

**IMPACT OF AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES ON
SCHEDULED CASTES AND SCHEDULED TRIBES POPULATION
IN MAHARASHTRA**

A. S. NADKARNI

GOKHALE INSTITUTE OF POLITICS AND ECONOMICS

PUNE - 411 004

1988

IMPACT OF AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES ON SCHEDULED
CASTES AND SCHEDULED TRIBES POPULATION IN MAHARASHTRA

Anand S. Nadkarni

Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics
Pune 411 004

1988

CONTENTS

		<u>Page</u>
	Foreword	(v)
	Preface	(ix)
<u>Chapter</u>	List of Tables	(xiii)
I	Project Background and Research Methodology	1
	<u>Annexure I-A: Participating Universities, Their Representatives and Districts Assigned</u>	30
	<u>Annexure I-B: Rural Households - Census 1981 and the Survey</u>	31
II	Profiles of Households Surveyed	35
	<u>Annexure II-A : Proportion of Gainfully Employed Adult Males/Adult Females/ Minors/Total of These Three to the Total Number of persons in Each Cate- gory Belonging to the Different Land- related Classes</u>	58
III	Agriculturists	59
	<u>Annexure III-A : Agriculturists : Assistance Programmes</u>	122
	<u>Annexure III-B : Maximum Limits of Schemes of Government Financial Assistance to Agriculturists</u>	124
IV	Livestock : Asset-Holding and Assistance Programmes	126
	<u>Annexure IV-A : Statement showing loans and subsidy given to Cultivators by the Government of Maharashtra under various Schemes coming under 'Animal Husbandry'.</u>	151
	<u>Annexure IV-B : Livestock : Assistance Programmes on which Questions were set</u>	152
V	Wage-Labour	153
VI	Welfare Programmes	170
VII	Summary and Findings	199

(iv)

	<u>Page</u>
Appendix I : Government of Maharashtra, Planning Department, Resolution No.EVA-1078/Div.II, Mentralaya, Bombay 400 032. Dated the 20th July, 1978.	228
Appendix II: महाराष्ट्र शासन (ग्रामीण कुटुंबांचे सर्वेक्षण)	230
Appendix III: गोमळे अर्थशास्त्र संस्था, पुणे - महाराष्ट्र शासन संशोधन प्रकल्प : ग्रामीण कुटुंबांचे सर्वेक्षण, अन्वेषकांसाठी सूचना.	252

Foreword

This study was undertaken at the instance of the Planning Department, Government of Maharashtra. The Government desired that the study be jointly made by the Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics (GIPE) and Universities in the State. Seven Universities communicated their willingness to participate. Accordingly, the GIPE collaborated with these seven Universities for the purpose of the study. The study was designed to assess the impact of the agricultural development programmes of the government on the Scheduled Castes (SC) and Scheduled Tribes (ST) population in the State.

The data for this study was collected through a survey of households in 220 villages spread throughout Maharashtra. The total number of surveyed households whose responses form the basis of analysis in this Report was 54833. For the purpose of the survey the representatives of the participating Universities nominated college teachers as supervisors, and under the guidance of these supervisors village-based students carried out the survey. The questionnaire as also the detailed instructions to investigators were prepared by the GIPE which also reviewed from time to time the progress of the survey work. In view of the massiveness of the data to be collected it was decided that in addition to the agricultural development programmes certain welfare programmes in fields such as education, housing and so on may also be covered in the survey. The Report was written by my former colleague, Prof. A.S.Nadkarni, who was entrusted by the Institute with the work relating to this project.

The survey was undertaken mostly over the period May 1981 to May 1982. The reasons for the time taken to present the Report have been explained by Prof. Nadkarni in his preface. It will be seen that the delay was caused by factors which were beyond our control.

Using 'student-power' for rural survey work of such a massive dimension was indeed a novel experiment. As it actually worked out in this case, the experiment had its plus and minus points. It was felt that the involvement of students in this research activity carried out in the rural areas in the State, would orient them better in the conduct of their studies in two ways. In the first place, they would come to realise the empirical nature of social studies, and secondly, and more specifically, they would have a healthy exposure to the working of governmental development and welfare programmes at the grass-roots level. Hopefully this dual objective was achieved in some measure in the case of several, if not all, of the student-investigators. One must accept, however, that in places the investigational effort left much to be desired. Nevertheless, the survey seems to have yielded certain meaningful results.

As Chapter II of the Report brings out SC/ST are the disadvantaged group relatively to others (Non-SC/ST), in point of ownership of land, farm implements, bullocks and livestock as also with regard to accessibility to inputs like fertilisers and credit. Then again, Non-SC/ST households have a better educational profile than those belonging to SC/ST, though there is reason to believe that the gap between the two sets of social groups in respect of education has narrowed somewhat in recent times.

Notwithstanding this relative handicap, SC/ST do not seem to have been particularly worse-off with regard to accrual of benefits from government schemes of assistance to farmers and livestock-owners. In respect of assistance schemes in the fields of education, house construction and medical assistance SC/ST households appear to have fared better than Non-SC/ST households. As for the supply of drinking water, Non-SC/ST were better-off than SC/ST in that the dependence of the former

social group on public wells was relatively less than that of SC/ST since a larger percentage of Non-SC/ST had private wells to draw from. Non-SC/ST were also comparatively better-off with regard to electricity supply.

The Report also attempts to assess the relative benefits from government schemes to four categories of landholders within each social group identified, viz. those without land (landless), those with a holding of less than 2 acres ('marginal'), those with 2 acres to less than 6 acres ('small') and those with 6 acres or more ('medium and large'). The survey brings out that in the case of several schemes of assistance to agriculturists, the degree of benefit, more or less, increased with the size-class of landholdings, almost in every social group. This was true of hardly any scheme in the fields of animal husbandry, education, housing and so on.

One last point needs to be made. The questionnaire included a number of questions requiring the concerned respondents to choose from among reasons cited for non-receipt of benefit from government schemes. It was expected that the responses of the households to these questions would further assist in evaluating the impact of the schemes on SC/ST vis-a-vis Non-SC/ST. Unfortunately, however, as pointed out in Chapter I (para 1-37) of the Report, the response to these questions on the whole was not quite adequate. In view of this, it must be admitted, the effort at evaluation has suffered to some extent. Even then it is felt that the exercise in assessment of impact attempted in the Report is quite revealing in so far as it is comprehensive and detailed, and is based upon massive primary data collected.

It is hoped that the Report will serve as a useful basis for a further examination by the governmental agencies involved and by research workers, of the various governmental development

(viii)

and welfare programmes taking into account the impact of these programmes on the SC/ST population.

V. S. Chitre
Director

Preface

In July 1978 the Government of Maharashtra proposed to entrust to certain Universities in the State and the Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics, Pune (GIPE) a study of the impact of its agricultural development programmes on Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes population in Maharashtra. It was expected that the study would be undertaken jointly by these academic organisations. Eventually seven Universities (viz. Marathwada Agricultural University, Parbhani; Marathwada University, Aurangabad; Punjabrao Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola; Nagpur University, Nagpur; Shivaji University, Kolhapur; University of Bombay, Bombay, and University of Poona, Pune) consented to participate in the Research Project and the study got under way only in April, 1981 when the first meeting of the Research Team comprising the representatives of the GIPE (Prof. N. Rath, the then Director and myself) and of the participating Universities was held at the GIPE in Pune. (The names of the University participants are given in ^{Annexure} I-A to Chapter I of this Report). This meeting, as well as those that followed, were attended also by the Director, Economics and Statistics, Government of Maharashtra and some of his senior colleagues.

In conformity with the decisions of the Research Team a survey was undertaken mostly during the period May, 1981 to May, 1982 in 220 villages spread over the whole of Maharashtra on the basis of a questionnaire prepared by the GIPE, and later discussed and finalised by the Research Team. In view of the wide geographical coverage of the survey it was decided that the questionnaire would include, besides the questions on agricultural development programmes, those also on welfare programmes of the Government of Maharashtra in fields such as education, house construction, drinking water supply and so on in the rural areas. It was unanimously decided that for the conduct

(x)

of the survey a University Representative would nominate selected teachers from colleges under his university as Supervisors and that the actual survey work would be undertaken by village-based college students under the direct supervision of the Teacher-Supervisors and the overall direction of the concerned University Representative. A little less than 55000 rural households were surveyed by the investigators. The GIPE was expected to prepare the report covering findings relating to these less than 55000 rural households surveyed. The Report being presented by me now is in fulfilment of the responsibility assigned to the GIPE.

Initially it was expected that the Teacher-Supervisors would do the work of coding of the data in the schedules. After the survey was over, however, it was realised that this arrangement would not work. The work of coding was, therefore, handed over to the District Statistical Offices of the Directorate of Economics and Statistics. An amount of time was naturally taken in collecting so many schedules from the Universities in the district offices of the Directorate; the preparation by the GIPE of a Code Transcription Sheet (CTS) for transferring data from the schedules in a coded form and the actual completion of work of transferring data to CTS in the district offices. In consequence the GIPE could begin preparing a programme for computerisation of data only in mid-1984. This work of computerisation was slowed down initially as it was realised that the data coded was not as 'clean' as expected. This was the result presumably of investigational lapses. Data validation programmes were developed and computer tables began flowing in early 1985. The work was over by mid-1985.

During 1985-86 I was extremely busy with the work of the Panchayati Raj Evaluation Committee (of which I was a member) appointed by the Government of Maharashtra. This involved extensive touring of Maharashtra districts for discussion

with persons interested in democratic decentralisation, visits to some other states in India in which new directions are being given to this experiment and later, as a member of the drafting Sub-Committee of the PREC, writing drafts of chapters for consideration by the Committee. The Report of the PREC was submitted to the Government at the end of June 1986, and only then I became relatively free to devote myself to the work of writing the Report now being presented. During the next several months I devoted myself to preparing a large number of subsidiary tables based upon computer data, writing out preliminary drafts of chapters in the Report and then revising the chapters one after another. Unfortunately after the first two chapters were finalised the further work relating to the remaining chapters was held up due to my protracted illness from June 1987 onwards. I am happy that the work is now over.

It must be said that the experience of enlisting college students for the purpose of conducting the survey of rural households under the direct supervision of college teachers who knew them, was rather mixed in character. There is no gainsaying the fact that assigning this work to students was certainly an idea worth pursuing. Responses from some of the student-investigators and teacher-supervisors were quite encouraging. However, undoubtedly there were several investigational lapses which necessitated the exercise of utmost care in interpreting the data collected. It is felt, however, that the data thrown up by the survey yields a number of meaningful conclusions.

I express my sense of gratitude to my former colleague, Prof. N. Rath for several illuminating discussions I had with him at different stages of this work, though he bears no responsibility for the blemishes that remain in this Report. The co-operation received from the University Representatives in contributing to the discussions within the Research Team as also in organis-

(xii)

ing and seeing through the survey, is gratefully acknowledged. Shri Vidwans, Director, Economics and Statistics, Government of Maharashtra, his deputy, Shri D.S.Kulkarni, the then Additional Director and some of their senior colleagues shared with the Research Team their substantial knowledge of the developmental programmes of the Government of Maharashtra. The Directorate of Economics and Statistics also provided a useful administrative support to the Research Team. On behalf of the Research Team I express our sincere thanks to the Directorate officials. Finally I must thank my former colleagues at the Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics, particularly the Staff of the Computer Division in the Institute, headed by Shri D.B. Sardesai and also Shri A.V. Moghe, the stenographer, for the assistance I received from them.

Anand S. Nadkarni

List of Tables

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
1.1	Number of Villages Surveyed Districtwise	6
1.2	Village Size in the Survey	10
1.3	SC/ST Households : Survey and 1981 Census	17
1.4	Coverage of the Survey (Regionwise)	26
1.5	Number of Households in the Survey vis-a-vis the number of rural households in the 1981 Population Census (Regionwise)	27
2.1	Percentage Distribution of Households in the Different Social Groups by Size of Cultivated Holding (Survey)	37
2.2	Percentage of Households in a Landholding Class (Within a Social Group) who have some Irrigated Land.	38
2.3	Percentage of Households with Irrigated Land of 6 acres or more to Total Households with Land	39
2.4	Percentage of Households (to those with some land under irrigation) having land under Well Irrigation/ Canal Irrigation/Lift Irrigation.	39
2.5	Proportion of Gainfully Employed Adult Males/Adult Females/Minors/ Total of these Three to the Total Number of Persons in Each Category	42
2.6	Main Occupation (Subtotal of Proportions to those Gainfully Employed).	44
2.7	Percentage Distribution of the Gainfully Employed into the Three Types of Main Occupation.	46
2.8	Percentage of Households which received Loans from One Source or More, to Total Households.	47
2.9	Percentage of Recipients of Loans from (i) Private Agencies and (ii) Public Agencies	49
2.10	Percentage of Households within a Given Size-Class of Loan Amounts Receiving these from the Stated Source, to Total Households receiving Loans from One Source or More.	50

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
2.11	Average Size of the Rural Household	52
2.12	Average Size of Rural Households by Land-related Classes (Survey Data)	53
2.13	Percentage of (i) Persons with some Formal Education and Not Studying any longer and (ii) Persons Being Educated in the Surveyed Households.	54
2.14	Percentage of 'Adults with Some Formal Education and No Longer Studying' (AFE) and of 'Those Being Educated' (TBE) in the Different Land-related Classes.	57
3.1	Percentage of Landless Households in a Social Group Reporting Receipt of Land under Tenancy/Ceiling Legislation, to total Landless Households in that Social Group.	64
3.2	Percentage of Households within a Landholding Class belonging to a Social Group Reporting Receipt of Land under <u>Tenancy Legislation</u> .	65
3.3	Percentage of Beneficiary Households under <u>Ceiling Legislation</u> within a Landholding Class belonging to a Social Group.	65
3.4	Percentage of Landholding Households in a Social Group Reporting Receipt of <u>Forest or Other Land</u> , to total such households.	67
3.5	Percentage of Households receiving Financial Assistance for Land Improvement, to total 'Reporting Households'	68
3.6	Percentage of Households in each Landholding Class within a Social Group which had Khar/Khajjan Land, to Total Households in that Class in that Group.	70
3.7	Percentage of Households with Khar/Khajjan Land (Regionwise).	71
3.8	Percentage of Households with Khar/Khajjan Land who received Subsidy/Loan for Capital Expenditure on Khar/Khajjan Land.	72
3.9	Proportion of Households receiving Subsidy/Loan for Capital Expenditure on other Types of Land.	73
3.10	Percentage of Total Number of Households within a Social Group on whose lands bunds were constructed by the Government (Regionwise).	74

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Title No.</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
3.11	Percentage of households (separately in Western Maharashtra and Marathwada) in each Landholding Class within a Social Group on whose lands bunds were constructed by the Government.	75
3.12	Percentage of Households reporting Bund Construction, whose bunds were intact/partially intact/not intact	77
3.13	Percentage of Households Receiving Benefit in the Form of Levelling/Shaping of Land by the Government.	78
3.14	Percentage of Households having Bullocks	79
3.15	Percentage of Households getting Financial Assistance for the purchase of Bullocks from one or more of the Agencies mentioned.	80
3.16	Percentage of Households getting Financial Assistance for Purchase of Bullocks from the Sources mentioned	82
3.17	Percentage of Households who owned at least one Farm Implement.	83
3.18	Average Number of Implements per Reporting Household	84
3.19	Percentage of Households receiving Financial Assistance from some agency for Purchase of Implements during the preceding five years.	85
3.20	Percentage of landholding households who received subsidy/loan from government for purchase of Implements during the preceding five years.	86
3.21	Percentage of Households Reporting Information on Seeds.	87
3.22	Reporting Households Regionwise (Seeds)	88
3.23	Percentage of Reporting Households Receiving Some Financial Assistance from Government in respect of seeds.	90
3.24	Percentage of Landholding Households Receiving Government Subsidy/Loan of differing amounts in respect of Seeds.	92
3.25	Percentage of Households Reporting Information on Fertilisers.	94
3.26	Percentage of Households (to 'Reporting Households') Obtaining Fertilisers from (i) Government and/or Co-operative Society or (ii) <u>only</u> Market	96

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
3.27	Percentage of Cultivator-Households who Received Some Financial Assistance from Government in the Form of Subsidy and/or Loan	97
3.28	Percentage of Households by Size-class of Amounts of Financial Assistance (Subsidy and/or Loan) from Government in respect of Fertilisers	99
3.29	Proportion of Households Reporting Information on Sources of Supply of and/or Government Financial Assistance in respect of Pesticides	101
3.30	Percentage of Households (to 'Reporting Households') Obtaining Pesticides from (i) Government and/or Cooperative Society and (ii) <u>only</u> Market	102
3.31	Percentage of Reporting Households who Received Some Assistance from Government (Subsidy/Loan) in respect of Pesticides	104
3.32	Percentage of Beneficiary Landholding Households Under Scheme for Writing-off of Loan Overdues	105
3.33	Percentage of Households whose Lands Fell within the Area of Benefit of a River Valley Dam	107
3.34	Percentage of 'Reporting Households' with differing amounts of Benefit from a River Valley Dam	108
3.35	Percentage of Households who Received Assistance for Well-digging and/or for Lift-Irrigation	110
3.36	Average Amount of Assistance (in Rupees) per Reporting Household	112
3.37	Percentage of Households with Pumps set on their wells, to Households with some Land Under Irrigation	113
3.38	Percentage of Households who Received Assistance from the Government for Pumps on Wells	114
3.39	Percentage of Households in each Size-Class of Government Assistance (Subsidy/Loan), in respect of Pumpsets installed.	116
3.40	Percentage of Households Reporting that Some Member(s) of the Household attended a Training Camp Organised by Government for Agriculturists	118
3.41	Percentage of Households whose Income from Agriculture <u>Increased</u>	120

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
4.1	Percentage of Surveyed Households Owning Livestock	127
4.2	Average Number of Livestock per 'Reporting Household'	129
4.3	Percentage of Households Owning 9 or more of a Livestock Species	130
4.4	Percentage of Households having Cross-bred Cows, to Total Households with Milch Animals	131
4.5	Percentage of Households Reporting that Artificial Insemination was done to their Cows	132
4.6	Percentage of Cows subjected to Artificial Insemination	132
4.7	Percentage of Households Reporting Purchase of Milch Animals/Goats and Sheep/Poultry/One or More of Livestock Species	135
4.8	Average Number of 'Milch Animals' Purchased per Reporting Household	136
4.9	Percentage of Reporting Households which received Government Subsidy for Purchase of Livestock	137
4.10	Percentage of Households (having Cross-bred Cows) who received Government Subsidy for purchase of Cross-bred Cows	138
4.11	Percentage of Households receiving Government Subsidy for raising Cross-bred Calves to Households possessing Cross-bred Cows	139
4.12	Percentage of Households who reported having received Government Subsidy for the purchase of Chickens, to Households who purchased Poultry	140
4.13	Percentage of Households reporting Arrangement of Veterinary Treatment to Livestock falling Sick, to Households possessing one or more Species of Livestock	141
4.14	Percentage of Households who reported that arrangement was made for Veterinary Treatment to Livestock fallen Sick (Regionwise).	142
4.15	Percentage of Households Reporting Free Inoculation by Government to their Animals/Poultry	143

