



Social Engineering in Public Policies and Legislations: A critical discussion in reference with Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA)

Sasmita Patel* and Rupa Salui Karmakar

Department of Social Work, Visva Bharati, Santiniketan, West Bengal, India

*Corresponding author: sasmitapatel16@yahoo.co.in

ABSTRACT

The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) was enacted with immense hope for paradigm shift and societal change ensuring legal protection of employment to rural citizens, especially to the marginalized section in India. But, the implementation of the Act shows a mix picture in general, though it shares a major portion of national budget allocation. It is now the proven fact that the Act is not being successful to provide social justice to the marginalized population relating to the issues concerning 'right to work', 'demand for work', 'right to get timely wages' 'right to conduct Social Audit' along with 'right of planning –implementation- evaluation of MGNREGA', creation of productive and sustainable assets for promotion of livelihood in rural areas. On the other hand, there is an increasing apathy on the part of people on the Act. questions about 'how to regain the faith and confidence of citizens on the Act. overcoming the present deficiencies at various levels.

The introduction of 'Social Engineering' in reshaping and overcoming the present field related hazards and limitations along with deficiencies in the legislation might be one of the probable solutions. 'Social Engineering' is comparatively a new concept in development field and today it has become a general task of each and every organization. There is also a global need of 'Social Engineering' in every sphere of development sector involving technical, economic and social aspects to deal with and achieving sustainability as an end result.

However, this paper will focus on how "Social Engineering" is becoming instrumental in overcoming the barriers and strengthening the existing systems and mechanisms in MGNREGA. The present study is based on few Focus Group Discussions held under two Gram Panchayats of Mongolkote Development Block of Purba-Bardhaman district under West Bengal.

Key words: MGNREGA, Social Justice, Social Audit, Social Engineering

The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) is a well known employment Gurantee programme in the country. It was enacted after a long term struggle with immense hope to paradigm shift of societal change ensuring legal protection of employment to rural citizens, especially the marginalized and vulnerable communities like Scheduled Caste (SCs), Scheduled Tribes (STs), Women headed families etc. The Act intends "to provide for the enhancement of livelihood security of the households in

rural areas by providing at least one hundred days of guaranteed wage employment in every financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work". The Act also provides many legal rights to its' citizens under the guiding principle of social justice, few of which are - right to have a job-card, right to demand for work and to get dated receipt, right to get work within 15 days if demand is made, right to get work for minimum period of 14 days at a stretch, right to get wages within a week, or fifteen days

at most, right to get compensation for delay in payment of wages, right to get unemployment allowance, right to time bound redress of grievances, right to prepare self of project and right to conduct social audit and many more. However, the Public Policies and Legislations relating to MGNREGA and other poverty alleviation programme did not produce or are not producing desired level of result.

The concept of social justice denotes to remove all type of inequalities based upon caste, creed, sex, power, position, wealth and to afford all equal opportunities to all citizens in respect of social, economic and political affairs. The term 'social justice' has mainly two connotation - first it is used in very generic sense to create just and fair order in the society for its every member and secondly, it mitigates the sufferings of the underprivileged, SCs, STs, women intending to meet their varied needs and to mainstream them in the society.

The MGNREG Act., thus, enacted primarily to give immediate economic relief to the jobless rural inhabitants by providing them employment within the locality. The Act has many more important secondary objectives as mentioned in the MGNREGA operational Guidelines, 4th Edition, 2013. It is likely to provide social protection to the most vulnerable people, ensuring livelihood security through creation of durable assets, improved water security, soil conservation and higher land productivity. It is generally to empower socially disadvantaged to strengthen decentralised, participatory planning through convergence of various anti-poverty and livelihoods initiatives, to deepening democracy at the grass-roots by strengthening PRIs etc. With these noble objectives the said Act was introduced in the country by two phases - first in the year 2006 for 200 districts and the rest of districts were covered in the year 2007. The undivided Burdwan district of West Bengal, which is the locale of the present research, was covered under MGNREGA in the 2007.

Since its introduction, the Act is being criticized from several angles in several studies as it is unable to fulfill the desired commitment. Goswami and Dutta (2014) stated that MGNREGA is poorly governed in the state of Assam with several loopholes at grass-

root like: unsatisfactory level of awareness among the beneficiaries, supply-based implementation process, merely visible impact of MGNREGA on the standard of living of the beneficiaries etc. In the context of West Bengal, Dey (2016) pointed out that the principal implementing agency i.e. the Gram Panchayat (GP) has no adequate capacities to implement the schemes in its real tune i.e. the registration of household in MGNREGA is very high, low employment generation that leads to low employment availability, not able to provide the desired days of work in a month, unorganized shelf of project, excessive workload on GPs, rare opportunities to the villagers to discuss in forums or to choose their preferences, GP's preference in traditional way of execution of projects etc. lead to creation of low value assets without much concern about the durability. The overall approach creates situation where number of projects lying incomplete with unproductive assets having no usefulness .

