rural lean season. Thus it is seen that bigger number of individual days a family landed position in private non-ranch work, he will be less inclined to move. In we see generally influence it is demonstrated that in our review region, extension of MGNREGP can diminish the force of movement among the provincial families.

### **Policy implications:**

In our survey area, it has been observed that MGNREGP reduces the intensity of rural to urban migration. Be that as it may, to proceed with this achievement, government ought to follow the accompanying two techniques:

1. It is great that MGNREGP wage is paid through financial balance. It has decreased defilement during the hour of compensation installment. Other than that this is likewise a decent monetary consideration drive among poor people and the minimized class especially in the provincial regions. In any case, the installment of pay ought not be postponed, for example the 'persistence cost' caused by a MGNREGP breadwinner during the hour of getting pay ought to be limited. In reality unfortunate families expect cash to keep up with their essential everyday utilization needs. In that particular situation assuming that getting wage is postponed, the family might lose interest to look for work through this program, rather he will like to take part in a confidential business program where the installment is quick. In that particular situation he might move. So government ought to further develop its framework so after finishing of allotted task, the member can get his/her pay rapidly.

2. 'Clientelism' ought to be stayed away from. It emerged from our field examination that provincial families who will look for work through MGNREGP now and again need to rely upon the impact of neighborhood ideological groups during the hour of looking for business. This was obliged as 'inspiration' in our choice condition. It is seen that less roused families are not helping great number of individual long periods of work through MGNREGP and they might be more inclined to relocate in the close by metropolitan regions. Just decrease of the force of 'clientelism' during the hour of looking for work through MGNREGP can lessen the rustic to metropolitan relocation among the poor provincial families.

### **References:**

1. Kumar. R. and R. Prasanna (2010), 'Role of NREGA in Providing Additional Employment for Tribal and Curtailing Migration' in *National Rural Employment Guarantee Act: Design, Process and Impact*, New Delhi, Ministry of Rural Development.
2. Verma .S (2012), 'Labour Markets Dynamics in Post-MGNREGS Rural India' Unpublished note shared with the Ministry of Rural Development.
3. <https://nreganarep.nic.in/netnrega/MISreport4.aspx>
4. [https://nreganarep.nic.in/netnrega/UID/UidNPCIStatusRpt.aspx?DBT=&page=S&state\\_name=ANDHRA%20PRADESH&state\\_code=02&fin\\_year=2023-2024&Digest=YGbg4WUTIHDsYJoZgK/XQ](https://nreganarep.nic.in/netnrega/UID/UidNPCIStatusRpt.aspx?DBT=&page=S&state_name=ANDHRA%20PRADESH&state_code=02&fin_year=2023-2024&Digest=YGbg4WUTIHDsYJoZgK/XQ)

**Additional Information:**

- i. Instrumental variable assessor in the Probit model thinks about the Greatest Probability Assessor of course.
- ii. In the past reference period, the work image of the provincial families from the private non-ranch area was more awful. Because of development of 'Indira Awas Yojana' the country workers currently get not many more long stretches of work in private non-ranch area in their own region.
- iii. The data emerged from the field study that each individual day private non-ranch wage in the region is Rs.170 and wage rate in the close by metropolitan region is Rs.200 - Rs.250 and these are something like the MGNREGP piece-rate which was then Rs.136. As a result, aside from MGNREGP, the household typically has other employment options. In the nonfarm area or in the close by metropolitan region, the worker needs to commit elevated degree of exertion in one individual day yet the installment is immediate. In MGNREGP every worker needs to dedicate less work to take care of business one individual day and the installment is additionally not quick. The compensation installment is made through ledger and it is seen that a worker can get installment at least 20 days after fruition of the gig which suggests each partaking labourer in MGNREGP needs to bear 'tolerance cost' prior to getting their installment.
- iv. There are a few families who requested work through MGNREGP just a single time in the whole reference period.
- v. In some cases a country family in the wake of getting 10 - 15 man long stretches of work through MGNREGP are not able to look for that because of its weighty exchange cost. They are likewise not propelled to the point of looking for work through MGNREGP over and over.
- vi. That kind of incident cannot be officially documented by the local panchayat. The panchayat needs to oblige the occurrence in two days. Yet, during the hour of field review, we have seen that a lot of occupation card holders who principally have a place with specific gathering do two man day work under MGNREGP in a solitary day. Their actual capacity assists them with doing that.
- vii. The assessed Probit Model shows  $MIGR = -.732 - 0.161MOTIVATION + e_i (.172)$
- The outcome shows by no means, 'Inspiration' can impact the relocation choice of a family on the grounds that the boundary gauge of 'Inspiration' is measurably irrelevant.
- viii. It is seen that the relationship co-productive among 'Inspiration' and 'TNONFARM' is .03 and it is measurably irrelevant. Subsequently the issue of multi-co linearity won't emerge in Eq. ( 2).
- ix. The relapse consequence of the Tobit model referenced in Eq.(2) will be as per the following.
- $$NREGSDAY = 2.28* + 1.314*MOTIVATION - .0045TNONFARM + .201LANDSIZE - 1.22BPL + e_i * => \text{critical at 1\% level.}$$

The above outcome shows 'Inspiration' impacts 'NREGSDAY' for example just the profoundly energetic families are more inclined to look for more individual long stretches of work through MGNREGP.