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
4.16	Percentage of Households Reporting Sale of Milk	144
4.17	Percentage of Households Selling Milk to Coop. Milk Producers' Society and at Government Milk Centre	146
4.18	Percentage of Households Selling Eggs	148
4.19	Percentage of Households Selling Eggs to Public Agencies	150
5.1	Percentage of Households with One or More Members Performing Wage-Labour	153
5.2	Average Number of Wage-Labourers Per Reporting Household	155
5.3	Average Number of Saldars Per Household for Households Reporting Wage-Labour by Members	156
5.4	Percentage of Saldars Who Could Not Leave Job	157
5.5	Percentage of Saldars who Could <u>Not</u> Leave Job (Regionwise Data)	157
5.6	Percentage of Persons working on EGS to Persons who are wage-workers, agricultural or otherwise.	158
5.7	Average Number of Persons Working on the EGS, per Reporting Household	159
5.8	Average Number of Persons Working on EGS, per Household Reporting any Wage-Labourer (Regionwise Data)	160
5.9	Average Man-months Per Person on EGS	161
5.10	Average Man-months per Person on EGS (Regionwise)	161
5.11	Percentage of Reporting Households experiencing Difficulties in getting work on the EGS	163
5.12	Percentage of Reporting Households experiencing Difficulties in getting Work on EGS (Regionwise Data)	164
5.13	Percentage of Households Reporting Difficulties Citing One or the Other Difficulty in Getting Work on the EGS	165
5.14	Percentage of Households Reporting that the Number of Days of Wage Labour Increased/Decreased/Remained Constant	167

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
5.15	Percentage of Households Stating that Income from Agricultural Labour Increased/Decreased/Remained constant	169
6.1	Percentage of Households (to total households in a group) in which Adults and/or Minors were being educated.	173
6.2	Percentage of Households who Received at least one of the Materials Free of Charge for its School-going Members	174
6.3	Percentage of Households Receiving Slates & Pencils/Exercise Books/Books/Uniforms/Breakfast or Lunch, Free of Charge.	175
6.4	Percentage of Households with Wards staying in Hostels to Total Households in which Adults and/or Minors were being educated	178
6.5	Percentage of Households who had to bear None of the Hostel Expenses/Part of these Expenses/All of these Expenses, to Households with Wards staying in hostels	179
6.6	Percentage of Households receiving Land from Government for House Construction, to total Households with one or more members performing Wage-labour	181
6.7	Percentage of Households reporting that Government Constructed Houses for them, to Households with one or more members performing Wage-labour	182
6.8	Percentage of Households Receiving Government Financial Assistance for House Construction, to Total Households	183
6.9	Percentage of Households Getting Drinking Water in the Village/at a Distance of 1 to 3 miles/at a Distance of More Than 3 miles	185
6.10	Percentage of Households Obtaining Water from Only One Source/Two Sources	186
6.11	Percentage of Households Obtaining Drinking Water from the Source Mentioned	187
6.12	Percentage of Households Getting Drinking Water All the Year Round	191
6.13	Percentage of Households with Electricity in Houses	192
6.14	Percentage of Households with Gobar Gas Plants	194

(xx)

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
6.15	Percentage of Households Whose Gobar Gas Plants Functioned well	194
6.16	Percentage of Households Reporting Illness in the Family	195
6.17	Percentage of Households who Visited Government Dispensary for Treatment, to those reporting Illness in the Family	196
6.18	Percentage of Households who received Medicines Free of Charge in Government Dispensaries	197
6.19	Percentage of Households with a Member Having Undergone Family Planning Surgery	198

Chapter I

Project Background And Research Methodology

Introduction

1.1 In response to the recommendations of Legislative Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes, Vimukta Jatis and Nomadic Tribes, the Government of Maharashtra decided in July 1978 to undertake an evaluation study for assessing the impact of agricultural development programmes on Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (SC/ST) population in the State.¹ It was proposed "to entrust the study jointly to certain universities (including Agricultural Universities) in the State and the Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics, Pune".² At the initial meeting on 21st July, 1978 (organised by the Planning Department, Government of Maharashtra) of representatives of some Universities, the Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics (GIPE), the Planning Department and the Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Government of Maharashtra (DESM), it was decided to invite the GIPE to coordinate the work of the participating universities and to prepare the final report.

1.2 It was only by November 1980 that the list of universities willing to participate as also the names of their respective representatives was more or less finalised. Seven universities agreed to associate themselves with the research project.

(Annexure I-A to this chapter gives names of universities, their respective representatives and the districts assigned to each university). During November and December 1980 the GIPE was busy organising on its premises the All India Economics Conference, the All India Agricultural Economics Conference and

1. See Government of Maharashtra, Planning Department, Resolution No. EVA.1078/Div.II dated 20th July, 1978. (reproduced as Appendix I to this Report).

2. Ibid.

two other all India conferences in specialised fields coming under Economics. Thereafter some time was spent in collecting some necessary information and in making preliminary preparations for a discussion-meeting among participants. The first meeting of the representatives of the GIPE, the seven participating universities and the DESM was held on 10th and 11th April 1981 to discuss details relating to the research project. The meeting discussed matters such as selection of villages for the survey, methodology to be employed in the survey and allied details. The draft household schedule for the survey prepared at the GIPE was also discussed at the meeting and it was decided that the GIPE should finalise the same in the light of the discussion. The representatives met five times during 1981-83 (twice in 1981, twice in 1982 and once in late 1983) to review progress of survey work and they arrived at agreed decisions. The details relating to the nature of the survey envisaged, methodology employed and such other aspects are set out in the succeeding paragraphs in this chapter.

Survey Design

1.3 The survey covered all the districts of Maharashtra except Greater Bombay. (Hereinafter Maharashtra excluding Greater Bombay will be referred to simply as Maharashtra). At the time of the survey the total number of surveyed districts was twentyfive.³ The initial plan of work relating to selection of villages, coverage of the survey, organisation of investigational work and such other details, may be explained briefly before we state the deviations which had to be made eventually.

1.4 Every university was expected to select 10 villages in a district assigned to it. In this respect in the first meeting of the participating institutions in April 1981 it was further decided as follows : "Considering that the average

3. These have since been made into 29 districts through subdivision of four districts. Ratnagiri has been divided into Ratnagiri and Sindhudurg; Aurangabad into Aurangabad and Jalna; Osmanabad into Osmanabad and Latur and Chandrapur into Chandrapur and Gadchiroli.

population⁴ in a village in Maharashtra is around 1000, the average number of families for the 10 villages to be selected in a district should be about 200 per village". Considering that the average number of households per village in Maharashtra is 191 as per the 1981 Population Census, the stipulation can be regarded as quite reasonable. All the households in a selected village were to be covered by the survey. Though the initial focus of the study as envisaged was assessment of impact on SC/ST households, it was felt that survey of all households in a village (SC/ST or otherwise) would be advisable as it would facilitate a comparative assessment of the impact on SC/ST vis-a-vis that on the rest.

300 fam-
per village
now?

1.5 It will be seen that about 2000 households were to be surveyed per district making a total of around 50000 households for Maharashtra. What is more, it was expected that with an average of 200 households per village as the target for the district the University Representatives would select villages of different sizes, some small, some medium and a few somewhat bigger. Thus, the diversity of conditions in different-sized villages in a district would get reflected in the survey data, yielding hopefully an average picture for the district.

1.6 The survey work was to be organised under the overall direction of the University Representative (UR) concerned. In every district the UR was to nominate two teachers from colleges located in the district to supervise the work of investigation. The actual investigation was to be done by students, selected on the basis of their background, ability, willingness to work, honesty, degree of involvement in rural society and so on. Students were considered for investigational work as it would

4. The average population mentioned here is as per the 1971 Census of Population.

give them a healthy exposure to this type of academic activity. Their selection was to be done by the UR in consultation with teacher-supervisors (TS).

1.7 The idea was that all the households in a village were to be surveyed by two students resident in that village or in a nearby village. One of these two student-investigators (SI) was to be a person belonging to SC/ST population. The 'residence condition' was intended to yield two advantages. The cost of the survey would evidently be minimised. Secondly, being resident in the village or a nearby village, the SI would have better access to households there. That should dispel customary suspicion among villagers about any enquiries into their conditions. It was, therefore, expected that the village households would cooperate wholeheartedly with the investigators by sparing time to answer questions truthfully and without inhibitions. This was likely to be facilitated further by the fact that the team of the two SI was to consist of one SC/ST and one non-SC/ST student.

1.8 A corollary to these decisions was that the selection of villages and the selection of two SI for every village were to be somewhat interdependent. It would appear that once the SI were selected on the basis of criteria mentioned earlier (background, ability, etc.), the villages to be surveyed would get selected automatically as these would be the ones in which SI resided or those nearby. At the same time, however, the UR were expected to select villages as far dispersed in a district as possible and also containing an adequate number of SC/ST households.⁵ If such villages are identified the UR would have

5. It was realised that "in talukas/tahsils with predominantly tribal population there may be villages with hardly any non-tribal population. There was no bar to selection of such villages in such talukas". (Taken from a summary of decisions at the meeting in April, 1981, intimated by GIPE to all the UR. Ref. GIPE No.1222/1981 dated April 14, 1981).

to find out SI from among those resident in these villages or nearby ones and possessing the needed qualities. Clearly such an interdependent exercise was possible only if a fairly large number of properly-motivated and capable students from colleges spread over the district showed willingness to work, giving a UR an opportunity to make a choice so as to get a proper 'fit' of SI and the villages to be surveyed. In actual fact, the choice among SI was rather limited, and hence, in several cases, villages had to be selected taking into account the locational convenience of SI nominated.

1.9 All this means that the villages and hence the households for survey were not to be selected on the basis of any random sampling exercise. One may object that this vitiated the representative character of the findings of the survey. There is some truth in this objection. All the same, it was felt that data collected from a massive group of about 50000 households, spread over 25 districts of Maharashtra, would be substantial and variegated enough to yield worthwhile conclusions, particularly if motivated resident SI, selected imaginatively and trained adequately by university participants (UR and TS), carried out the survey with a sense of purpose.

Survey Work

1.10 From a few details provided in the preceding section it should be clear that the actual conduct of the survey was to be planned and undertaken by the UR with the help of SI under the direct supervision of teacher-supervisors. The GIPE was not connected with this part of the work. The GIPE participated in preparation of survey design, prepared draft of questionnaire which then was finalised after discussion in meetings of participants, issued written instructions useful for investigational work, which, it was expected, would be explained by UR to TS who, in turn, would brief the SI in these instructions. But the quality of the data on schedules depended upon the quality of effort by SI who were under the direct control of

TS and overall control of UR.

1.11 The survey could not be undertaken simultaneously in all the districts. Each UR had his own set of difficulties to grapple with in organising the survey, relating particularly to the finalisation of lists of TS and SI. The survey was, therefore, conducted in stages by almost every university within its own group of districts, mostly over the period May 1981 to May 1982.

(A) Number of Villages Selected for Survey

1.12 It was not possible to adhere in practice to all the conditions relating to selection of villages and coverage of the survey mentioned above. The following table gives information on the number of villages selected for the survey, district by district.

Table 1.1 : Number of Villages Surveyed Districtwise

District/Districts Group (1)	No. of villages selected for study (2)
1. Thane	4
2. Raigad	5
3. Ratnagiri	4
<u>Konkan</u>	13
4. Nashik	5
5. Dhule	10
6. Jalgaon	10
7. Ahmednagar	7
8. Pune	9
9. Satara	10
10. Sangli	10
11. Solapur	10
12. Kolhapur	10
<u>Western Maharashtra</u>	81

(1)	(2)
13. Aurangabad	9
14. Parbhani	9
15. Beed	10
16. Nanded	9
17. Osmanabad	9
<u>Marathwada</u>	46
18. Buldhana	10
19. Akola	10
20. Amravati	10
21. Yeotmal	10
22. Wardha	10
23. Nagpur	10
24. Bhandara	10
25. Chandrapur	10
<u>Vidarbha</u>	80
<u>Maharashtra</u>	220

N.B.: (i) In all the tables in this Report 'Maharashtra' means Maharashtra excluding Greater Bombay.

(ii) At the data processing stage one village, Bhaler from Dhule district, had to be dropped on grounds of lack of response to a crucial question (explained later). That makes the actual number of villages studied in the case of Dhule district 9, of Western Maharashtra, 80 and of Maharashtra, 219. It may also be mentioned that at a meeting of representatives of the GIPE, the participating universities and the DESM in September 1982 it was decided to drop one surveyed village from Wardha District, viz., Jamni, as survey work in the village was reported to be unsatisfactory. However, through inadvertence, the data for this village remained to be left out at the data processing stage. Since the number of households in the village is only 45, the inclusion of their schedules for data processing is not likely to have affected the results materially.

1.13 We see from the above table that the stipulation as regards the number of villages to be selected (i.e. 10 per district) was observed only in the case of 15 districts

(including none from Konkan, 6 from Western Maharashtra, 1 from Marathwada and all the 8 from Vidarbha). In 5 of the remaining 10 districts, the number of selected villages is nine each. Of these 4 districts are from Marathwada and 1 from Western Maharashtra. In the three Konkan districts the number is quite low, being 4 each in Thane and Ratnagiri and 5 in Raigad. Thus in this region instead of 30 only 13 villages were actually surveyed. The number is also on the low side in Ahmednagar (7 villages) and Nashik (5 villages) districts of Western Maharashtra. In all, therefore, instead of 250 villages the survey covers 220 villages. Our study here, however, relates to 219 villages, since, as stated above, one village from Dhule district had to be dropped at the data processing stage. This became necessary because the question whether the household belonged to SC, ST or Non-SC-ST group remained unanswered in all the schedules pertaining to this village. The answer to this question is crucial in the context of this project.

(B) Average size of surveyed village

1.14 It has been stated above that while selecting 10 villages in a district the UR were to see that the average number of households per village was around 200. Clearly if this expectation was fulfilled in the selection of villages in every district, the average number of households per village would be around 200 for every districts-group (i.e. region) as also for the State as a whole. This was intended to ensure that (a) a sufficiently large number of households were covered in the survey and (b) there was a fair distribution of different-sized villages in the group of villages chosen. The following table (Table 1.2) gives the survey information on the distribution of villages by size and average number of households per village for every district.

1.15 We may regard villages with 200 households or less as

relatively 'small' villages (Columns 2 + 3), those with 201 to 500 households as the 'medium' ones (Columns 4 + 4) and those with more than 500 households as the relatively 'bigger' villages (Columns 6+7+8). It is found that out of the total number of villages surveyed in the State 129 villages (i.e. 59 per cent of the total) belonged to the 'medium' category; 78 villages (i.e. 35 per cent of the total) are 'small', and the remaining 13 villages (6 per cent of the total) were relatively 'bigger' villages. Thus, the accent in the survey was on the 'medium' category with a sizeable number in the first ('small') category. In the 'big' category, most of the villages (9) had between 501 to 750 households. Only 4 villages were still bigger in size.

1.16 The picture for the different districts-groups (to be referred to hereinafter as 'regions') was not far different. However, in the Konkan and Western Maharashtra samples the small villages were larger in number as compared to medium villages, while the opposite was true for the Marathwada and Vidarbha samples. In Konkan, of the 13 villages surveyed, 9 were 'small', 4 'medium' and none 'big'. In Western Maharashtra, the corresponding figures were 81 (total); 44 (small); 36 (medium) and 1 (big); for Marathwada, the figures were : 46; 8; 35; and 3 and for Vidarbha, 80; 17; 54; 9.

1.17 As between the districts taken individually the picture was rather uneven. In the districts of Konkan no big village had been covered in the survey.⁶ The same was more or less true of the districts of Western Maharashtra except for Jalgaon in which one of the 10 villages covered was somewhat big. In each one of the districts of Parbhani, Nanded and Osmanabad

6. This is subject to the observation being made in paragraph 1.20 below.

Table 1.2 : Village size in the survey

Districts	Villages with 100 house-holds or less	Villages with 101 to 200 house-holds	Villages with 201 to 350 house-holds	Villages with 351 to 500 house-holds	Villages with 501 to 750 house-holds	Villages with 751 to 1000 house-holds	Villages with 1001 house-holds or more	Total No. of villages	Average of house holds
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
1. Thane	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	4	103
2. Raigad	2	1	2	-	-	-	-	5	163
3. Ratnagiri	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	4	221
<u>Konkan</u>	4	5	4	-	-	-	-	13	163
4. Nasik	-	4	1	-	-	-	-	5	176
5. Dhule	-	3	7	-	-	-	-	10	225 (228)
6. Jalgaon	1	2	6	-	1	-	-	10	258 (231)
7. Ahmednagar	-	5	2	-	-	-	-	7	205 (197)
8. Pune	-	6	3	-	-	-	-	9	225 (207)
9. Satara	3	3	4	-	-	-	-	10	168 (166)
10. Sangli	1	7	2	-	-	-	-	10	171 (162)
11. Solapur	2	6	1	1	-	-	-	10	167 (161)
12. Kolhapur	-	1	8	1	-	-	-	10	271 (264)
<u>Western Maharashtra</u>	7	37	34	2	1	-	-	81	209 (200)
13. Aurangabad	-	4	5	-	-	-	-	9	206
14. Parbhani	-	-	6	2	1	-	-	9	331

(contd.)