Singh and Dutta (2016) observed in their comparative study in two districts of West Bengal that the number of employment days provided in the scheme is much lower than the guaranteed 100 days. Though the people eagerly wait for the work with timely payment, GP lacks subtle skill to develop perspective plans and thus, MGNREGS failed to meet to provide the guaranteed work. However, the rural infrastructural development through this programme need convergence with other ongoing government programme for better results. Abraham *et al.* (2016) studied impact of MGNREGS on the beneficiaries in Bardhaman district of West Bengal. They observed on various challenges of MGNREGA at the ground level such as: no availability of alternative employment opportunities before the GPs, preferences of people about less labour intensive schemes, pressure by vested interest and other political groups on the GPs which creates difficulties to meet the needs and demands of the villages. The other major issues faced by the programme are: gaps between work demand and supply, non-creation of durable assets, technical difficulties to implement works during extreme summer and monsoon and people's reluctance to undue preferences in taking of the jobs.

West Bengal always belongs to the highest expenditure states of the country (www.nrega.nic.in) and alike the undivided Burdwan district belonged to the highest expenditure districts within the state. Therefore, it would have a very common expectation of bearing satisfactory result with MGNREGA in the district in spite of unpleasant implementation process and other reasons as depicted in the above reviewed studies. Thus, the present study would mainly focus on the gaps found in the literature reviewed i.e. to understand the areas of social protection in respect of various rights of citizens that are being provided by MGNREGA and to find out the scope of social engineering, a new intervention approach to overcome the deficiencies and limitations of the Act.

The 'social engineering' in the context of the current research refers to technological knowledge with economic feasibility in implementation of projects concerning social and human aspects. It involves scientific method of analysing and understanding social systems to plan and design the appropriate alternative to achieve the best desired result. It influences people's social and economic position with the highest level of freedom, prosperity and happiness. The approach intends to produce effective result with intelligent management of natural resources and human capital in a sustainable way. Social engineering has now become general task of any social organization and also there is a global need of it. Thus, the concept of social engineering intervention in MGNREGA involves cause-effect analysis emphasising efficiency and effective way of resource management - human, natural and social. By the way, it would produce productive assets for future livelihood opportunities in the village locality. Thus, it has become one of the major focus area in this paper.

Objectives of the study

- ❖ To critically analyse how MGNREGA is providing social justice to the marginalised people.
- ❖ To study the present limitations and deficiencies in the Act.
- ❖ To understand the very possibilities of introduction of "Social Engineering" to overcome the barriers

and strengthening the implementation process in MGNREGA.

Methodology

The present study was conducted in the highest populous Gram Sansads (IV) under Jhiloo - I GP and lowest populous Gram Sansad (II) of Bhalugram GP of Mongolkote Development Block of Purba-Bardhaman district of West Bengal. Both the primary and secondary data were used in the study. The study followed Qualitative approach in data collection and employed Focus Group Discussion (FGD) with the marginalized job-card holders in the selected Gram Sansads. The research was conducted to obtain the following information - (i) views and opinion of the marginalized people about their rights in MGNREGA (ii) understand the need of the respondents (iii) plan of developmental interventions (iv) examine the level of acceptance or rejection of present development interventions by the respondents. FGD was followed in the study because the respondents were more or less homogeneous in terms of their social, economic and cultural status. The marginalized people feel free and express their views easily without hesitation when they are being put in a group and FGD could provide them such environment. By FGD, a large number of information is collected within a short span of time. Being conscious with the limitations of FDG like less control over the flow of discussion, picking up the result by analyzing the discussion etc., four number of FGDs were conducted in the selected Gram Sansad areas. Each FGD was conducted with 10 participants and it was continued at least for 45 to 50 minutes. The issues discussed in FGD were in the line of the research objectives.