Table 1.2 (contd.)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15. Beed	1	1	8	-	-	-	-	10	242 (241)
16. Nanded	-	-	7	1	1	-	-	9	333
17. Osmanabad	-	2	6	-	1	-	-	9	297
<u>Marathwada</u>	1	7	32	3	3	-	-	46	281
18. Buldhana	-	1	7	2	-	-	-	10	288 (286)
19. Akola	-	4	3	2	1	-	-	10	269 (266)
20. Amravati	-	4	6	-	-	-	-	10	198 (189)
21. Yeotmal	-	3	5	2	-	-	-	10	249 (242)
22. Wardha	1	1	4	3	-	1	-	10	345 (342)
23. Nagpur	-	-	3	1	3	1	2	10	606 (567)
24. Bhandara	1	1	6	2	-	-	-	10	265 (256)
25. Chandrapur	-	1	6	2	1	-	-	10	334 (232)
<u>Vidarbha</u>	2	15	40	14	5	2	2	80	319 (297)
Maharashtra	14	64	110	19	9	2	2	220	261 (250)

N.B.: Explanation of bracketed figures is given in the text (Paras 1.21 and 1.22).

one somewhat big village had been covered in the survey. In the Vidarbha region, big villages figured in the survey in the districts of Akola, Wardha, Nagpur and Chandrapur. Of these, Nagpur is a case apart. Here, of the 10 villages surveyed, none was 'small', 4 were 'medium' and 6 'big'. Of the 6 'big' villages, 3 had between 501 to 750 households on an average, 1 had between 751 to 1000 households and 2 were quite big having more than 1000 households.

1.18 A glance over the district figures of average number of households per village reveals a wide disparity ranging from a low of 103 in Thane to a very high of 606 in Nagpur. In fact only in three districts (Ahmednagar, Aurangabad and Amravati) the average was quite near the one expected. It was 205 in Ahmednagar, 206 in Aurangabad and 198 in Amravati. In six other districts of Maharashtra (barring Amravati) the average number of households per village was less than 200, the highest among these six numbers being 176 for Nashik — 12 per cent less than the average number expected to be covered in every district. That leaves sixteen districts in each of which the average number of households per village surveyed was significantly higher than expected. The lowest among these 16 numbers was 221 for Ratnagiri district which is 10 per cent higher than expected. Figures which are particularly high are to be found in the case of Marathwada and Vidarbha districts. Thus, we find that the accent on 'medium' category of villages in the survey made average figures for as many as 16 districts rather high.

1.19 When we consider the average number of households per village for the whole state we see from the table that the figure for Maharashtra was 261 which, as an average, is little on the high side in the light of instructions given. Region-wise the figures are as follows : Konkan, 163; Western Maharashtra 209; Marathwada 281 and Vidarbha, 319. In both

Marathwada and Vidarbha, the average number of households per surveyed village was quite high, whereas in Konkan it was rather low. At 209 it was rather adequate in the case of Western Maharashtra. It may not matter much if this average was rather high or low, if (i) there was a satisfactory distribution among small, medium and big villages and (ii) a sufficiently large number of households were covered in the survey. We have seen that in most of the districts villages were selected from the 'small' and 'medium' categories. There were also a few 'bigger' villages. Hopefully the distribution among small, medium and big villages was not unsatisfactory. The second condition is certainly fulfilled as the total number of households surveyed came to 57503.

1.20 A lapse in the survey work organised by two Universities (Bombay and Poona) may be mentioned here. In a few of the villages selected by these universities, the instruction that all households in a selected village were to be surveyed was not carried out. There were two such villages in Ratnagiri district, six in Ahmednagar district and one in Nashik district. The number of households surveyed in each of these villages was about 200, though the total number of households in each was much larger. There was thus a partial coverage. This was the result of faulty instructions given by TS to SI. For whatever reasons, these TS thought that the important thing was to survey only about 200 households from whichever village was selected on the basis of criteria mentioned earlier rather than the full coverage of a selected village, small, medium or big.

1.21 One more detail merits attention. The figures of average households per surveyed village in the preceding paragraphs are on the basis of schedules actually filled in and the number of villages actually covered in the survey. We may describe these as 'uncorrected' figures. As will be explained below,

a number of schedules from villages had to be discarded at the processing stage. Mention has already been made earlier of one whole village in Dhule district which was left out of account at the processing stage. Consequently, the total number of households covered for purposes of the present study comes down from 57503 to 54833. We have discarded 2670 schedules, i.e., 4.6 per cent of the schedules filled in. All the same the group of households whose responses are being analysed in this study is still sufficiently massive to yield hopefully worthwhile conclusions.

1.22 The number of schedules in a district processed divided by the number of villages in that district to which these schedules pertain gives us the average households per village (district by district) taken into account in this study. We describe these as 'corrected' figures. Such figures are shown in brackets in the last column in Table 1.2. It will be seen that bracketed figures are shown against 17 districts (none in Konkan, 8 in Western Maharashtra, 1 in Marathwada, all the 8 in Vidarbha). This means that in the case of each of these districts, all the schedules actually filled in have not been processed at the tabulation stage.

1.23 It is seen that the picture for Konkan and Marathwada remains the same, with the 'corrected' figures of average number of households per village being still low at 163 for Konkan and on the high side at 281 for Marathwada. The 'corrected' figures for the other two districts-groups are as follows : Western Maharashtra : 200, and Vidarbha : 297. The Western Maharashtra average is as envisaged in the survey and the Vidarbha one, though quite high, is somewhat lower than the 'uncorrected' average.

1.24 One implication of the 'correction' process may be stated here. As stated earlier, one whole village surveyed in Dhule district was left out at the data processing stage. Besides,

there are some villages in other districts in the case of which a few schedules from among the total filled in had to be discarded. This means that responses of all the households in such villages are not being taken into account for purposes of later analysis. It has been argued above that a decision was taken in favour of covering in the survey all households (SC, ST and others) in a selected village to facilitate comparative assessment of impact of agricultural development programme on SC/ST, on the one hand and the rest, on the other. It is hoped that the 'correction' process undertaken at the tabulation stage does not materially affect the capacity of the data to throw light on the comparative assessment aspect.

1.25 The question is whether the households of different types, (particularly SC and ST) have been covered adequately district by district. Adequacy of coverage could be gauged with the help of two sets of proportions, viz. (A) the proportion of, say, SC households in a district to total households in that district in the survey compared to similar proportion for the rural SC households as per 1981 census. A satisfactory tally between proportion in the survey with that in the census should assure us of adequacy on this account. (B) proportion of, say, the surveyed SC households in a district to the total surveyed SC households in Maharashtra compared to similar proportion for the rural SC households as per the 1981 census. What type of information does this proportion bring out? It marks out districts with relatively greater concentration of, say, the rural SC households (defined, for example, as those districts in each of which the rural SC households formed, say, 5 per cent or more of the total rural SC households in the State) from those in which the rural SC households were not so concentrated. We may describe this proportion as indicating the 'concentration profile' in the case of, say, SC for a given district. If the two sets of proportion (for the survey and

for the 1981 census) tally this means that the 'concentration profile' districtwise was the same in the survey as in the 1981-census. This is another aspect of the adequacy of coverage. The data on the two sets of proportion for SC and ST households are given in the Table 1.3.⁷ Columns (2) to (5) give proportions of the (A) type separately for SC and ST; columns (6) to (9) those of the (B) type.

1.26 It is seen from proportions of the (A) type in columns (2) and (3) in the table that so far as SC households are concerned, the proportion of rural SC households to all households was higher - in fact, significantly higher - in the survey than in the census, for Maharashtra as a whole and for each of the four separate regions, Konkan, Western Maharashtra, Marathwada, and Vidarbha. The same is true for each of the 25 districts, except Thane. Scheduled caste rural households formed a negligibly small proportion of the total in Thane district according to the 1981 Population Census. The fact that the survey proportion was still smaller, is of little consequence. On the whole this comparison may be regarded as indicating adequate coverage.

1.27 As for ST households the survey proportion exceeds the Census proportion for Maharashtra and for three of the four regions, viz., Konkan, Western Maharashtra and Marathwada. (Columns 4 and 5 of the table). It was somewhat less in Vidarbha, but not significantly less. While according to the Census, the rural ST households were about 18 percent of all rural households in Vidarbha, ST households surveyed formed 14 percent of the total households surveyed in this region.

1.28 Coming to the comparison at the district level we find that the survey proportion was considerably higher than the

7. See Annexure I-B to this chapter for details of basic data used to prepare the table mentioned in the text.

Table 1.3: SC/ST Households : Survey and 1981 Census

District	Rural SC households as percent of Total Rural households (1981 Census)	SC Households to Total Households (Survey)	Rural ST Households as percent of Total Rural households (1981 Census)	ST Households to Total Households (Survey)	Rural SC Households in the district to Total Rural SC Households in Maharashtra (1981 Census)	SC Households in the district to total SC Households (Survey)	Rural ST Households in the district to total Rural ST Households in Maharashtra (1981 Census)	ST Households in the district to total ST Households (Survey)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
1. Thane	1.83	0.24	38.14	97.82	1.08	0.009	13.63	5.62
2. Raigad	1.50	7.23	14.72	1.47	0.63	0.54	3.77	0.17
3. Ratnagiri	2.23	14.85	1.89	0.34	1.50	1.21	0.77	0.04
Konkan	1.91	9.05	17.83	19.85	3.21	1.76	18.17	5.82
4. Nashik	6.09	25.51	32.53	37.13	3.59	2.06	11.64	4.53
5. Dhule	4.20	9.94	49.80	37.55	2.04	1.88	14.72	10.71
6. Jalgaon	6.48	9.61	10.13	31.82	3.97	2.04	3.76	10.21
7. Ahmednagar	11.53	22.13	8.43	5.95	8.03	2.81	3.56	1.14
8. Pune	6.30	9.43	6.72	17.19	4.13	1.62	2.67	4.46

(contd.)

Table 1.3 (contd.)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
9. Satara	6.24	16.05	0.72	6.55	3.48	2.46	0.24	1.51
10. Sangli	11.82	16.64	0.97	5.30	5.12	2.49	0.26	1.19
11. Solapur	16.94	24.36	2.09	3.24	9.30	3.60	0.70	0.72
12. Kolhapur	13.16	18.99	1.36	1.59	7.36	4.62	0.46	0.58
Western Maharashtra	9.15	15.99	12.19	15.75	47.04	23.58	38.01	35.06
13. Aurangabad	6.85	18.70	3.87	6.32	3.37	3.19	1.36	1.63
14. Parbhani	6.27	21.01	6.25	12.32	2.92	5.76	1.40	5.10
15. Beed	13.08	22.30	0.98	1.16	5.07	4.94	0.23	0.39
16. Nanded	13.14	23.37	11.72	10.12	5.89	6.44	3.02	4.21
17. Osmanabad	17.18	29.18	2.49	2.81	9.43	7.18	0.83	1.04
Marathwada	11.21	23.16	4.69	6.90	26.98	27.52	6.84	12.36
18. Buldhana	6.43	23.91	5.17	5.57	2.52	6.29	1.23	2.21
19. Akola	5.71	33.17	7.80	16.85	2.50	8.12	2.07	6.22
20. Amravati	5.85	21.43	15.52	4.93	2.51	3.72	4.04	1.29
21. Yeotmal	4.97	23.23	25.20	24.60	2.36	5.36	7.27	8.27
22. Wardha	3.63	25.26	18.11	9.98	0.85	7.94	2.58	4.74

(contd.)

Table 1.3 (contd.)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
23. Nagpur	7.79	13.66	16.70	13.71	2.94	7.15	3.82	10.83
24. Bhandara	9.95	16.05	17.75	17.34	5.16	3.77	5.59	6.15
25. Chandrapur	6.70	23.34	29.21	21.87	3.93	4.98	10.39	7.04
Vidarbha	6.60	21.52	17.67	14.14	22.78	47.15	36.99	46.76
Maharashtra	7.89	19.81	13.00	13.13	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

census proportion for Thane district. Thane, in fact, is one of the five districts in Maharashtra in which, as per the 1981 Census, the ST rural households formed more than 25 percent of total rural households. However, in the survey almost all the rural households covered in Thane belong to ST, viz., 404 households out of a total of 413.

1.29 In the remaining districts, the survey proportion for ST households was lower than the census proportion for the following 11 districts : Raigad and Ratnagiri in Konkan; Dhule and Ahmednagar in Western Maharashtra; Nanded in Marathwada; and Amravati, Yeotmal, Wardha, Nagpur, Bhandara and Chandrapur in Vidarbha. However, the difference in proportion was not quite high except in Raigad and Amravati. The districtwise coverage of ST households in the survey seems to be rather satisfactory.

1.30 We may now consider the proportion of the type B (i.e. columns 6 to 9 in the table). The 1981 Census brings out that in rural Maharashtra 8 districts (each with more than 5 percent of rural SC households in the state), accounted for 55 percent of these households. These are : Ahmednagar, Sangli, Solapur and Kolhapur in Western Maharashtra; Beed, Nanded and Osmanabad in Marathwada and Bhandara in Vidarbha. The corresponding survey proportions for these districts total upto about 36 percent. This means that a larger proportion of SC households surveyed was drawn from districts with relatively smaller concentration of rural SC households according to the Census. Columns 6 and 7 of the table show that seven districts of Vidarbha (barring Bhandara) which had about 18 percent of the rural SC households in the State according to the Census, accounted for 43 percent of the total rural SC households surveyed. On the other hand, the 9 districts of Western Maharashtra which together had 47 percent of this category of households in Maharashtra, provided only about 24 percent of these households surveyed.

1.31 In the case of rural ST households 6 districts in Maharashtra (each with more than 5 percent of the total ST households in rural Maharashtra as per Census, 1981) had together 63 percent of this category of households. The districts are : Thane in Konkan; Nashik and Dhule in Western Maharashtra; and Yeotmal, Bhandara and Chandrapur in Vidarbha. The rural ST households selected for the survey in these six districts accounted for nearly 42 percent of the total such households surveyed. In other words, a larger proportion of ST households in the survey was drawn from districts with relatively smaller concentration of ST rural households according to the Census.

1.32 In brief, it is true that, the 'Concentration profile' of the SC/ST drawn from the Survey was different from that based upon the Census. All the same, the more important criterion of adequacy of coverage is provided by proportion 'A' above. As we have noted, the position in respect of this proportion is quite satisfactory.

Questionnaire

1.33 The study was intended to focus on the impact of agricultural development programmes of the Government of Maharashtra on SC/ST population as compared to that on the rest of the population. In the course of discussions, however, the focus was modified in a variety of ways. It was decided to limit the study to benefits flowing possibly from only a few selected agricultural assistance programmes of the government out of an immense number of such programmes. This was done in consideration of the budgetary constraints, of the limited man-hours of work that could be expected from students and hence of the need to keep the size of the questionnaire within manageable limits. Then again, in this respect the target group for study was to be not just the cultivators but also the landless and wage-labourers in the agricultural and non-agricultural sectors. This meant that a few of the assistance programmes for such

sections, such as, for example, the Employment Guarantee Scheme (EGS), were also included in the study. It was further felt that since a large-scale survey of this magnitude was to be undertaken in over 200 villages of Maharashtra, it may be worthwhile collecting information also on assistance programmes in the fields of education, house construction, medical assistance and such other welfare activities, particularly since these are relatively limited in number as compared to programmes of assistance to agriculturists.

1.34 Since the information was to be collected from households in a selected village it would be useful to state what we understood by a 'household'. Those who resided in the village under the same roof and had a common kitchen, were to be regarded as constituting a 'household'. While writing down the names of the members of the households, the investigators were required to include only those members who normally resided in the village as also boys/girls of the household studying outside the village. Any near relative ordinarily staying outside the village to earn his/her livelihood was to be left out.

1.35 As mentioned above, a draft questionnaire meant for village households was considered at the first meeting of the representatives of GIPE, Universities, and the DESM. The draft was finalised in the GIPE in the light of observations made at the meeting. This questionnaire was eventually administered to over 57000 rural households spread over 25 districts of Maharashtra.

1.36 The questionnaire ⁸ was divided into seven Blocks. The first Block consisted of a set of questions bearing principally

8 The questionnaire naturally had to be in Marathi. It is given as Appendix II to this Report. Appendix III presents the 'Instructions to Investigators' issued for the benefit of student-investigators.

on demographic background of the household as also on the educational attainments and employment status of its members. Under item No.8 in this Block the householder-respondent was required to state whether the members of the household belonged to Scheduled Castes, Nava Boudha, Scheduled Tribes or to none of these. While tabulating the data later it was decided to include Nav Boudhas among the Scheduled Castes, view of the fact that the State government treats both on par for purposes of benefits from various schemes. It will be appreciated that information on item 8 was crucial for this enquiry as we were interested in assessing the impact on SC/ST relatively to that on the rest of the population in Maharashtra. Evidently, therefore, we had no alternative but to discard, as stated earlier, all the schedules from village Bhaler in Dhule district at the stage of data processing since in none of these schedules was any information supplied under item 8.

1.37 Block 2 consisted of questions addressed to agriculturists. Some of the questions here, such as, for example, those seeking information on the amount of land held, ownership of bullocks and implements, type of irrigation used, if any, change in income earned in agriculture, if any, were intended to provide data on profiles of different kinds of households being studied. The rest of the questions in the Block related to benefits of government schemes derived by the households. Attempt was also made to find out, through a series of questions, the reasons of non-receipt of benefits by the households concerned. Unfortunately, the response to such questions on the whole was not quite adequate. Thus the data tells us whether the different categories of households identified benefitted or not from a given assistance programme. Under several items information was also provided by the respondents on the amount of financial assistance which they respectively received. But we have hardly any worthwhile information on the reasons for non-

receipt of benefits or for difficulties faced in securing benefits, as perceived by the respondents.

1.38 Block 3 of the questionnaire was on wage-labour. The questions here attempted to bring out the status of workers as either saldars (annual farm servants) or casual workers, the importance of EGS to households surveyed, change in availability of agricultural work during a year to households and change in income from agricultural labour. In the case of labourers who were unable to leave the employer in search of better opportunities, an attempt was made to find out the reasons for this inability. Similarly, an effort was made to understand the difficulties that workers in a household may be facing in getting work under EGS. Unfortunately responses to such probing questions do not appear to be satisfactory.

1.39 Block 4 sought to yield information on animal husbandry activities of the households. An attempt was made here to obtain for surveyed households information on the following : (i) stock of animals/poultry in possession, (ii) those purchased during the preceding five years, (iii) dairy activities, (iv) veterinary services availed of and (v) government assistance received for different purposes and in different forms.

1.40 Questions in Block 5 were on credit facilities open to respondent households. An attempt was made to find out whether a household benefitted from the government scheme of writing off loans to farmers. Those households which did not so benefit were asked to choose from among alternatives indicating possible reasons for non-receipt of benefit.

1.41 Blocks 6,7 and 8 seek from households information on education, house construction, drinking water, electricity, gohar gas plants and medical aid. These are broadly activities ensuring to the people the supply of what are known as 'public goods'. The government is supposed to aid the households by (a) providing these services out of general revenues and

(b) providing assistance of a specific nature to households in respect of some of these services. For example, there is a government scheme of providing to school students slates, pencils, exercise books, books, school uniforms, and eatables in the morning or afternoon free of charge. Then again, government may also provide land for house-construction to households and, in some cases, financial assistance for construction. There are also assistance schemes in respect of medical treatment in government dispensaries, or of gobar gas plants.

Classification of Information

1.42 For the tabulation of data collected, the three basic social groups identified were : (A) Scheduled Castes (SC) (B) Scheduled Tribes (ST) and (C) Others (Non-SC/ST). It was, however, felt that since data on landholdings was available, we may also classify households on the basis of land held as follows: (E) those without land or landless, (F) those cultivating less than 2 acres (G) those with 2 acres to less than 6 acres, and (H) those with 6 acres or more. This landholding-based classification was made on the basis of a preliminary scrutiny of over 1000 schedules at the GIPE. The classification also tallies somewhat (if not entirely) with the national classification into the 'landless', 'marginal farmers', 'small farmers,' and 'medium and large farmers'. Accordingly, we shall designate throughout in this report households without land as 'Landless' , those holding less than 2 acres as 'Marginal', those with 2 to less than 6 acres as 'Small', and those with 6 acres or more as 'Medium and Large'.

1.43 The data was tabulated districtwise, regionwise (i.e. Konkan, Western Maharashtra, Marathwada and Vidarbha) and for the State as a whole, excluding Greater Bombay. In this report, however, the accent is on the analysis at the State level. It was, in fact, decided in a meeting of the research group that UR, with the assistance of TS, would write reports for

the districts assigned to them and the GIPE representative would prepare the state-level report. This is the state-level report being presented by the GIPE.

1.44 According to the initial design of the survey, 10 villages were to be selected for survey in each district and the average number of households per village in a district was to be 200. It may be worthwhile to compare the total number of households that were to be surveyed according to this design in each region with the actual number surveyed. The table below gives this information.

Table 1.4 : Coverage of the Survey (Regionwise)

Region	No. of districts	No. of households (Survey design)	No. of households surveyed (Actual)	Col.4 as percent of Col.3
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. Konkan	3	6000	2111	35.18
2. Western Maharashtra	9	18000	16021	89.01
3. Marathwada	5	10000	12905	129.05
4. Vidarbha	8	16000	23796	148.73
5. Maharashtra	25	50000	54833	109.67

N.B.: 'Actual' number shows the total number of schedules net of those dropped at the data processing stage.

1.45 It is seen that the 'coverage' at the Maharashtra level was about 10 per cent higher than expected as per the research design. However, there were inter-regional differences. There was considerable amount of 'undercoverage' in the Konkan and some degree of 'undercoverage' in Western Maharashtra. On the other hand, the degree of 'coverage' was somewhat higher than that stipulated in Marathwada and much more so in the case of Vidarbha.

1.46 Another way of making the same type of comparison is to

consider the respective proportions to total rural households in each region as per 1981 Population Census, of (i) the number of households in the relevant region which was intended to be surveyed and (ii) the number actually surveyed (net of those dropped at the data processing stage). The following table provides the necessary information.

Table 1.5 : Number of Households in the Survey vis-a-vis the number of rural households in the 1981 Population Census (Regionwise)

Region	No. of households intended to be surveyed to total households as per Census (proportion)	No. of households actually surveyed to total households as per Census (proportion)
(1)	(2)	(3)
1. Konkan	0.60	0.21
2. Western Maharashtra	0.59	0.52
3. Marathwada	0.70	0.90
4. Vidarbha	0.78	1.16
5. Maharashtra	0.66	0.73

It will be seen that proportions in column (3) giving actual survey coverage diverge from one another far more widely than those in column (2). The proportion of the number of households actually surveyed in a district to the number of rural households in that district as per 1981 census varies widely from a low one at 0.12 for Thane to a quite high one at 2.54 for Nagpur. 1.47 A word about the quality of the data would be in order here. As mentioned earlier a total of 57503 schedules were filled in by investigators. It would have been greatly inconvenient to feed data on the schedules filled in ink by a wide variety of student-investigators, directly into the computer. A Code Transcription Sheet (CTS) was, therefore, prepared at the GIPE, to which coded data from a Schedule could be transferred. The work of transferring the data to CTS was assigned

by the DESM to its district offices. It is this coded data on the CTS which was fed into the computer to generate the required tables.

1.48 It follows that the quality of the data could have suffered, if at all, at two points : (a) as the investigation was being carried out by SI under the direct supervision of TS who were being advised by UR and (b) at the point of transfer of data to CTS. There is no way of telling in most cases how much error crept in at which stage. In fact, the reference earlier to the dropping of 2670 schedules at the data processing stage does not mean necessarily that these schedules were filled in indifferently by the investigators. What were discarded in fact were 2670 CTS representing as many schedules. In that case errors may have been made at stage (a) or stage (b) mentioned above. One thing, however, needs to be pointed out. On several schedules scrutinised separately by the GIPE and the DESM it was found that replies recorded against specific questions that were related were not quite consistent. This testified to the fact that the investigational work and the work of supervision left something to be desired.

1.49 Let us consider these 2670 CTS. During the processing of data it was found that the data provided in some of the CTS was not usable for a variety of reasons. Some illustrative cases are cited below.

1.50 One reason has already been cited, viz., that in the case of village Bhaler in Dhule district in which none of the respondents reported any response under item 8 of Block 1 of the questionnaire. In a few cases - stray cases, to be sure - it was found that no adult member (male or female) was reported on the CTS. It was decided that responses on such CTS would be of little use, and hence these were discarded.

1.51 In rows under item 1 of Block 1 of the questionnaire the names of the members of an household were to be entered. The

age of each of this individual was to be shown under item 3 of the Block. Taking this into account the CTS provided for five columns to codify the following information : (a) number of adult males, (18 years and above), (b) number of adult females (18 years and above), (c) children (6 years and less), (d) boys (above 6 years and less than 18 years) and (e) girls (above 6 years and less than 18 years). Clearly the sumtotal of numbers under (a) to (e) must necessarily be greater than the sumtotal of gainfully employed adult males, adult females and minors (Boys and girls), drawn from survey data. A few of the CTS had to be discarded as this condition was not satisfied.

1.52 In Block 4 of the questionnaire, the first two rows under item No.1 give information on the cattle (cows and buffaloes) with the household. If a household had no information to offer in these rows it meant that it did not possess any cattle. In that case, it would not be selling any milk, i.e. the rows under item 5 on sale of milk should also be blank. This is not so in the case of a few CTS which then had to be discarded. Similarly on some CTS it appears that households sold eggs of hens (Block 4, item 6 of the questionnaire) even when they did not have poultry (Block 4, item 1, row 6 of the questionnaire). These CTS were also set aside.

Annexure I-A : Participating Universities, Their Representatives and Districts Assigned

University	Name of Representative	Districts Assigned
1. Marathwada Agricultural University, Parbhani	Prof. G.K.Sangle, Head, Department of Extension Education Marathwada Agricultural University	Parbhani, Nanded, Osmanabad
2. Marathwada University, Aurangabad	Prof. V.V.Borkar, Head, Department of Economics, Marathwada University	Aurangabad Beed, Jalgaon
3. Panjabrao Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola	Prof. V.D.Galgalikar Head, Department of Agricultural Economics & Statistics, Panjabrao Krishi Vidyapeeth	Buldana, Yevatmal, Akola Amravati
4. Nagpur University Nagpur	Prof. S.A.Deshpande Head, Department of Economics, Nagpur University	Nagpur, Wardha, Bhandara, Chandrapur
5. Shivaji University Kolhapur	Dr.(Smt.) S.B.Pandit Lecturer, Department of Economics, Shivaji University	Kolhapur, Sangli, Satara, Solapur
6. University of Bombay	Prof. S.H.Deshpande, Department of Economics, University of Bombay	Thane, Raigad, Ratnagiri
7. University of Poona	Shri M.S.Mahajan, Lecturer & Head, Department of Economics, Modern College, Pune	Pune, Nashik, Dhule, Ahmednagar

N.B.: Districts listed are those before the bifurcation of Aurangabad, Osmanabad, Chandrapur and Ratnagiri.

Annexure I-B: Rural Households - Census 1981 and the Survey

District	Total No. of Rural Households (1981 Census)	Total No. of Rural SC Households (1981 Census)	2 as % of 1	Total No. of Households Covered in the Survey	Total No. of SC Households Covered in the Survey	5 as % of 4
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Thane	350289	6411	1.83	413	1	0.24
2. Raigad	250736	3750	1.50	816	59	7.23
3. Ratnagiri	397540	8883	2.23	882	131	14.85
Konkan	998565	19044	1.91	2111	191	9.05
4. Nasik	350622	21353	6.09	878	224	25.51
5. Dhule	289542	12149	4.20	2053	204	9.94
6. Jalgaon	364170	23606	6.48	2310	222	9.61
7. Ahmednagar	413799	47729	11.53	1378	305	22.13
8. Pune	389007	24527	6.30	1867	176	9.43
9. Satara	331066	20659	6.24	1664	267	16.05
10. Sangli	257435	30426	11.82	1623	270	16.64
11. Solapur	326369	55275	16.94	1605	391	24.36
12. Kolhapur	332581	43752	13.16	2643	502	18.99
Western Maharashtra	3054591	279476	9.15	16021	2561	15.99

(Continued)

Annexure I-B: (Continued)

District	Total No. of Rural ST Households (1981 Census)	7 as % of 1	Total No. of ST Households Covered in the Survey	9 as % of 4	3+8	6+10
	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Thane	133593	38.14	404	97.82	39.97	98.06
2. Raigad	36907	14.72	12	1.67	16.22	8.70
3. Ratnagiri	7510	1.89	3	0.34	4.12	15.19
Konkan	178010	17.83	419	19.85	19.74	28.90
4. Nasik	114071	32.53	326	37.13	38.62	62.64
5. Dhule	144183	49.80	771	37.55	54.00	47.49
6. Jalgaon	36890	10.13	735	31.82	16.61	41.43
7. Ahmednagar	34869	8.43	82	5.95	19.96	28.08
8. Pune	26141	6.72	321	17.19	13.02	26.62
9. Satara	2396	0.72	109	6.55	6.96	22.60
10. Sangli	2499	0.97	86	5.30	12.79	21.94
11. Solapur	6832	2.09	52	3.24	19.03	27.60
12. Kolhapur	4507	1.36	42	1.59	14.52	20.58
Western Maharashtra	372388	12.19	2524	15.75	21.34	31.74

32

(Continued)

Annexure I-B: (Continued)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Aurangabad	343975	23565	6.85	1850	346	18.70
14. Parbhani	276762	17352	6.27	2979	626	21.01
15. Beed	230281	30122	13.08	2408	537	22.30
16. Nanded	252596	33189	13.14	2995	700	23.37
17. Osmanabad	326205	56054	17.18	2673	780	29.18
Marathwada	1429819	160282	11.21	12905	2989	23.16
18. Buldhana	233334	14993	6.43	2856	683	23.91
19. Akola	259906	14846	5.71	2659	882	33.17
20. Amaravati	254933	14912	5.85	1885	404	21.43
21. Yeotmal	282664	14041	4.97	2419	562	23.23
22. Wardha	139378	5065	3.63	3416	863	25.26
23. Nagpur	224168	17472	7.79	5689	777	13.66
24. Bhandara	308375	30671	9.95	2554	410	16.05
25. Chandrapur	348604	23346	6.70	2318	541	23.34
Vidarbha	2051362	135346	6.60	23796	5122	21.52
Maharashtra	7534337	594148	7.89	54833	10863	19.81

(Continued)

Annexure I-B: (Continued)

	7	8	9	10	11	12
13. Aurangabad	13324	3.87	117	6.32	10.72	25.02
14. Parbhani	13702	6.25	367	12.32	12.52	33.33
15. Beed	2252	0.98	28	1.16	14.06	23.46
16. Nanded	29609	11.72	303	10.12	24.86	33.49
17. Osmanabad	8137	2.49	75	2.81	19.67	31.99
Marathwada	67024	4.69	890	6.90	15.90	30.06
18. Buldhana	12071	5.17	159	5.57	11.60	29.48
19. Akola	20264	7.80	448	16.85	13.51	50.02
20. Amaravati	39570	15.52	93	4.93	21.37	26.36
21. Yeotmal	71232	25.20	595	24.60	30.17	47.83
22. Wardha	25241	18.11	341	9.98	21.74	35.24
23. Nagpur	37434	16.70	780	13.71	24.49	27.37
24. Bhandara	54751	17.75	443	17.34	27.70	33.39
25. Chandrapur	101832	29.21	507	21.87	35.91	45.21
Vidarbha	362395	17.67	3366	14.14	24.27	35.66
Maharashtra	979817	13.00	7199	13.13	20.89	32.94

Source: Cols. 1, 2 and 7. Based upon Data for Maharashtra in Census of India, 1981, Series-I, India, Part II B (i), (ii) and (iii), Primary Census Abstract.

Chapter II

Profiles of Households Surveyed

Introduction

2.1 The total number of households surveyed in the State was 54833, excluding those dropped at the stages of scrutiny of schedules and tabulation of data. The remaining chapters of this report are based upon information relating to these 54833 households. In the present chapter we attempt a brief profile of these households.

2.2 These 54833 households were distributed among the Scheduled Castes (SC), the Scheduled Tribes (ST) and others (Non-SC/ST) as follows : SC, 10863 (19.81 per cent of the total); ST 7199 (13.13 per cent), and Non-SC/ST, 36771 (67.06 per cent). In rural Maharashtra the proportion of the three sets of households according to the 1981 Population Census are : 7.89 per cent, 13.00 per cent and 79.11 per cent respectively.¹ This means that in our sample the proportion for ST households was more or less the same as in the Census. But our sample had nearly 20 per cent of the households which belong to SC as against roughly 8 per cent in the Census. Correspondingly the sample proportion for Non-SC/ST at around 67 per cent was lower than the Census proportion of 79 per cent.

2.3 In fact, it may be noted that the selection of our sample villages - 10 in a district with an average number of households of 200 per village - was not done with reference to either the size of the district population or its composition into that of SC, ST and Non-SC/ST. Therefore, there is no reason to expect proportions of SC, ST and Non-SC/ST population in our sample

1. Based upon the data for Maharashtra in : Census of India, 1981, Series-I, India, Part II B(i), (ii) and (iii), Primary Census Abstract. See Annexure I-B to Chapter I in which the Census data and the Survey data districtwise are presented together.

to broadly tally with those in the Census either for districts or for the State as a whole. Any such broad agreement would be more accidental than designed. However, in view of the large number of households surveyed in every district, it would be surprising if the composition of the sample population in this matter turned out to be very wide off the actual position. It does so, however, in the case of SC and Non-SC/ST. The need for household data which would facilitate comparison between SC/ST and Non-SC/ST has influenced our choice of villages, inflating the proportion of SC households in the sample. However, this is not considered to be undesirable since wider coverage of SC/ST households would give us a better empirical basis for our conclusions.

Landholding among SC, ST and Non-SC/ST

2.4 In Chapter I we have stated that the households have also been classified according to size of their operational landholding. These size-classes are : (i) landless; (ii) those cultivating less than 2 acres; (iii) those cultivating 2 acres to less than 6 acres and (iv) those cultivating 6 acres or more. We have earlier described households in size-classes (ii), (iii) and (iv) as "marginal", "small" and "medium and large" landholding households respectively. The distribution of these classes of landholders in our sample was as follows : landless (39.70 percent); "marginal" (9.13 per cent); "small" (24.15 per cent) and "medium and large" (27.02 percent). These figures show that the largest proportion of sample households were landless, followed by those in the "medium and large" category, the "small" category and the "marginal" category, in that order. If we leave out the landless and consider only the cultivating households we find that the "marginal" category households formed 15.15 percent of the total cultivating households, the corresponding percentages for the "small" and "medium and large" category households being 40.05 and 44.80

percent respectively.

2.5 We are, however, interested in comparison as between SC, ST and Non-SC/ST, taking into account the division by land-holding in each one of the three social groups. The following table gives the proportion of households in each of the four land-related classes (landless, 'marginal', 'small' and 'medium and large'), within a social group to the total households surveyed in the relevant social group in rural Maharashtra as a whole.

Table 2.1 : Percentage Distribution of Households in the Different Social Groups by Size of Cultivated Holding (Survey)

Land-related Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)	Total (5)
1. Landless	61.92	53.66	30.40	39.70
2. Marginal	9.00	7.14	9.56	9.13
3. Small	17.97	23.13	26.21	24.15
4. Medium & Large	11.21	16.07	33.83	27.02
5. Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

2.6 It is seen from the table that in our survey the landless preponderated among SC and ST, being nearly 62 percent of the households in the former and about 54 percent in the latter, while among Non-SC/ST the percentage of the landless was only 30. Even among the landholding SC/ST households, the small and marginal cultivators formed the bulk, while among the others (Non-SC/ST) the division between the small-marginal and the medium-large category households, was roughly half and half. This shows that the overwhelming bulk of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled tribe households belonged to what is called, the weaker section of our rural society. It is necessary to note here that the assistance programme of the government intended

for agriculturists, however, small, simply cannot reach more than 60 percent of SC households and more than 50 percent of ST households in the State. Non-SC/ST are much less disadvantaged in this respect.

2.7 Besides land, provision of irrigation is the most important factor governing the generation of income by the households. It also facilitates adoption of a large number of measures extended by government for improvement of agriculture. SC and ST households, with some land, appear to be much less advantageously placed in this regard also than Non-SC/ST. Table 2.2 below shows that while 35 percent of Non-SC/ST households with land had some irrigated land, only 20 percent of SC households and 14 per cent of ST households with land had any irrigation facility.

Table 2.2 : Percentage of Households in a Landholding Class (Within a Social Group) who have Some Irrigated Land

Landholding class	Social Group		
	SC	ST	Non-SC/ST
1. Marginal	26.48	19.46	27.70
2. Small	17.62	12.07	32.91
3. Medium & Large	19.54	14.35	39.31
4. All classes	20.28	14.00	35.31

2.8 Among Non-SC/ST the percentage of households with some irrigated land increased with the size-class of landholding. Then again, in each size-class of landholding Non-SC/ST proportion was higher than SC/ST proportions. Thus the disadvantage of the households with land belonging to SC and ST relatively to those of Non-SC/ST is brought out by the data presented.