Profile of the study area

The undivided Burdwan district always stands among the highest expenditure districts in MGNREGA. Though the district has been divided into two districts with effect from 7th April, 2017 named as Purba Bardhaman and Paschim Bardhaman, but the credit of scores of being highest expenditure district goes to Purba-Bardhaman district. Purba-Bardhaman is predominantly agricultural zone and the region is known as 'Granary

of West Bengal'. The administrative set up of the district comprises of four Sub-Divisions, 23 Blocks and 215 GPs. Mongolkote is one of the important blocks within the district. It is located at 23°30'51"N 87°53'28"E. It is the part of Kanksa-Ketugram plain land and located on the bank of Ajoy river. The total geographical area of the block is 365.44 Square Kilometres. According to 2011 census, the block having 61,309 households and 263,240 population (SC population - 81,950, ST Population - 7,462). Agriculture and allied activities are the main occupation of the residents. There are 20,408 cultivators and 98,789 main workers. Among the main workers there are agricultural labourers, marginal workers and very limited industry workers. There are 157,769 literate population. The block comprises 15 GPs, 198 Gram Sansads, and 130 inhabited villages.

The study carried on in 2 Gram Sansad areas - Gram Sansad (IV) of Jhiloo-I GP includes three hamlets/paras namely Dakhin Para, Nabagram and Paschim Para which includes total 1361 rural voters and Gram Sansad (II) of Bhalugram includes two hamlets namely Uttar Kherua and Uttar Bramhapur which comprises 386 voters (According to Panchayat Election, 2013). The rural voters are the member of Gram Sabha and are eligible to participate in the development process of GPs.

Mongolkote block always stands in top two positions within the district in regards to the expenditure of MGNREGS. The last five years' expenditure of MGNREGS since the Financial Year 2012-13 to 2016-17 of Mongolkote Dev. Block, Jhiloo-I GP and Bhalugram GP are 23644.98 lakh, 1603.36 lakh and 1593.79 lakh respectively. The expenditure and other details of last Financial year are mentioned below :

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

(I) Level of awareness & participation

In each FGD, it was observed that the villagers were not well aware about the objectives of the Act, and their basic entitlements- right to get work, right to get timely wages, right to plan of schemes, right to do social audit, right of unemployment allowances, procedure of implementation etc. People were unaware

about the scope of durable assets creation through MGNREGA for promotion of livelihood opportunities in their locality. They just simply know that MGNREGA means construction of roads, renovation of ponds and drains, social plantation etc. The Act provides scope of involvement of the villagers in planning process of schemes through Gram Sansad Sabha and Gram Sabha. The social audit in MGNREGA provides scope to the villagers to measure the performance of MGNREGA. But, it is eventual that marginalized people neither involve in the process nor they are interested. Few revealed about their participation in meetings but they could not clearly explain about the purpose the meeting, the agenda and the resolutions etc. It was also came to the front that whenever they are called for meeting by their panchayat member or the ruling political group or the supervisor of MGNREGA, few of them participate in meeting being fully unaware about the facts. Women are generally the silent participants in the meeting. The well sound slogan, '*Sabka sath sabka bikash*', the present policy of the government of India seems here as a gloomy word. The important goals mentioned in the (MGNREGA operational Guidelines, 4th Edition, 2013 i.e. (i) empowerment of the socially disadvantaged especially women, SCs, STs, through the processes of a right-based legislation (ii) strengthening decentralised participatory planning and (iii) deepening democracy at the grass-roots through MGNREGA not evident as factual fact here. Thus, they neither become aware nor they participate in the process, though awareness and active participation are two important conditions of empowerment.

Implementation mechanism / procedure

MGNREGA ensures "Social protection for the most vulnerable people living in rural India by providing employment opportunities" (MGNREGA operational Guidelines, 4th Edition, 2013). The FGDs have enlightened into the facts that the required employment is not being provided as per the demand. The Project Implementing Agency (PIA) i.e. GP focuses on the mass employment in seasonal basis - they generally prefers lean-season, period before local and major festivals, before monsoons etc. The villagers revealed, "once the work is opened,

Table 1: Expenditure, job-card registration, employment provided

Financial Year : 2017-2018							
Particulars	Total Expenditure (Rs. in lakh)	No. of Registered		Employment Provided			No. of Families completing 100 days
		Household	Persons	Household	Persons	Persondays	
Mongolkote Dev. Block	8729.58 (Unskilled wage -5749.56 Material - 2373.82) 463.06	64823	140774	47158	76084	2959613	414
Jhiloo-I GP	(Unskilled wage -236.89 Material - 201.52) 599.06	3127	7336	2155	3382	132183	10
Bhalugram GP	(Unskilled wage -507.89 Material-67.72)	6356	12456	4968	5193	280055	0

([www.http://nrega.nic.in](http://nrega.nic.in))

Table 2: Relative performance of MGNREGA of all GPs of Mongolkote Development Block

Sl. No.	Panchayat	Average days per HH	% of HHs Completed 100 days	% of SC/ST HH provided employment	% of wage paid with-in 15 days
1	GOTISTHA	70.28	3	93	94.15
2	BHALUGRAM	56.37	0	81	55.25
3	SIMULIA-II	61.95	1	83	67.06
4	JHILOO-I	61.34	0	54	84.53
5	KAICHAR-I	57.12	0	91	84.04
6	PALIGRAM	66.63	0	89	79.35
7	KAICHAR-II	65.54	3	87	95.21
8	SIMULIA-I	60.96	0	79	86.89
9	MAJHIGRAM	58.93	0	70	81
10	MONGOLKOTE	67.24	0	58	80
11	JHILOO-II	61.62	0	50	59.99
12	KSHIROGRAM	56.75	0	88	90.73
13	CHANAK	71.34	0	95	89.64
14	NIGON	63.74	0	40	80.95
15	LAKHURIA	59	0	35	93.98

* HH : Households ([www.http://nrega.nic.in](http://nrega.nic.in))

people from most of the households of the villages join the work". It was also enlightened that nobody is aware about employment demand forms i.e. Form 4A, but the NREGA website shows that each person who were provided employment had submitted 4A form. The facts simply denotes that the present implementation procedure of Act has not been successful to provide social protection to the vulnerable people during their need or crisis. In a nutshell, it has turned its nature from demand driven to supply driven. The village Supervisor or Panchayat members or party worker are the key person in communicating between the villagers and the GPs. Villagers depend on them for getting the work. The activities or schemes to be undertaken are prepared without consultation with all the stake holders specially the marginalized villagers. The weak and powerless have no voice in planning- implementation-evaluation process. The village key persons take all decision. Local needs are not assessed properly before formulation of schemes and thus the project fails to create productive assets.

Economic aspects: The marginalised villagers depend on labour work for their livelihood. Few of them are marginal workers. The young people from most of the families under the study area have migrated to cities for their employment. They generally work in construction linked industries as mason or labourer. Those who stay at village depend on seasonal agricultural work for their livelihood. ,During the lean season, few of them move to local market for searching work other few get irregular work under the rich framers.

The women participants of Uttar Kherua village stated, *"we do fishing for small fishes in Ajoy river we collect 'Dhaner shish ' from paddy field after harvesting and any how manage our survival..... we need NREGA work....."*. In such situation, these people would urgently require of regular work as guaranteed by MGNREGA. They added that, when the village supervisor or panchayat member was asked about the work, they answered that work would be provided when order would come from upper level. Many a times the officials intentionally hide the actual information from the villagers for their vested interest. In the study area, the villagers were provided work varying from 10-30 days in a year but

wages are not paid immediately within the stipulated period of 15 days. Though the MIS report shows (refer Table 2) that the average work for 56.37 days and 61.34 days in Bhalugram and Jhiloo-I GPs have been provided to the households in the Financial Year 2017-18. Credit of payment in their bank account sometimes takes one month or more than also but the MIS reflects that 55.25% and 84.53% cases payment made within 15 days in Bhalugram and Jhiloo-I respectively. No delay compensation is paid to the eligible as viewed by the participants. Thus, it can be analysed that the MGNREGA has not been successful in providing immediate economic relief to the needy. It become a source of marginal income of the villagers. The spirit in which MGNREGA is supposed to be implemented has now been in a missing state and the reasons are varied.

Assets creation

The revival of village economy by creation, promotion and strengthening of durable and productive assets is one of important goals of MGNREGA. Though the existing implementation system did quite a noticeable work on construction and repairing of village roads, pond re-excavation, renovation of few irrigation field channel during the early phases of implementation but it failed to do scientific intervention in generation of productive assets for economic return in the locality. The marginalised people have hardly any share in the re-excavated ponds in the villages or they rarely get engaged in pisciculture in the re-excavated ponds through convergent mode of projects with MGNREGA and department of Fisheries. The very common and popular activities are being implemented in the villages for creation of only employment opportunities like land development, drain renovation, plantation, construction of ajola pit and vermi pits etc. in the study areas without future plans to use the assets into productive one. In case of plantation only "sonajhuri" plants are being planted for early return of economic benefit without focussing their nurturing. Uttar Kherua is a flood prone village but no special focus was paid to area specific development. The PIA has no integrated plan of action to emphasize on individual assets creation through convergent mode with various government or non-governmental departments.