2.9 There is one more detail relating to households with irrigation which may be looked into. We have data in our tables on the total number of households with land in each social group. These have been classified also into four size-classes of irrigated land : (i) those with no irrigated land, (ii) those with irrigated land of less than 2 acres, (iii) those with irrigated land of 2 acres to less than 6 acres and (iv) those with irrigated land of 6 acres and more. Let us consider the highest size-class by land under irrigation, viz., 6 acres or more. In the table below we give the percentage of households having irrigated land of 6 acres or more, to total households with land in each social group.

Table 2.3 : Percentage of Households with Irrigated land of 6 acres or more to Total Households with Land

Social Group	Percentage
Scheduled Castes	1.64
Scheduled Tribes	1.41
Non-SC/ST	4.51

2.10 It is seen that the proportion of households with irrigated land of 6 acres and more to the total households with land was 1.64 per cent for SC, 1.41 per cent for ST and 4.51 per cent for Non-SC/ST. The proportion for SC and ST was more or less the same but that for Non-SC/ST was significantly higher. This finding also testifies to the fact of relative disadvantage suffered by SC/ST landholders in comparison with those belonging to Non-SC/ST.

2.11 It is interesting to examine the sources of irrigation of the different social groups and of size-classes of farmers.

Table 2.4 presents the relevant data.

Table 2.4 : Percentage of Households (to those with some land under irrigation) having land under well Irrigation/Canal Irrigation/Lift Irrigation

Landholding Class	SC	ST	Non-SC/ST	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(A) <u>WELL-IRRIGATION</u>				
1. Marginal	12.36	12.00	30.49	25.58
2. Small	29.82	24.38	47.62	44.72
3. Medium & Large	44.96	47.59	60.78	56.65
4. All Classes	28.72	29.98	52.89	49.90

(B) CANAL-IRRIGATION

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. Marginal	15.06	23.00	13.14	14.25
2. Small	20.47	37.81	15.23	16.94
3. Medium & Large	15.97	20.48	12.09	12.52
4. All Classes	17.52	28.48	13.30	14.33

(C) LIFT-IRRIGATION

1. Marginal	73.36	66.00	61.50	64.14
2. Small	51.46	38.81	41.19	42.00
3. Medium & Large	40.34	33.13	31.51	31.96
4. All Classes	55.07	42.61	38.14	39.72

2.12 In this table the total number of farmers with some irrigated land in a particular social group-size class, has been classified under the three different sources of irrigation, viz., wells, canal and lift, and these are expressed as percentages to the total number in that social group-size class. The three percentages do not add up to 100 but to a slightly higher figure, because some cultivators had more than one source of irrigation and therefore, have been classified under more than one head. However, the proportion of such farmers in each size-class was very small.

2.13 Less than 15 percent of all surveyed farmers with any irrigated land, had obtained water from canals; more than 85 percent irrigated their lands from their own wells or from lifts which were mostly co-operative enterprises of farmers. Then again, in the case of surveyed farmers with any irrigated land, the percentage of those using well-irrigation increased with the size-class of landholding whereas percentage of those using lift-irrigation declined as the size-class of landholding increased.

2.14 Irrigation from canals was relatively more with ST cultivators (28.48 percent of households) than with either SC or Non-SC/ST. But this is more of an accident of location of land of farmers in the command area. The more interesting point to note is that Scheduled Caste and even Scheduled Tribe farmers, with some irrigation, had a much larger proportion getting their water from lifts (55.07 and 42.61 percent respectively) than Non-SC/ST. Since most of these SC/ST cultivators were small and marginal in size, common sources like lifts would be the more reasonable alternative for them, and this is what appears to have been the case. This is also broadly seen if we examine the size-wise percentages for the three different social groups.

Gainful Employment

2.15 The surveyed households were required to state the main occupation of every member. This gives us a basis for estimating the number of gainfully employed persons. It must be remembered that no direct question was asked about the work-status of a member at the time of the survey. All the same, the investigators were instructed to record responses under 'Main occupation' which would help to identify not merely those engaged in specific occupations but also categories of persons such as, for example, 'superannuated', 'unemployed and in search of gainful work', 'not doing anything at present but willing to accept gainful work', 'not doing anything at present and not willing to accept gainful work', and so on. Adult women who did not do any gainful work but were engaged only in domestic work were to be reported as doing domestic work. However, adult women working part of the time on farm or on wages may sometimes report 'domestic work' as their 'main occupation'. Such women would be excluded from our list of persons forming the labour force (or those gainfully employed). The following data are subject to such limitations. The data are presented for adult males, adult females and minors (i.e. boys and girls above 6 years and below 18 years of age), separately.

Table 2.5 : Proportion of Gainfully Employed Adult Males/
Adult Females/Minors/Total of these Three
to the Total Number of Persons in Each Category

Gainfully Employed	SC	ST	Non-SC/ST
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1. Adult Males	88.14	90.56	86.96
2. Adult Females	56.54	57.92	35.56
3. Minors	14.35	19.09	8.93
4. All those gainfully employed	54.77	57.57	45.98
5. No. of gainfully employed per household (Average)	2.3	2.4	2.1

N.B.: In the case of 'Minors' figures show percentages of minors gainfully employed to total minors (boys and girls) above 6 years and less than 18 years. This means that children of 6 years and less are left out.

2.16 The table shows that an equally high proportion of adult males in all the three social groups (87 to 90 per cent) were engaged in gainful occupations. But it was different for adult females and minors. While 57 per cent of adult females in SC/ST groups reported some gainful occupation, the percentage was only about 36 for Non-SC/ST. This is because of two reasons : SC/ST households were mainly landless or small/marginal farmers and therefore participation of women in some gainful activity was necessary; secondly, norms and taboos were different among tribals and even Scheduled Castes than amongst Non-SC/ST. Almost twice as large a proportion of minors reported being engaged in gainful activity in SC and ST households (14 and 19 percent) as in Non-SC/ST households (9 percent). This also can be attributed to economic necessity.

2.17 Examination of the data relating to different size-groups of landholdings among the three social groups (See table in Annexure II-A to this Chapter) bear out some of these differences. Thus, the proportion of adult females reporting gainful

occupation increases as we move from medium-large cultivators to the landless in each social group, though the rate of increase is somewhat greater in the case of Non-SC/ST than SC/ST. The persistent differences, nevertheless, can be attributed mainly to social mores. The differences among the gainfully employed minors in different size-groups again illustrate the difference in economic necessities ; not only was the percentage of minors gainfully employed lowest in the households belonging to the highest size-class of landholding, but there was no difference amongst SC and Non-SC/ST households of this class. The higher percentage of ST households could reflect a certain degree of inadequate awareness of the usefulness of education for the young.

2.18 Indeed, the minors (i.e. boys and girls between 6 and 18 years of age) were either gainfully employed or being educated (i.e. going to school or college) or doing neither, meaning thereby just staying at home and possibly being useful in the household. One would like to see all minors being educands; but this is not so. About 70 percent of the minors² in Non-SC/ST households were going to school/college; and this was the highest among the three social groups. For SC households, the proportion was 58 per cent, while for ST households it was 47 percent. While poverty is one reason for this, nevertheless SC households recorded a much higher percentage of children going to school/college than ST households. The proportion neither going to school/college nor gainfully employed was quite high : 28 per cent among SC, 34 per cent among ST and 22 percent among the rest. This in itself shows that the provision of schools for children of all classes in rural areas has reached SC households less and ST households, the least compared to Non-SC/ST households.

2. The percentage mentioned relates 'those going to school (or college)' to the total of boys and girls in the households referred to as 'minors' here. We ignore the fact that among 'those going to school/college' there were some adults (18 years and above). The same observation applies in the case of SC/ST percentages cited in the next sentence.

Main Occupation

2.19 For purposes of the survey, 'main occupation' has been defined as one which brought to the person concerned more than half of his/her earnings from all sources. At the stage of tabulation we decided to classify main occupations into three types : cultivation, wage-labour and non-agriculture. In the case of each of these, we have proportion of persons (to the total gainfully employed persons) who reported a given occupation as the 'main occupation'

2.20 As stated earlier, the information on the number of gainfully employed persons is based upon the data on the 'main occupation'. This would mean that the total number of gainfully employed persons should be exactly equal to the sumtotal of those depending mainly on cultivation, wage-labour and non-agriculture respectively. In other words, the sumtotal of proportions of the number of persons pursuing each of the three types of occupation to the total number of gainfully employed, should add up to 100. Unfortunately, in the case of each land-related class belonging to a social group (except the landless among Non-SC/ST) the sumtotal of proportions exceeded 100, as is borne out by the data in the following table.

Table 2.6 : Main Occupation (Sumtotal of Proportions to those Gainfully Employed)

Land-related class	Social Group		
	SC	ST	Non-SC/ST
1. Landless	100.14	100.22	99.98
2. Marginal	108.95	108.04	107.74
3. Small	113.39	113.23	107.67
4. Medium & Large	106.37	107.18	101.77
5. All Classes	104.00	105.14	103.30

2.21 The probable explanation for the above result is that in the case of persons with multiple occupations, with none bringing to them more than half of the total earnings, the investigators may have entered all the relevant occupations under 'main occupation'. This means that for some individuals there would be more than one main occupation shown on the relevant schedules. This would make for some degree of overlap as between the three types of main occupations and hence make the sumtotal of proportions referred to above exceed 100.

2.22 We, however, find that in the case of the landless among SC, ST and Non-SC/ST the excess over 100, where it occurs, was negligibly small. Even in the case of SC or ST or Non-SC/ST as a whole the excess was in the range of 3 to 5 percentage points. It is true that the excess was much more, ranging upto 13 percentage points, for the landholding classes (marginal, small and medium & large). One feels, however, that if we are to make use of the information on percentage distribution of the gainfully employed as between the three main occupations only in a broad way (i.e. only to highlight the contrast, if any, between, say, the proportion of those who depended mainly on cultivation and of those who depended primarily on wage-labour), we may ignore the discrepancies brought out by the preceding table.

2.23 Table 2.7 that follows shows the occupational distribution of all persons recorded as gainfully employed in all the three social groups classified according to land held for cultivation.

2.24 It is natural that persons in all landless households were mainly wage labourers. The point of interest to note here is that even in the case of such households there were a larger proportion of persons gainfully employed in non-agricultural work among Non-SC/ST households than SC/ST. SC/ST workers had less opportunity to work in non-agricultural

Table 2.7: Percentage Distribution of the Gainfully Employed into the Three Types of main occupation

Land-related class (1)	Social Group and Main Occupation								
	SC			ST			Non-SC/ST		
	C	WL	NA	C	WL	NA	C	WL	NA
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
1. Landless	0.0	90.43	9.71	0.0	91.50	8.72	0.0	83.98	16.00
2. Marginal	45.43	47.80	15.72	50.00	51.25	7.39	63.89	31.94	11.91
3. Small	49.69	54.79	8.91	66.84	41.26	5.13	71.58	28.37	7.72
4. Medium and Large	67.70	31.37	7.30	80.99	21.83	4.36	84.68	11.09	6.00
5. All Classes	20.38	73.83	9.79	33.09	65.01	7.04	54.45	38.93	9.92

C : Cultivation; WL : Wage-labour; NA : Non-agriculture

occupations. This was to their relative disadvantage.

2.25 As for the cultivating households, it may be noted that nearly half or more of the workers in SC households belonging to the small and marginal farmer categories were mainly wage-labourers. The corresponding proportion for these categories among Non-SC/ST households was less than one-third and it varied between half and two-fifth among ST households. The lower proportion of wage workers in the small and marginal farmers households among ST (relatively to SC) was probably due more to less availability of wage work in farming, than any other reason.

Credit

2.26 Information on loans received by surveyed households from different sources was sought in the questionnaire. The sources identified were : (i) Relatives & Friends, (ii) Moneylender, (iii) Landlord, (iv) Cooperative Society, (v) Cooperative Bank, (vi) Commercial Bank and (vii) Government. At the stage of tabulation we classified these sources into three types : (a) Relatives and Friends, (b) Moneylender and Landlord, i.e., (ii) and (iii) above, (c) Agencies of Institutional Finance, i.e. (iv) to (vii) above. The percentage of households (to total households) which stated that they received loans during the preceding year from one source or more, is presented in the following table.

Table 2.8: Percentage of Households which received Loans from One Source or More, to Total Households

Land-related Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Landless	11.36	12.58	11.32
2. Marginal	28.43	33.85	29.12
3. Small	24.57	34.11	30.22
4. Medium & Large	29.80	36.73	36.36
5. All Classes	17.32	22.96	26.45

2.27 A little more than one-fourth of Non-SC/ST households surveyed reported that they received loans from one source or more during the preceding year. The corresponding proportions for ST and SC households were lower at 22.96 percent and 17.32 percent respectively. SC households were relatively the most disadvantaged.

2.28 In every social group the landless had the lowest proportion indicating that, among the land-related classes, they were at the greatest disadvantage. Among the landholding groups, the 'medium large' category households were comparatively better-placed than the 'marginal' and 'small' category households.

2.29 We have also tabulated data available on the number of households who could obtain loans from (i) either 'Relatives & Friends' or 'Moneylender and Landlord' or both but not from Agencies of Institutional Finance and (ii) Agencies of Institutional Finance, irrespective of whether they received or did not receive loans from any other source. Households under (i) were recipients of loans from private agencies of finance. Those under (ii) received loans from public agencies but maybe some (probably, not many) received loans from private agencies as well. We may describe households (i) as 'Loan Recipients : Private Agencies' and households (ii) as 'Loan Recipients : Public Agencies'. It will be seen that households (i) and (ii) together add up to the total of households who received loans from one source or more. The data on percentage respectively of households (i) and households (ii) to total households who received loans from one source or more, is given in the following table (p.49)

2.30 The table brings out as follows :

(i) More than half of SC/ST households obtained loans from private agencies of finance, whereas the corresponding percentage for Non-SC/ST was much lower, viz., a little more than one-third. Non-SC/ST depended relatively more on public

Table 2.9 : Percentage of Recipients of Loans from
(i) Private Agencies and (ii) Public Agencies

Land-related class	SC		ST		Non-SC/ST	
	Private Agencies	Public Agencies	Private Agencies	Public Agencies	Private Agencies	Public Agencies
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1. Landless	81.15	18.85	79.63	20.37	78.52	21.48
2. Marginal	62.59	37.41	66.67	33.33	51.07	48.93
3. Small	37.32	62.68	47.01	52.99	34.34	65.66
4. Medium & Large	23.97	76.03	21.18	78.82	22.26	77.74
5. All Classes	56.27	43.73	52.03	47.97	36.24	63.93

agencies of finance. About 64 percent of their households turned to this source for loans as against roughly 44 percent in the case of SC and about 48 percent in the case of ST. It should be noted, however, that this result must not be interpreted to mean that government finance supported Non-SC/ST relatively more than SC/ST, because in the public agencies of finance we have included, besides government, co-operative and commercial banks also.

(ii) In every social group as we move upwards from the landless to the 'medium & large' category the percentage of households depending on private agencies diminishes and that getting resources from the public agencies increases. Thus superimposed on the fact of relatively greater accessibility of Non-SC/ST to the public agencies of finance is the fact of such accessibility to the comparatively larger landholders in every social group.

(iii) The pattern of relative dependence on the two types of agencies of finance was, more or less, the same for the landless households belonging to the three social groups. A similar conclusion holds also in the case of the 'medium & large' category households among SC, ST and Non-SC/ST. It is the pattern of relative dependence pertaining to the 'marginal'

category households and, to a lesser extent, the 'small' category households, which presents a contrast between Non-SC/ST on the one hand and SC/ST on the other.

2.31 In our tabulated data we have classified households into those receiving (i) less than Rs. 500/- (ii) Rs.500/- to less than Rs. 3000/-, (iii) Rs. 3000/- to less than Rs.8000/- and (iv) Rs. 8000/- or more. For every size-class there is a further categorisation by sources, viz., (a) Relatives and Friends (RF), (b) Moneylender and Landlord (ML) and (c) Agencies of Institutional Finance (AIF).

2.32 In the following table we present, separately for SC, ST and Non-SC/ST, percentage of households within a given size-class of loan amounts receiving these from the stated source, to the total households receiving loans during the preceding year from one source or more.

Table 2.10 : Percentage of Households within a Given Size-class of Loan Amounts Receiving these from the Stated Source, to Total Households receiving Loans from One Source or More

Size-Class of Amounts	SC			ST			Non-SC/ST		
	RF	ML	AIF	RF	ML	AIF	RF	ML	AIF
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
1. Less than Rs.500/-	22.58	13.02	12.49	27.71	16.52	13.25	11.13	6.03	11.11
2. Rs.500 to less than Rs.3000/-	16.63	14.40	24.71	16.76	10.65	25.71	15.54	10.41	36.13
3. Rs.3000/- to less than Rs.8000/-	1.17	1.12	5.53	1.15	0.85	8.11	2.46	3.01	14.09
4. Rs.8000/- or more	0.27	0.05	1.01	0.06	0.0	0.91	0.26	0.46	2.44
5. All Size- Classes	40.65	28.59	43.74	45.68	28.02	47.98	29.39	19.91	63.77

2.33 It will be noted that in any social group borrowers from each source (RF/ML/AIF) were not mutually exclusive groups. Some may have borrowed from more than one agency. Thus, for example, the total of percentages for, say, SC in row 5, (Cols.2,3 and 4), add upto more than 100. Similar is the case for ST and Non-SC/ST.

2.34 The bulk of households in each group borrowed upto less than Rs.3000/-. The percentage of households in the topmost size-class (Rs.8000/- or more) was negligibly small, even among Non-SC/ST. It may be mentioned, however, that nearly 6 percent of SC households, 8 percent of ST households and 14 percent of Non-SC/ST households borrowed from 'agencies of institutional finance' anywhere from Rs. 3000/- to less than Rs.8000/-.

2.35 There is one interesting piece of information which can be derived by reading tables 2.9 and 2.10 together. In table 2.9 percentages under 'Private Agencies' (RF + ML) refer to households within a social group which were exclusive, in the sense that they did not borrow from 'agencies of institutional finance' (i.e. public agencies). On the other hand, proportions under 'Public Agencies' refer to households who borrowed from these agencies and some of whom may have borrowed from private agencies as well. In Table 2.10, as stated earlier, percentages in each column do not pertain necessarily to exclusive groups of households within SC/ST/Others. If we deduct from percentage of, say, SC households in all size-classes in table 2.10 which borrowed from private agencies (RF + ML) the percentage of SC households shown as borrowing from private agencies in table 2.9, we get percentage of SC households which borrowed both from private and public agencies. When we subtract this proportion from the percentage of SC households which borrowed from public agencies according to table 2.9, we get proportion of SC households which borrowed only from 'public agencies'. The exercise can be repeated for ST

and Non-SC/ST households. We find that whereas 30.76 percent of SC households and 26.30 of ST households borrowed only from the 'agencies of institutional finance', the relevant proportion in the case of Non-SC/ST was 50.87 percent. The private agencies are less rule-bound and more 'exploitative' than the public agencies. Nearly half of the borrowing Non-SC/ST households could steer clear of private agencies; the corresponding proportions were much lower for SC/ST.

Demographic Profiles

(I) Average Size of the Rural Household

2.36 On the basis of information as regards the number of households surveyed and the number of persons in these households, we estimated the average size of the rural household. A similar exercise was made with the help of data from the Census of India, 1981. The following table brings together this information for the three social groups in rural Maharashtra as a whole.

Table 2.11 : Average Size of the Rural Household

Source	SC	ST	Non-SC/ST
Survey	4.9	4.9	5.1
Census	5.2	5.3	5.5

N.B.: Source for Census figures : Census of India, 1981, Series I, India; Part IIB(i), (ii) and (iii), Primary Census Abstract.

2.37 It is true that the average size of household as per the Census data was somewhat higher than that according to the survey for all the three social groups. All the same, we find that in both the sets of information the average size for SC and ST was more or less the same and that it was somewhat smaller than that for Non-SC/ST.

2.38 We may consider further details. The table below gives average size of rural households by land-related classes belonging respectively to the three social groups. The data

drawn from the survey.

Table 2.12 : Average Size of Rural Households by Land-related Classes (Survey Data)

Land related class (1)	Social Group		
	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Landless	4.6	4.5	4.4
2. Marginal	5.1	5.0	4.9
3. Small	5.2	5.3	5.1
4. Medium & Large	5.6	5.7	5.7
5. All together	4.9	4.9	5.1

2.39 One conclusion that emerges from this table is that for any social group (SC, ST or Non-SC/ST), the larger the landholding, the greater was the average size of the household. Secondly, we find that for first three land-related classes (landless, 'marginal' and 'small') the SC/ST figures exceeded those for Non-SC/ST. In the case of the 'medium and large' category households, however, the figures of the three social groups were, more or less, the same. This means that the average on the aggregate was higher for Non-SC/ST than for SC/ST (row 5 figures) because the 'medium and large' landholding households formed a minor group among SC (11 per cent) and ST (16 per cent) but was a sizeable group among the Non-SC/ST (34 per cent). This fact pulls up the figure of average size of household for Non-SC/ST as a whole relatively to that for the two other social groups, SC and ST.

(II) Education

2.40 Table 2.13 below gives information based on the survey on the following proportions, separately for each of the three social groups being studied : (1) adults with some formal education and no longer studying, to total adults, (2) adult males with some formal education and no longer studying, to

total adult males, (3) adult females with some formal education and no longer studying, to total adult females, (4) those being educated³ to total minors, i.e., boys and girls, in the households, (5) males being educated³ to the total of boys, and (6) females being educated³ to the total of girls. The table also gives for each of the three social groups the proportion of households in which someone or other was being educated to total households.

Table 2.13 : Percentage of (i) Persons with some Formal Education and Not Studying any longer and (ii) Persons Being Educated, in the Surveyed Households

Category (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Adults with some formal education and no longer studying	29.4	25.7	40.5
2. Adult males with some formal education and no longer studying	42.5	37.2	54.8
3. Adult females with some formal education and no longer studying	14.7	12.8	24.3
4. Those being educated	57.9	47.1	69.3
5. Males being educated	66.9	55.0	77.5
6. Females being educated	46.1	37.2	58.9
7. Households in which someone or other was being educated	42.7	34.7	49.1

2.41 We can infer as follows from the data in the table above.

(1) The first interesting point to note is that less than half the surveyed households had anyone going to school/college: among Non-SC/ST the proportion was 49 per cent, while among SC it was 43 per cent and among ST, 35 per cent. Earlier we noted that about 70 per cent of all minors (between 6 and 18 years) in/ Non-SC/ST households

3. See foot note 2 above.

were going to school/college. This means that these 70 percent minors being educated belonged to 49 percent of Non-SC/ST households. Similarly 58 percent of the minors being educated among SC belonged to only 43 percent of households. Among the ST 47 percent of minors going to school/college belonged to 37 percent of households. Clearly households not reporting anyone being educated had either no minors or no minors going to school/college. This information was not separately tabulated. However, it is unlikely that most of the households not reporting anyone being educated had no minors. Therefore, it is clear that a very substantial proportion of households had no minors going to school/college, and this proportion was higher among SC/ST than among Non-SC/ST.

(2) As between the two disadvantaged groups, SC and ST, the position was comparatively better for SC. This is borne out by comparing figures for SC and ST in all the seven rows of the table.

(3) In every social group (SC, ST and Non-SC/ST) the incidence was less for females than for males. A comparison of figures in row 3 with those in row 2 and of those in row 6 with those in row 5 under each column brings out this fact.

(4) The porportion of 'adults with some formal education and no longer studying' (row 1) signifies the incidence of education among the older generation; that of 'those being educated' (row 4), the incidence among the upcoming generation. We may compare in the case of both, two sets of proportions, one for SC/ST on the one hand and the other for Non-SC/ST on the other. The differential in the porportions pertaining to Non-SC/ST on the one hand and SC/ST on the other was less in the case of 'those being educated' (the upcoming generation) than in the case of 'adults with some formal education and no longer studying' (older generation). This suggests a narrowing of the gap between the relatively less and the relatively more

disadvantaged social groups in respect of the incidence of education. This is a welcome trend.

(5) A similar trend is observable in the case of the male-female divide as well. Let us consider figures in rows 2 (older generation among males) and 5 (upcoming generation among males). The differential as between proportions for SC/ST on the one hand and Non-SC/ST on the other, was greater in the case of row 2 figures than in the case of row 5 figures. Similar conclusion holds in the case of row 3 figures vis-a-vis row 6 figures (females).

(6) There is another angle to the male-female divide. We see that the differentials between row 5 figures ('males being educated') and corresponding row 6 figures ('females being educated') are less than the differentials between the relevant row 2 ('adult males with some formal education and no longer studying') and row 3 ('adult females with some formal education and no longer studying') figures. This means that handicap to female education in each social group is less now than in the past. This, to be sure, is a change to be welcomed.

2.42 We may now take a comparative view of the incidence of education among the land-related classes within the three social groups. In this context, we take into account only (i) the proportion of 'adults with some formal education and no longer studying' to 'total adults' and (ii) the proportion of 'those being educated' to the 'total of boys + girls'. We leave out the proportions relating to the male-female divide. The following table presents the relevant information (P.57)

2.43 The data in this table bring out the fact that whether we consider the proportion AFE or the proportion TBE, the proportion for every land-related class belonging to Non-SC/ST was the highest followed by that for the corresponding land-related class within SC and within ST, in that order. We had seen earlier that the incidence of education was the greatest

Table 2.14 : Percentage of 'Adults with Some Formal Education and No Longer Studying' (AFE) and of 'Those Being Educated' (TBE) in the Different Land-related Classes

Land-related classes	Proportions for Social Groups					
	Percentage of AFE			Percentage of TBE		
	SC	ST	Non-SC/ST	SC	ST	Non-SC/ST
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1. Landless	26.46	22.05	36.76	52.55	42.46	60.61
2. Marginal	33.00	26.84	38.02	68.20	50.07	72.04
3. Small	31.50	25.55	39.00	61.43	46.98	70.44
4. Medium & Large	36.38	34.59	44.59	69.15	57.45	73.58

among Non-SC/ST. We now add that this is true of Non-SC/ST belonging to every land-related class. In this respect Non-SC/ST were better-placed than SC/ST. Then again, as between SC and ST, land-related classes within SC were better-placed than their counterparts within ST.

2.44 Furthermore, in every social group the proportion was the lowest for the landless. The landless thus were the most disadvantaged class in this respect. Among the landholding classes the 'medium and large' category was better-placed than the 'marginal' and 'small' categories in every social group.

Annexure II-A : Proportion of Gainfully Employed Adult Males/Adult Females/Minors/Total of These Three to the Total Number of persons in Each Category Belonging to the Different Land-related Classes

(1)	Land-related Class											
	SC				ST				Non-SC/ST			
	Land-less (2)	Marginal (3)	Small (4)	Medium & large (5)	Land-less (6)	Marginal (7)	Small (8)	Medium & large (9)	Land-less (10)	Marginal (11)	Small (12)	Medium & large (13)
Adult Males	90.39	86.48	87.57	80.68	92.61	88.67	90.65	85.94	89.28	87.50	87.23	85.16
Adult Females	65.31	37.81	51.30	38.83	68.29	50.00	52.88	40.54	51.41	32.55	33.87	26.74
Minors	16.21	9.83	14.12	9.70	19.47	16.74	20.94	16.57	11.52	6.79	8.65	7.93
All those gainfully employed	58.87	46.44	52.83	45.64	62.18	53.82	56.09	49.31	52.74	42.78	45.05	42.87

Chapter III
Agriculturists

Introduction

3.1 Many of the important schemes of the State Government affecting the rural people relate to agriculture. The impact of these schemes on the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe households relatively to that on the other households, is the subject matter of this Chapter.

3.2 It was stated in an earlier Chapter that while bulk of the Non-SC/ST households in rural Maharashtra were landholders (cultivators), nearly 62 per cent of the SC and 54 per cent of the ST households were non-cultivators. This means that State schemes relating to agriculture can directly affect only a minority of SC/ST households.

3.3 It has been mentioned in Chapter I that the survey was conducted mostly over the period May 1981 to May 1982. Since the questionnaire was designed to collect information, in most cases, over a period of five years preceding the survey, the assistance schemes relevant to the present study were those that prevailed from 1976-77 to 1980-81. Apart from the transfer of land to rural households by Government under the tenancy and ceiling legislations (which came into effect even before 1976-77) or the transfer of forest or other land, there were during the period in question a number of incentive schemes devised by the Government of Maharashtra for the benefit of agriculturists.

3.4 Among these schemes there were a few which were centrally-sponsored. Some of these were : (1) Intensive Cotton District Programme, (2) Organisation of demonstration of Sunflower, (3) Intensive Oilseeds Development Programme, and (4) Sugarcane Development in Maharashtra State. Under these schemes assistance in the form of subsidy was available for making demonstrations on farms and in that context also for inputs like seeds, fertilisers and pesticides used. Besides, there were also a

few centrally-sponsored schemes in the field of horticulture in relation to cashew gardens, and to raising of banana, citrus and mango. Assistance was in the form of subsidy, in some cases in kind, for cost of inputs to help cultivation and/or demonstration.

3.5 The bulk of the incentive schemes were, however, State Government schemes as such, implemented directly by the State Government in most cases but implemented also, in a few cases, through the instrumentality of the Zilla Parishads, which were provided by the State Government with financial resources for the purpose. Several of these schemes were identified under specific classificatory heads, such as, High Yielding Varieties Programme, Plant Protection, Horticulture, Integrated Area Development Programme, Small Farmers Development Agency, Extension and Farmers' Training and Land Development through Soil Conservation Measures. Besides, there were several miscellaneous schemes intended to benefit the cultivators. The assistance was in the form of loan and/or subsidy, in kind or in money.

3.6 Under a variety of schemes loan/subsidy was available for obtaining seeds, fertilisers and pesticides. For example, the assistance of this type was forthcoming under the centrally-sponsored schemes, HYVP, IADP, SFDA, Horticulture and so on. Assistance could also be obtained to meet part of the cost of plant protection equipment. In addition to seeds, fertilisers, pesticides and plant protection equipment, certain other inputs also qualified for assistance. These included bullock pairs, agricultural implements, and machinery like tractors and tillers, water and so on. In respect of water assistance was to be given under IADP for well-construction, construction of joint wells, repairs to wells, deepening of old wells, installation of pump sets, lift irrigation schemes, construction of small works for plugging nallas and water courses, and so on. The government

also had schemes of providing subsidy/loan to cultivators for activities undertaken for the purpose of land development and soil conservation. These activities included levelling and toning of land; tractor ploughing, contour/graded bunding, nala bunding, terracing of land, work of desilting of farms and reclamation of non-coastal saline and alkaline land. Finally, there were schemes of assistance for the purpose of extension and farmers' training. Apart from grants given to several agencies, such as, for example, to agricultural associations for agricultural propaganda or to agricultural universities, assistance for the purpose was also forthcoming in the form of subsidy for multi-crop demonstration. This subsidy was payable at a stipulated rate for each demonstration plot.

3.7 Fairly elaborate information on incentive schemes of the Government of Maharashtra intended for cultivators is given in the Performance Budgets of the Agriculture and Cooperation Department of the government, in the volume pertaining to Agriculture. The relevant Performance Budgets during the period 1976-77 to 1980-81 are of interest to us. The requisite information is obtainable from the Performance Budgets for 1976-77 and for 1980-81 for the Department mentioned.

3.8 While designing questions for the household schedule we focussed attention not on individual schemes under broad classificatory programmes such as HYVP, IADP, centrally-sponsored schemes and so on, but on the type of benefit intended for the cultivators as a part of schemes under whichever classificatory programmes. For example, we asked households about the subsidy/loan obtained in relation to seeds, fertilisers, pesticides and other inputs. As stated earlier such assistance was available under different classificatory programmes or schemes.

1 Government of Maharashtra, Performance Budget, 1976-77, Agriculture and Cooperation Department (Agriculture), Statement C, Pp. 16-26, and Performance Budget, 1980-81, Agriculture & Cooperation Department (Agriculture), Part II, Appendix VII, Pp. 754 to 796.

It was expected that the cultivating households would report on a type of benefit (say, subsidy for seeds) obtained by them under all the relevant classificatory programmes or schemes. A list of assistance programme for agriculturists on which questions were set and included in the household schedule is provided in Annexure III-A to this Chapter. It will be seen from this Annexure that the coverage in our questionnaire of the types of benefit expected to flow from incentive schemes under classificatory programmes, was quite comprehensive.

3.9 Two types of information on each item of government assistance were sought : (i) whether the cultivating household received any benefit of the type cited and (ii) the quantum of financial assistance received, if any. As stated earlier, the reference period on these matters was five years ending 1980-81, i.e., from 1976-77 to 1980-81. The Performance Budgets mentioned above tell us that till 1974-75 the rate of incentive under a particular scheme was uniform over the whole state, but that from 1975-76 it was left to every District Planning and Development Council to fix the rates for their respective districts. We quote from the Performance Budgets : "The incentives granted to cultivators under various agricultural schemes upto 1974-75 are indicated in this table. From 1975-76 the rates of subsidies and loans are different in each of the districts according to the pattern suggested by the District Planning and Development Council."²

3.10 This means that one cannot presume the rates of assistance to be uniform for every district, from 1975-76 onwards. However, it was not possible for us to collect such information district-wise and itemwise for every one of the five years under reference. For illustrative purposes, we reproduce in Annexure-III B to this Chapter the information relating

2. Performance Budget, 1976-77, p.16; Performance Budget, 1980-81, Part II, p. 754.

principally to Pune district collected during the year 1984-85 for us by the Deputy Director, Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Regional Office, Pune on instructions from DESM, Bombay. The information was based upon enquiries with Zilla Parishad, District Rural Development Agency, Horticultural Department, Divisional Soil Conservation Officer and Poona District Central Cooperative Bank. This information (read with the information in the Performance Budgets) gives some idea of the broad dimension of the specific types of assistance, subject of course to variations in rates from district to district.

3.11 It is seen from statements in the Performance Budgets as also the information in Annexure-III B (primarily for Pune district) that the subsidy/loan from the government covered only a portion of the cost on account of the input in question. This means that the agriculturist had to bear the remaining portion of the cost himself. Though this is a salutary principles to follow, one probable consequence of this procedure may be noted. An agriculturist with more resources and, therefore, a greater capacity to bear the portion of the cost payable by him, was in a better position to take advantage of the government schemes of assistance.

Land Obtained by Households

3.12 Certain categories of rural households were entitled to get land under (i) tenancy legislation and (ii) ceiling legislation. Tenancy laws, having the objective of conferring ownership of land on tenants, came into force in areas which now constitute the State of Maharashtra, between 1957 and 1965. A kindred measure for transfer of land holdings was the one placing ceilings on agricultural holdings. Land rendered surplus as a result of this measure was expected to be distributed among specified categories of rural households. Ceilings were first imposed in Maharashtra in January 1962 and these were later lowered in October 1975. Besides tenancy

and ceiling legislation there were schemes of distribution of forest and other lands among the rural households.

3.13 Our survey data shows that even some of the landless households reported receipt of land under tenancy/ceiling legislation. This means that these households must have lost that land in the intervening period to be reduced to the status of the landless before our survey began. We do not have information on reasons for the loss of land by the concerned beneficiaries. It is even likely that investigational lapses may have yielded this result. All the same the proportion of beneficiary landless households was negligibly insignificant as the data below shows.

Table 3.1 : Percentage of Landless Households in a Social Group Reporting Receipt of Land under Tenancy/Ceiling Legislation, to total Landless Households in that Social Group.

Legislation	SC	ST	Non-SC/ST	All Social Groups
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Tenancy Legislation	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10
Ceiling Legislation	0.07	0.07	0.15	0.11

We may therefore ignore this category of beneficiary households.

3.14 Let us now consider the transfer of land under tenancy legislation reported by landholding households surveyed by us. The table below gives data on percentage of households in each landholding class within a social group receiving land under tenancy legislation, to total households in that landholding class within that social group. (Table 3.2)

3.15 It is seen that only 2.3 per cent of all cultivating households surveyed reported receipt of land under tenancy legislation. The proportion appears to be rather low. This may be because the transfer of land under this piece of legislation took place some 15 to 25 years before our survey in 1981-82.

However, the proportion for ST at nearly 7.5 per cent was much higher than that for SC (1.6 per cent) or Non-SC/ST (2.0 per cent).

Table 3.2 : Percentage of Households within a Landholding Class belonging to a Social Group Reporting Receipt of Land under Tenancy Legislation

Landholding Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)	All Social Groups (5)
Marginal	2.15	2.33	5.49	4.51
Small	1.39	7.69	2.04	2.66
Medium & Large	1.31	9.42	0.98	1.67
All Landholding Classes	1.55	7.46	2.00	2.30

3.16 Among the size-classes of landholdings, the 'marginal' category of households had a higher percentage of beneficiaries (4.5) than the 'small' or 'medium and large' categories.