The villagers who were provided with sanitary toilets and IAY houses were considered with as beneficiaries of IBS schemes and they are not being provided with any more MGNREGA work in the year. The villagers of Uttar Kherua under Bhalugram GP, who have no agricultural land or domestic animals, were provided ajola pits and naturally they became less interested to continue the scheme as it turns as useless activity for them. The villagers dug pits in their backyard or out site their mud-house only because of getting wages from MGNREGA. Therefore, the villagers showed a very casual attitude here in maintaining of created assets under MGNREGA. However, some successful cases of vermi-culture and ajola-culture are seen in Paschimpara of Jhiloo-I GP. Vermi-compost that are being produced are used in vegetable cultivation in their small piece of land and ajola is used as fodder of cattle as well as compost. The GP consciously or unconsciously has selected potential villagers for potential scheme and therefore it has turned into its effort into productive assets. However, there is a huge scope of commercial intervention in those schemes. But, it require proper intervention on the part of GPs and other government agencies for marketing.

Environmental Issues

MGNREGA has great potentiality to take care of environmental issues - likely enhancing of water storage, development of natural plantation, protect soil erosion, development of posture land, improvement of barren lands, development of horticulture and orchards, construction and renovation of drainage system, and so on. But, the participant villagers in FGDs have no idea about environmental issues linked with MGNREGA. They were never informed about the issues by the implementing agencies while planning or executing schemes for the villagers. According to the participants of Uttar Kherua, "just before monsoon flood protection bundh was given in the bank of Ajoy river and every year it is washed away". It seems that the scheme is executed in very unplanned way and just for creation of number of stipulated employment days. The participants also discussed about damaged of mango plants on the river embankment in flood. This indicates that the GP lacks

skill and efficiency to plan and execute schemes with proper management of resources.

Technological aspects

The Government is committed for greater transparency and accountability in governance of MGNREGA. The MIS (Management Information System) has been introduced. Public can access information relating to the scheme from programme website i.e. [www.http://nrega.nic.in](http://www.nrega.nic.in). However, the local people more specifically the marginalized people still not able to take benefit of it due to lack of knowledge, awareness and accessibility. The participants of FGDs have no experience of accessing information from website and neither from the office.

Apart from MIS, special attention to be paid on technical & expertise knowledge while executing projects at grass roots. The private as well as government resource agencies may be involved in it. Knowledge dissemination among the project beneficiaries is an another important aspect which is to be done most effectively.

Social Audit

Introduction of Social Audit in MGNREGA was a milestone policy decision of Government of India. Prior to it, various stakeholders including the project beneficiaries had no scope to monitor the performance of projects meant for them from various angles, more specifically – physical, social, economical. Social Audit is a mechanism that provides opportunities to the villagers to measure the performance of the project and review the fulfillment of rights and entitlements of labourers with proper utilization of funds. The Audit facilitators in the name of Village Resource Person (VRP) who are engaged at GP level from the primary stakeholder's families are assigned to verify each and every scheme, take views of the labourers, assess their needs and take their grievances for discussion in Gram Sabha. District Social Audit Unit has been established at district level to facilitate the process of Social Audit. Every year Social Audit is being conducted twice in the Special Gram Sabha meeting, but the participants of FGDs have no in-depth knowledge about Social Audit and its purposes. Further, they fear about village politics of being isolated and deprived of work due to

raising questions or seeking clarification publicly in the meeting. There are instances in few communities that the village leaders and supporters who are in opposition to the major politics in the community were given threats for being excluded from all types of governmental social assistance and benefits schemes.

Intervention of Social Engineering in MGNREGA

Alike engineering field, social organizations must adopt outlook of 'social engineering' to deal with each and every activity. Lack of social engineering concept, the Project Implementing Agencies fails to satisfy the villagers. In Uttar Kherua villages in FGD-1 under Bhalugram GP, the marginalized villagers having no agricultural land, kitchen garden or cattle or poultry were provided aloja pits for creation of individual assets. The villagers, therefore, did not show interest in ajola culture as it has no utility for them. Neither they could use ajola in the cultivation or use it as cattle fodder nor the GP took initiative for marketing. The villagers were confused about the objective of the scheme but dug their respective pit just to get the wages. However, reverse experience was observed in case of FDG-2 under Paschim Para of Jhiloo-I GP where the marginal farmers producing vermi-compost and are using it not commercially but for own agricultural activities especially vegetable cultivation. The marginal farmers who have little piece of land and have cattle are benefited and they felt it is a useful activities for them. The more intervention in this respect may turn these small units into the productive one. The commercial unit may also create additional employment for needy villagers. Proper resource mapping, need analysis and proper implementation has made the schemes successful here.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Though the policy ensures multiple rights to the people but why the marginalized people are not exercising their rights should be analysed scientifically. Why are the villagers unaware about the programme even after introduction of MGNREGA since 2007 in the GPs, why are they dependent on supervisor or the political leaders, why a reciprocal relationship has not built up between the GP and the very marginalized villagers, why demand