Furthermore, relatively higher proportion of beneficiaries were to be found among the 'marginal' landholding households belonging to Non-SC/ST and among the 'small' and 'medium and large' landholdings ST households. Relatively speaking, SC proportions were much lower.

3.17 Data on percentage of beneficiary households under the ceiling legislation in each landholding class within a social group to total households in that landholding class within that social group, are presented in the table that follows.

Table 3.3: Percentage of Beneficiary Households under Ceiling Legislation within a Landholding Class belonging to a Social Group

Landholding Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)	All Social Groups (5)
Marginal	1.33	0.58	1.22	1.18
Small	2.16	1.32	0.60	0.92
Medium & Large	0.74	0.43	0.13	0.20
All Landholding Classes	1.55	0.90	0.46	0.64

221142

3.18 While interpreting the data on beneficiary households under ceiling legislation we must remember that the size-classification of beneficiaries is according to their size status at the time of our survey, not what it was when they were given the land. It is likely that several beneficiary households rose in size status as a result of receipt of land under the ceiling legislation.

3.19 Considering that the ceiling legislation was intended to benefit the landless and the relatively small landholder, with preference shown to backward class persons, one would expect that the proportion of beneficiary households would be relatively higher for the 'marginal' and 'small' landholding households than for the 'medium and large' and also for SC/ST than for Non-SC/ST. The data in the table broadly confirms this expectation.

3.20 However, it is true that the proportion of households benefitting from ceiling legislation was quite low in each landholding class within every social group. Only 0.64 per cent of all cultivating households surveyed reported receipt of land under this piece of legislation. It is true that a more revealing proportion would have been the percentage of rural households which benefitted from ceiling legislation to all those households which could be held 'eligible' for benefit under the ceiling laws if sufficient surplus land were available. We do not have this kind of information from our survey. We, therefore, fell back on the percentage of beneficiary households to total households. It is worth-noting, however, that this percentage yielded by the survey is quite in consonance with percentage derived on the basis of data provided in a study relating to ceiling legislation made at the Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics.³ Table 1.3 in this study

3. G.R.Mulla : Survey of Surplus Land Allottes under the Maharashtra Agricultural Lands (Ceiling on Holdings) Act, 1961 (Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics, Pune, August 1980) (Typed).

shows that the total number of allottees of land in Maharashtra under the ceiling laws was 88173, by the end of October, 1976. We may assume that by 1981-82 (i.e. the year of our survey) the number increased to 1,00,000. This means that by 1981-82 a maximum of 100,000 households benefitted by this legislation. The total number of rural households in Maharashtra was 75.34 lakhs according to 1981 census. Thus the proportion of beneficiary households to total rural households works out to 1.33 per cent - not much higher, in fact, than 0.64 per cent which we get from our survey data.

3.21 As stated above a cultivator could obtain forest or other government land as well. In table 3.4 we give data on the proportion of surveyed households in every social group (divided on the basis of size-class of holdings) which reported receipt of such land, to total households in the relevant group. Here also we leave out the landless households (of our survey) for the reason already explained in para 3.13 above. It may be mentioned here that the percentage of landless households which reported receipt of forest or other land was negligibly small. It was as follows for the landless belonging to the different social groups : SC (0.55 per cent); ST (0.13 per cent) and Non-SC/ST (0.17 per cent).

Table 3.4 : Percentage of Landholding Households in a Social Group Reporting Receipt of Forest or Other Land, to total such households.

Landholding Class	SC	ST	Non-SC/ST	All Social Groups
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Marginal	1.12	2.33	1.25	1.34
Small	2.11	4.62	0.50	1.25
Medium & Large	1.72	4.15	0.29	0.71
All Classes	0.76	4.11	0.50	1.02

3.22 It is seen that only 1 per cent of the total cultivating households surveyed reported receipt of forest or other land. All the percentages in the table are quite on the low side. However, relatively speaking, ST seem to have performed better than SC or Non-SC/ST. Nearly 4 per cent of the cultivating ST households benefitted as against 0.8 and 0.5 per cent in the case of SC and Non-SC/ST respectively.

Financial Assistance for Land Improvement

3.23 The respondent-households were asked whether they had received during the preceding five years any financial assistance from the government (either in the form of subsidy or loan) for improving land obtained under tenancy legislation or ceiling legislation or for improving forest or other government land obtained. The table below gives information on the proportion of households (to total households who received any such land i.e. 'reporting households') which intimated that they received such assistance.

Table 3.5 : Percentage of Households receiving Financial Assistance for Land Improvement, to total 'Reporting Households'

Landholding Class	SC	ST	Non-SC/ST	All Social Groups
Marginal	0.0	0.0	1.37	1.09
Small	11.46	3.21	3.57	4.71
Medium & Large	4.88	1.27	2.94	2.44
All Landholding Classes	7.74	2.25	2.69	2.43

3.24 A little less than two and half per cent of the 'reporting households' among those surveyed received financial assistance for the purpose mentioned. As between the social groups, SC had relatively higher proportions of beneficiary households than either ST or Non-SC/ST. The Non-SC/ST had an edge over ST. Thus, interestingly, as stated above, a

relatively larger proportion of ST households benefitted under tenancy legislation and under the scheme for gift of forest and other government land. But the percentage of 'reporting households' getting financial assistance was the lowest among ST. The opposite was true in the case of SC, with low proportions of beneficiary households under the two land-receipt schemes mentioned above, but relatively higher proportions in respect of receipt of financial assistance. For Non-SC/ST the proportions were quite low on both accounts.

3.25 This phenomenon may probably be explained as follows: The tenanted land was already under cultivation and therefore did not need money for land improvement. Even in the case of forest land distributed, a part of this was only belated formalization of unlawful occupation of forest land by people for cultivation. Since such lands were already under cultivation, no grants were needed for development of such lands. Grants were necessary mainly in the case of surplus land under ceiling legislation, a larger part of which badly needed some land development work on it to be made fit for cultivation. Hence SC and Non-SC/ST had a larger percentage of beneficiary households under the financial assistance schemes.

3.26 The broad finding, however, is that if we consider the two sets of schemes together (land-receipt and financial assistance) the extent of benefit was low for all the three social groups, as also for the landholding classes within each social group. It needs to be mentioned that in the case of financial assistance our focus was on benefit during the five years preceding the survey, i.e. 1976-77 to 1980-81. Clearly any assistance received prior to 1976-77 could not be captured by our survey data.

Capital Expenditure by Government on Private Land

3.27 In respect of capital expenditure by government (in the form of subsidy or loan) on the land of a cultivating

household we made a distinction between Khar/Khajjan land and other land. Capital expenditure on Khar/Khajjan land was classified into that on bunding and on any other type of work. In the case of other types of land there were additional categories of capital expenditures on terracing and on afforestation.

3.28 Let us first begin with cultivating households which reported that they held some Khar/Khajjan land. Such households are described below as 'reporting households'. The following table gives the necessary information.

Table 3.6 : Percentage of Households in each Landholding Class within a Social Group which had Khar/Khajjan Land, to Total Households in that Class in that Group.

Landholding Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
Marginal	2.66	0.97	7.28
Small	3.45	1.80	3.79
Medium & Large	3.37	3.20	3.37
All Classes	3.24	2.16	4.06

3.29 The percentages of 'reporting households' were very much on the low side among all the social groups. Relatively speaking, however, there was a larger proportion of such households among Non-SC/ST, particularly among the 'marginal' landholding category within that group. It may be interesting to glance over the regional figures of percentages of 'reporting households' in this context. The table below gives the necessary information. (Table 3.7)

3.30 It is seen that the percentage of households reporting the possession of Khar/Khajjan land was significantly high only among the landholding classes belonging to Non-SC/ST in the Konkan region. The proportions in this case ranged between 30 and 40 per cent. Barring these three landholding classes in the Konkan region, there were four other landholding classes belonging to SC and ST and spread over the four regions, which

Table 3.7: Percentage of Households with Khar/Khajjan Land (Regionwise)

Landholding Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
<u>KONKAN</u>			
Marginal	3.30	2.94	31.65
Small	7.02	0.46	38.64
Medium & Large	0.0	0.0	28.21
All Classes	4.58	0.57	34.57
<u>WESTERN MAHARASHTRA</u>			
Marginal	3.36	0.50	2.80
Small	5.23	2.80	2.70
Medium & Large	3.86	1.48	4.23
All Classes	4.13	2.01	3.34
<u>MARATHWADA</u>			
Marginal	0.97	5.88	0.98
Small	4.87	1.30	1.21
Medium & Large	2.40	5.91	2.71
All Classes	3.57	3.56	2.18
<u>VIDARBHA</u>			
Marginal	1.61	0.41	0.87
Small	1.88	1.47	1.33
Medium & Large	3.55	3.94	3.12
All Classes	2.44	2.23	2.18

had proportions ranging between 5 and 7 per cent. All the remaining 29 landholding classes belonging to the social groups in the four regions had proportions quite on the low side. Thus, barring the Konkan region, the holders of Khar/Khajjan land were a very small group in Maharashtra. This is so as Khar/Khajjan land is mostly a coastal phenomenon.

3.31 It was mentioned above in para 3.27 that government provided subsidy/loan for the purpose of capital expenditure on account of bunding or any other type of work on Khar/Khajjan land. The table that follows gives information on the proportion of households (to 'reporting households', i.e. those having Khar/Khajjan land) which received subsidy/loan.

Table 3.8 : Percentage of Households with Khar/Khajjan Land who received Subsidy/Loan for Capital Expenditure on Khar/Khajjan Land.

Land holding Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
	<u>SUBSIDY</u>		
Marginal	0.0	0.0	1.17
Small	16.42	43.33	3.56
Medium & Large	2.44	0.0	2.39
All Classes	8.96	18.06	2.50
	<u>LOAN</u>		
Marginal	0.0	0.0	0.39
Small	17.91	43.33	4.38
Medium & Large	9.76	0.0	2.86
All Classes	11.94	18.06	2.79

3.32 The table shows that while only a very small percentage of Khar/Khajjan landholders amongst Non-SC/ST received any subsidy/loan for capital expenditure on land, the percentage was higher for ST and SC landholders. In the case of ST 18 per cent received both subsidy and loan, while nearly 12 per cent of SC households with such land received loan and nearly 9 per cent, subsidy for the purpose mentioned.

3.33 It is interesting to note that while the Khar/Khajjan landholders were found in all three size-classes of landholding, the households benefitting from loan and subsidy schemes were limited to only certain size-classes of landholding among SC/ST.

Among ST households only the small landholders received both loan and subsidy. In the case of SC households the assistance was given to small as well as medium-large farmers though the percentage of beneficiary small farmers was much higher than that of medium-large farmers. However, the marginal SC/ST households in the sample reportedly received nothing. On the other hand, amongst Non-SC/ST households the beneficiary households were uniformly few in all the size-classes whether we consider loan-assistance or that in the form of subsidy.

3.34 A further point worth-noting is that while amongst ST households all beneficiary households (which were only from the small landholding category) received both loan and subsidy, amongst Non-SC/ST presumably this was largely but not entirely true. A larger number of marginal farmers amongst Non-SC/ST received subsidy than loans; in the other size-classes the percentage receiving loan was slightly larger than that receiving subsidy. This was true of SC households as well. We must not, however, lose sight of the fact that households having Khar/Khajjan land are an extremely small group in Maharashtra.

Assistance for Capital Expenditure on Other Types of Land

3.35 The following table (3.9) gives percentage of households in a landholding class (group by group) who reported the receipt of subsidy/loan from government for capital expenditure on land other than Khar/Khajjan land.

Table 3.9 : Proportion of Households receiving Subsidy/Loan for Capital Expenditure on other Types of Land

Landholding Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
<u>SUBSIDY</u>			
Marginal	1.64	0.0	1.39
Small	1.75	1.92	1.60
Medium and Large	0.99	0.69	1.29
All Classes	1.50	1.20	1.42
<u>LOAN</u>			
Marginal	1.94	0.0	1.68
Small	2.16	2.22	2.20
Medium and Large	1.89	1.82	3.30
All Classes	2.03	1.74	2.66

3.36 The table brings out the following points :

(i) A negligibly small proportion of households in all the landholding classes reported that they received subsidy and/or loan from government for capital expenditure on their land, other than Khar/Khajjan land.

(ii) In the case of each landholding class, the percentage of households getting assistance by way of loans was uniformly higher than that getting it by way of subsidy.

(iii) In both the above cases there was no significant difference between the three social groups.

Bunds Constructed by Government

3.37 The respondent households were asked about the bunds constructed by government on their lands under the contour bunding scheme of the Government of Maharashtra, particularly in dry agricultural regions of the State. Only a certain proportion of households in each landholding class within a social group had affirmative information to offer on whether government constructed bunds on their lands. We may describe these as 'reporting households'. The percentage of these beneficiary 'reporting households' to total households (in all landholding classes) within a social group, region by region, is shown in the table that follows.

Table 3.10 : Percentage of Total Number of Households within a Social Group on whose lands bunds were constructed by the Government (Regionwise).

Region (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)	All Social Groups (5)
Konkan	0.0	6.84	0.59	1.83
Western Maharashtra	20.42	15.95	21.22	20.56
Marathwada	54.85	72.00	55.13	56.11
Vidarbha	17.24	14.63	19.71	18.85
Maharashtra	24.68	22.00	28.12	27.23

3.38 The table brings out that in Maharashtra as a whole the proportion of beneficiary households in each social group was not insignificantly small. However, there were significant interregional differences. The percentages of beneficiary households were negligibly small in Konkan. These were rather small in Vidarbha. In Marathwada the proportion for each social group was quite high, whereas the corresponding percentage for Western Maharashtra, though much smaller than that for Marathwada, was still somewhat higher than that for Vidarbha. This is as could be expected since the scheme relating to contour bunding is intended to benefit particularly the dry agricultural regions of the State. We shall therefore concentrate hereafter only on the picture concerning Marathwada and Western Maharashtra.

3.39 The table that follows gives, separately for Western Maharashtra and Marathwada, percentage of beneficiary households to total households in each landholding class within a social group.

Table 3.11 : Percentage of households (separately in Western Maharashtra and Marathwada) in each Landholding Class within a Social Group on whose lands bunds were constructed by the Government.

Landholding Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
<u>WESTERN MAHARASHTRA</u>			
Marginal	11.40	4.95	13.26
Small	25.00	16.80	19.57
Medium & Large	31.27	21.01	26.48
All Classes	20.42	15.95	21.22
<u>MARATHWADA</u>			
Marginal	45.63	61.76	51.80
Small	55.22	69.13	51.18
Medium & Large	58.00	77.42	57.21
All Classes	54.85	72.00	55.13

3.40 The following conclusions follow from the table :

i) The percentage of beneficiary households was substantially high in the Marathwada region, being more than half among SC and Non-SC/ST, and more than 70 per cent among ST households. The corresponding percentages for Western Maharashtra, though not very small, were relatively moderate. In this region, the ST percentage was, in fact, lower than those respectively for SC and Non-SC/ST.

ii) It is seen that in each of the two regions the proportion of beneficiary households was the lowest in the case of marginal landholding households and the highest for the medium and large category with that for the small category falling in between. This conclusion was true more or less, for each social group. All the same the percentages of beneficiary households among even the 'marginal' category of farmers in Marathwada were higher for each social group than those respectively for the 'medium and large' category households in Western Maharashtra. The scheme, on the whole, benefitted the Marathwada farmers more than those in Western Maharashtra.

3.41 We may now turn to whether all/some/none of the bunds constructed remained intact. Again we shall limit ourselves to consideration of situation in Western Maharashtra and Marathwada. The households giving one or the other answer are clearly from among those we described above as 'reporting households'. The following table gives percentage of households (to 'reporting households') giving one or the other of the replies mentioned. (Table 3.12).

3.42 If we consider the percentage of households belonging to all landholding households taken together in Western Maharashtra and Marathwada, stating that none of the bunds remained intact, we find that the percentage was quite small in both the regions, meaning that an overwhelming proportion of households reported either that all bunds were intact or that

Table 3.12: Percentage of reporting Bund Construction, whose bunds were intact/partially intact/not intact.

Landhold- ing Class	All Intact			Some Intact (i.e. partially intact)			None Intact		
	SC	ST	Non- SC/ST	SC	ST	Non- SC/ST	SC	ST	Non-SC/ ST
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
<u>WESTERN MAHARASHTRA</u>									
Marginal	21.31	50.00	50.00	39.34	30.00	29.90	39.34	20.00	20.10
Small	22.73	28.43	50.52	67.27	61.76	36.44	10.00	9.80	13.04
Medium & Large	30.86	25.35	37.07	46.91	57.75	45.84	22.22	16.90	17.09
All Classes	25.00	28.42	43.65	53.97	58.47	40.45	21.03	13.11	15.90
<u>MARATHWADA</u>									
Marginal	68.09	80.95	58.23	27.79	14.29	36.08	2.13	4.76	5.70
Small	56.72	61.01	46.82	35.29	31.45	41.60	7.98	7.55	11.58
Medium & Large	36.55	34.03	30.54	53.79	48.61	56.84	9.66	17.36	12.62
All Classes	51.16	50.31	36.34	40.93	37.96	51.65	7.91	11.73	12.02

some of them were. In Marathwada only 8 to 12 per cent of 'reporting households' stated that none of the bunds were intact. The corresponding range for 'reporting households' in Western Maharashtra was higher at 13 to 20 per cent. Interestingly more than half of the SC/ST households in Marathwada reported that all bunds were intact, as against a little more than one-third among the Non-SC/ST households. On the other hand, all the bunds of about 45 per cent of Non-SC/ST households in Western Maharashtra were intact, the corresponding percentage of SC/ST households in the region being around one-fourth.

3.43 Finally, in the Marathwada region the percentage of 'reporting households' none of whose bunds were intact, was the lowest in the case of the marginal category of households;

it was higher for the small category and the highest for the medium category households. This was true for all the three social groups, SC, ST and Non-SC/ST. The picture in the case of Western Maharashtra was rather different. In each social group, the marginal category of households seem to have suffered the most, judging by the percentage of households with none of the bunds remaining intact.

Levelling and Shaping of Land

3.44 A respondent-household belonging to a landholding category was asked to state whether it derived any benefit in the form of levelling and/or shaping of its land by the government. The data on the porportion of households (to total households) giving reply in the affirmative, is given in the following table.