for work not made by the villagers but MIS reflects about demand generation, why delay in payments and even providing compensation are to be critically explained. The situation raises the question of transparency and accountability in implementation of MGNREGA. The social inclusive approach with scientific intervention of need assessment, planning, identification, execution and post monitoring of schemes may result a good deed. Identification and categorization different potential beneficiaries and right selection of schemes for them can only help to generate productive assets. Marketing linkage and involvement of expertise person or agencies would promote livelihood opportunities in the locality.

There is a huge gap existing between policy and field reality which need to be minimized. According to the capacity and feasibility policy measures should be designed. It has a proven fact that the commitment in the policy of providing 100 days of work to each rural household, delay compensation, unemployment allowance etc. remained unfulfilled. Practically, it would possible when only the marginalised people willing to do manual work are provided work and payment made on the basis of actual output. If it is to be added strategically with the agricultural work than it may probably create additional opportunities. It may also directly benefit to the individual marginal farmers in the communities.

In present trend, payment is not made on the basis of work output but the process of distribution due to varied vested interests. The process thus creates too many problems in implementation process and transparency-accountability thus not maintained. That is to be taken care with proper mechanisms.

Social justice to the villagers can be ensured through Social Audit. But, there are so many obstructions in social auditing – one of prime issue is non-inclusion of very ordinary villagers in the process from planning to execution. Thus, they are unaware about the facts and figures, feel isolation and take less interest in the activities of GP. Here, the GP need to follow non-political and democratic attitude in respect of developmental issues.

Only support in paying of wages to the villagers under MGNREGA can't be a sustainable way to take care of vulnerable families. The local government must create sufficient wealth within the villages to meet the requirement of villagers at least moderately. But, the unrealistic planning from top to bottom level irrespective of geographical location, cultural attributes, socio-economic status, capacity of GPs and so on insist the functionaries to take sneaky process in implementation. Therefore, GP need to step very rationally to intervene starting from identification, planning, and execution of schemes taking with villagers for creation of productive and sustainable assets within the village areas. If GP is unable due to insufficiency of manpower, knowledge and skill etc. then expertise agencies may be involved in the process. GP must take innovation in implementation process, co-ordinating various other line departments and also in establishing marketing linkages.

Over all, MGNREGA provides a subsidiary support to the marginalized people. It is still not successful in providing immediate economic benefits to people in managing their day to day and even any crisis situation. Social justice in respect of exercising their rights yet to be realized. Resource generation and asset creation are to be emphasized for strengthening their capacities with revitalization of village economy. MGNREGA has all inherent characteristics to provide inputs in social, economic, technological and environmental development within villages. But, the existing approach should be altered with the intervention of 'Social Engineering'.

REFERENCES

- Goswami, B. & Dutta, A.R. 2014. Status of Implementation of the MGNREGA in Assam: All Is Not Well. *Journal of Rural Development*, **33**(2): 173- 182. NIRD, Hyderabad.
- Dey, D.K. 2016. Employment generation and asset building through MGNREGA: reflections from West Bengal. *Journal of Rural Development*, **35**(1): 51-76. NIRD&PR, Hyderabad.
- Abraham, B.P., Chakrabarti, B., Chattopadhyay, R. and Nath, S. 2016. Wage Employment: Impact of MGNREGS in Bardhaman, West Bengal. *Journal of Rural Development*, **32**(1): 19 - 31 NIRD, Hyderabad.
- Singh, K. and Datta, S.K. 2016. Impact Assessment of NREGA Programme: A Comparative Analysis in Two Backward Districts of West Bengal, India. *Journal of Global Economics*.
- The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005. Retrieved from <http://www.nrega.nic.in>
- The gazette of India : Extordinary [Part II - sec.3(I)]. Ministry of rural development notification. New Delhi, the 30th June, 2011.
- Social Engineering (Political Science). Retrieved from [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_engineering_\(political_science\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_engineering_(political_science))