Table 3.13 : Percentage of Households Receiving Benefit in the Form of Levelling/Shaping of Land by the Government

Landholding Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1 Marginal	0.51	0.97	1.37
2 Small	1.80	2.70	1.53
3 Medium and large	1.97	2.25	2.10
4 All Classes	1.55	2.28	1.78

3.45 The following conclusions can be derived from the table:

i) An insignificantly small proportion of households belonging to the three social groups reported benefit of the type mentioned. No particular group was specially advantaged or disadvantaged in this respect.

ii) The proportion for the 'marginal' landholding households belonging to each social group was quite low relatively to the proportions for the other two categories of landholding households.

3.46 The beneficiary households were asked to state the area of land which benefitted through levelling and/or shaping. The

average amount of land (in acres) per 'beneficiary household' was calculated for each social group. Our data show that Non-SC/ST benefitted the most with an average of 10.47 acres, followed by SC (6.72 acres) and then ST (4.98 acres).

Bullock-Power

3.47 We have information in the schedules on the number of households who owned bullocks. The proportion of such households to total households in every landholding class within a social group is given in the table that follows.

Table 3.14 : Percentage of Households having Bullocks

Landholding Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
Marginal	21.88	35.99	30.09
Small	42.04	59.16	52.12
Medium & Large	73.56	84.18	83.96
All Classes	46.56	64.27	64.57

3.48 It is seen that whereas among ST and Non-SC/ST a little less than 2/3rd of the households reported ownership of bullocks, less than half of SC households fell in this category. ST and the Non-SC/ST households seem to be better-placed in this respect than SC households. This was also true for all the three landholding classes, SC landholders being worse off in this respect than their counterparts in other groups. Besides, as is well known, in each social group the proportion of landholders having bullocks increased significantly with the increase in the size-class of holding.

Financial Assistance for Purchase of Bullocks

3.49 In our questionnaire we identified four sources of financial assistance to cultivating households for the purchase of bullocks : government, co-operative society, commercial banks and the moneylender. Government assistance was broken down into

that in the form of subsidy and of loan. We can draw from our schedules information on the number of households in each landholding class within a social group who received financial assistance for the purchase of bullocks from one or more of the above agencies. The following table gives percentage of such households to total households in the relevant landholding class/social group.

Table 3.15 : Percentage of Households getting Financial Assistance for the purchase of Bullocks from one or more of the Agencies mentioned

Landholding Class	SC	ST	Non-SC/ ST	All Social Groups
Marginal	1.64	2.33	1.91	1.90
Small	2.32	3.36	3.26	3.13
Medium & Large	2.96	3.80	5.08	4.81
All Classes	2.34	3.36	3.96	3.70

3.50 It is not surprising that the percentage of receivers of financial assistance was small. Most farmers do not buy bullocks every year. Only a very small percentage would be doing so at any time, unless the preceding year was a severe famine year. What is interesting to note is that the percentage was the highest for Non-SC/ST households classes (3.96), followed by those for ST (3.36) and then SC (2.34). Then again, we find that in each social group the percentage increased with the increase in the size-class of landholding.

3.51 We shall now consider the sources from which the landholding households surveyed received financial assistance for the purchase of bullocks. The sources mentioned in para 3.49 are not mutually exclusive. A household which, for example, received assistance from government might have secured some assistance from, say, co-operative society as well. The table below gives percentage of landholding households within a social group receiving financial assistance from the different

sources, to total households in a landholding class/social group who received such assistance from one or more sources. (Table 3.16)

3.52 One striking fact which forces itself on one's attention when one looks through the table, is the overwhelming percentage of landholding households in every social group that depended on moneylender as a source of financial assistance for the purpose mentioned. Nearly 88 per cent of ST households, 84 per cent of Non-SC/ST households and 73 per cent of SC households turned to this source. The same conclusion as regards the preponderating importance of this source applied as well in the case of each size-class of landholdings among the social groups. In fact, cent per cent of ST households of the marginal category secured financial assistance only from moneylenders. The institutional finance represented by the other sources mentioned was of no avail to them.

3.53 Among the sources of institutional finance it appears that, relatively speaking, the commercial banks were the most important to all the social groups. In comparison Government subsidy/loan, co-operative society loans were less important. Then again, Government assistance (subsidy/loan) seems to have reached a larger proportion of households than that from co-operative societies.

Implements : Ownership

3.54 A respondent household was asked to provide information separately on five identifiable farm implements owned (viz. plough, harrow, seed drill, chaff cutter and spray-pump) as also on a residuary category of 'others'. The household was asked to state the number of implements of each type possessed at the time of the survey and also five years back. Then again, an attempt was made to elicit information on the financial assistance received during the preceding five years for the purchase of each category of implements, in the form of

(i) Government subsidy, (ii) Government loan, (iii) Co-operative

Table 3.16 : Percentage of Households getting Financial Assistance for Purchase of Bullocks from the Sources mentioned.

Land- holding Class	GS			GL			CSL			CBL			ML		
	SC	ST	Non- SC/ST	SC	ST	Non- SC/ST	SC	ST	Non- SC/ST	SC	ST	Non- SC/ST	SC	ST	Non- SC/ST
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
Marginal	0.0	0.0	13.43	6.25	0.0	8.96	6.25	0.0	8.96	0.0	0.0	22.39	87.50	100.00	56.72
Small	4.44	1.79	4.46	15.56	3.57	3.18	4.44	3.57	6.05	13.33	5.36	9.55	66.67	85.71	81.53
Medium & Large	8.33	2.27	1.27	5.56	4.55	3.96	0.0	4.55	1.27	13.89	4.55	4.59	75.00	88.64	87.34
All Classes	5.15	1.79	7.01	10.31	3.57	4.05	3.09	3.57	3.26	11.34	4.46	7.31	73.20	88.39	83.51

GS : Government Subsidy;

GL : Government Loan

CSL: Loan from Co-operative Society;

CBL: Loan from Commercial Bank;

ML : Loan from Moneylender

loan, (iv) Other kind of loan and (v) Any other kind of assistance. However, a preliminary scrutiny of almost 1000 schedules showed very scanty information under many heads. We have, therefore, lumped all the implements together and used the information only to deduce the number of households having any one or more of these implements at the time of the survey. As for financial assistance we have paid attention here only to government as a source of partial finance.

3.55 In the table that follows we give data on proportion of households (to total households in each landholding class within a social group) who owned at least one farm implement from among those listed above. Households that reported ownership may be described as 'reporting households'.

Table 3.17 : Percentage of Households who owned at least one Farm Implement

Landholding Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Marginal	29.75	43.58	41.01
2. Small	48.02	66.07	56.43
3. Medium and Large	70.20	82.63	80.55
4. All classes	50.23	68.35	66.04

3.56 We can deduce as follows from the data in the table :

(i) Among ST and Non-SC/ST nearly 2/3rd of the households owned implements whereas the corresponding proportion for SC households was about 50 per cent. We came across more or less the same pattern in respect of ownership of bullocks. SC landholding households were among the most disadvantaged with regard to ownership of such important assets as bullocks and implements. Even ST were better-off than SC in this respect. In fact, every landholding class among SC was at a disadvantage on this account relative to its counterpart belonging to ST and Non-SC/ST.

(ii) In every social group the percentage of owning households increased significantly with the size-class of landholding. The 'medium and large' category was better-placed than the 'small' category who, in turn, were ahead of the marginal category.

3.57 We saw in Chapter II that less than 40 per cent of the surveyed SC households were landholding, as against 46 per cent among ST and nearly 70 per cent among Non-SC/ST. In the preceding few paragraphs we noted that the proportion of SC landholding households owning bullocks and implements was significantly lower than those for their counterparts among ST and Non-SC/ST. What is more, the 'medium and large' category households were better-placed in respect of ownership than the other category households in every social group. Even here, the SC proportion in the case of the 'medium and large' category was lower than those for the corresponding category among ST and Non-SC/ST. In sum, the percentage of surveyed SC households who could benefit from assistance programmes relating to bullocks and implements was less than that among ST, and more so that among Non-SC/ST, and furthermore, percentage of landholding SC households who actually benefitted was lower than that for either ST or Non-SC/ST in the case of assistance for the purchase of bullocks.

3.58 There is one more aspect of the possession of implements which merits attention. Though the implements listed were of different types and these varied in value, it was felt that information on the average number of implements per households would still make for some meaningful comparison. The data based upon the survey are reproduced in the following table.

Table 3.18 : Average Number of Implements per Reporting Household.

Landholding Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Marginal	2.47	2.79	2.96
2. Small	2.84	2.83	3.23
3. Medium and Large	3.84	3.78	4.07
4. All Classes	3.20	3.23	3.70

3.59 In continuation of the general trend observed so far, Non-SC/ST were more advantageously placed than SC/ST. This was also true if we compared Non-SC/ST with SC/ST households within every landholding class. It is indeed significant that even marginal as well as small category households belonging to Non-SC/ST were better-placed in this respect than their counterparts among SC/ST. Furthermore, in every social group the average number of implements per reporting household increased with the increase in the size-class of landholding.

Government Subsidy/Loan for Purchase of Implements

3.60 As stated earlier, every respondent-household was asked to state the amount of financial assistance it received from various sources during the preceding five years. We bring into focus here only the assistance from the government in the form of subsidy or loan. The table below gives, to begin with, the proportion of households (to total households) in each landholding class within a social group who received financial assistance from some agency (government or otherwise) during the preceding five years for purchase of implements (We describe these households as 'reporting beneficiary households').

Table 3.19 : Percentage of Households receiving Financial Assistance from some agency for Purchase of Implements during the preceding five years.

Landholding Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ ST (4)	All Social Groups (5)
1. Marginal	1.12	0.0	0.80	0.78
2. Small	1.18	0.30	1.22	1.10
3. Medium and Large	0.82	0.09	0.84	0.78
4. All Classes	1.06	0.18	0.98	0.91

3.61 The percentage of landholding households which reported receipt of financial assistance for the purchase of implements during the preceding five years, was extremely small. This is not surprising as landholding households do not purchase

implements frequently. A piece of information of special importance is the one on percentage of landholding households (to 'reporting beneficiary households') who mentioned that they received financial assistance from government for the purpose in the form of subsidy/loan. The table below provides the information based on the survey.

Table 3.20 : Percentage of landholding households who received subsidy/loan from government for purchase of implements during the preceding five years

Landholding Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
<u>SUBSIDY</u>			
1. Marginal	0.0	0.0	0.0
2. Small	0.0	20.0	0.85
3. Medium and Large	0.0	100.00	12.50
4. All Classes	0.0	33.33	5.60
<u>LOAN</u>			
1. Marginal	0.0	0.0	3.57
2. Small	30.43	0.0	12.71
3. Medium & Large	40.00	0.0	15.38
4. All Classes	25.00	0.0	12.80

3.62 The table leads to the following conclusions :

(i) The marginal category of households among SC/ST received neither government subsidy nor government loan. Among the Non-SC/ST the marginal category did not receive any subsidy but a small proportion - nearly 4 per cent - received loan. The marginal landholding households were, on the whole, relatively worse-off in respect of government assistance for the purchase of implements.

(ii) The 'small' and 'medium and large' category households among SC received no subsidy, whereas the households belonging to the same categories among ST received no loan. The counterparts of these types of households within Non-SC/ST received

subsidy as well as loan. However, the percentage receiving loan was higher in each case than that receiving subsidy.

(iii) Among those who received subsidy ST were better-placed than Non-SC/ST, while among those who received loan SC percentage was higher than that for Non-SC/ST.

Seeds and Other Inputs

3.63 The questionnaire sought information on sources of supply of and financial assistance in respect of (i) seeds (hybrid and improved), (ii) fertilizers and (iii) pesticides. Four alternative sources of supply have been mentioned on the schedule: (i) government, (ii) co-operative society, (iii) market and (iv) one's own farm. At the data-processing stage the last two categories were consolidated into a single category, viz., 'market or one's own farm' in order to highlight the contrast between public and non-public sources of supply.

3.64 Not all cultivating households provided information on sources of supply and/or financial assistance mentioned in the preceding paragraph. Those that did may be described as 'reporting households'. The information on the proportion of 'reporting households' in respect of seeds to total households surveyed is given in the following table.

Table 3.21 : Percentage of Households Reporting Information on Seeds

Landholding Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
Marginal	69.53	56.03	68.03
Small	74.24	69.91	75.22
Medium and Large	81.86	78.91	81.13
All Classes	75.37	70.89	77.11

3.65 One would feel that seed being an absolutely essential input for every agriculturist, all the respondent-households would have something to report on the relevant item. In other words, all the cultivating households surveyed should have been

'reporting households'. In fact, however, whereas nearly 3/4th of the SC as well as Non-SC/ST households surveyed were 'reporting households', the proportion was a little less at 71 per cent for ST. Then again, in every-social group the percentage of 'reporting households' increased with the size-class of landholding. This fact probably indicates either some deficiency in investigational work or unwillingness of several households to part with information, for reasons not known.

3.66 A comparison between regions in this respect may be interesting. We give in the following table the data on the proportion of 'reporting households' to total surveyed households belonging to the three social groups in the four regions of Konkan, Western Maharashtra, Marathwada and Vidarbha.

Table 3.22 : Reporting Households Regionwise (Seeds)

Regions (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
Konkan	49.02	43.02	55.76
Western Maharashtra	78.28	68.09	77.51
Marathwada	79.85	90.22	85.83
Vidarbha	73.80	73.99	73.66

3.67 It is seen that the proportion for each of the groups was the highest in the case of Marathwada region and the lowest for Konkan, with those for Western Maharashtra and Vidarbha falling in between. This is probably one indication of the differential in the quality of investigational work done in the four regions under the supervision of different Universities.

3.68 As could be expected, most of the reporting households depended only on the 'market or one's own farm' for the supply of seeds. Our data show that nearly 3/4th of the reporting households belonging to SC and Non-SC/ST depended just on this source, whereas the relevant percentage for ST was lower at around 2/3rd. These households got seeds exclusively from the

source cited. There could be some other which depended partly on this source and partly on other (i.e. public) sources. This means that the proportion of those depending, partly or wholly, on 'market/one's own farm' was still higher.

Government Assistance for Seeds

3.69 We now turn to the question of benefit to the surveyed households of government assistance in the form of subsidy or loan in respect of seeds. To begin with, it may be useful to have some idea of the types of schemes of financial assistance and of the extent of such assistance offered. Annexure III-B to this Chapter tabulates information received from the Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Government of Maharashtra (DESM). It is principally for Pune District. We see that loans are given at different rates per acre (ranging from Rs.15 to Rs.350) for the different crops. The maximum limit for subsidy is Rs. 2150. The Performance Budget for 1980-81 of the Agriculture and Co-operation Department (Agriculture), Part II, referred to earlier, mentions several subsidy schemes in respect of seeds for different crops like hybrid jowar, pulses, cotton, oilseeds and so on, and also some loan schemes to enable cultivators to purchase improved and high yielding varieties of seeds. Most of the schemes mentioned are those of subsidy; rates of assistance ranged from Rs. 30 to Rs. 150 per quintal. Loans were of a short-term nature and these were given at rates per hectare ranging from Rs. 12 to Rs. 87.50 for the different crops. There was no specific limit for the grant of total loan to an individual. It is true that, according to a note at the top of Appendix VII in the Performance Budget giving details of assistance schemes, rates under these schemes were in force upto 1974-75 and that from 1975-76 onwards the rates of subsidies and loans were different in each of the districts according to the pattern suggested by the District Planning and Development Council.⁴ All the same, as stated earlier in

4. Please see footnote 2 above.

this chapter (para 3.10), the DESM information cited above (read with the information in the Performance Budgets) gives some idea of the broad dimension of the specific types of financial assistance offered by the government to the cultivators.

3.70 In the table that follows we give the percentage of households (to 'reporting households') who received some financial assistance from the government in respect of seeds, either in the form of subsidy or of loan or of both.

Table 3.23 : Percentage of Reporting Households Receiving some Financial Assistance from Government in respect of Seeds

Landholding Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
Marginal	7.50	17.01	13.84
Small	15.41	21.22	18.20
Medium and Large	19.06	26.62	21.36
All Classes	14.85	22.79	19.29

3.71 A broad impression one gets from the above table is that a relatively small percentage of households belonging to the three social groups obtained financial assistance from government in respect of seeds. Around 23 per cent of ST, 19 per cent of Non-SC/ST and 15 per cent of SC landholding households benefited from the schemes of financial assistance. It may, however, be mentioned that these percentages, though relatively small, were not insignificantly so.

3.72 Interestingly, in every social group the percentage of beneficiary households increased with the size-class of landholdings, the 'medium and large' category farmers being relatively the largest beneficiaries, followed by 'small' and then 'marginal' farmers, in that order.

3.73 Let us now consider the amount of assistance received. In the Code Transcription Sheet (CTS) (mentioned in Chapter I above) we classified households receiving government subsidy

(or loan) into three size-classes : (i) those getting less than Rs.300/-, (ii) those getting between Rs. 300/- to less than Rs.1000/- and (iii) those getting Rs. 1000/- or more. In the table below (3.24) we give percentage of households coming under one or the other of the three above-mentioned size-classes by amounts of assistance (subsidy or loan, as the case may be) from the government, to households who received some financial assistance from the government, in whichever form, in respect of seeds. Clearly within any social group/size-class of landholdings the recipients of subsidy/loan belonging to the three size-classes by amounts of assistance (subsidy or loan) mentioned, would be mutually exclusive groups.

3.74 The following conclusions follow from table 3.24 :

(i) Consider first data in columns 5, 9 and 13 against rows 4 and 8. It is seen that in each social group the percentage of loan-receiving cultivator-households was significantly higher than that of subsidy-receiving landholding households. This was also true separately for each landholding category (marginal/small/medium and large) within each social group.

(ii) A negligibly small proportion of households in each landholding class belonging to a social group received assistance in the form of subsidy of Rs. 1000/- and above. In fact, none of the marginal category households among SC, ST or Non-SC/ST, received this much subsidy. The same held true in the case of 'small' as well as 'medium and large' category households belonging to ST and of 'medium and large' category households within SC.

(iii) Let us now consider loan-assistance of Rs. 1000/- and more. The percentage of ST households falling in this size-class was negligibly small, whichever category of landholders we consider. Among SC and Non-SC/ST, however, the same was true of marginal and small category households. Interestingly, however, about 15 per cent of 'medium and large' category

Table 3.24: Percentage of Landholding Households receiving Government Subsidy/Loan of differing amounts in respect of Seeds

Landholding Class	SC				ST				Non-SC/ST			
	Less than Rs.300/-	Rs.300/- to less than Rs.1000/-	Rs.1000/- and above	All size-classes by Amounts of Assistance	Less than Rs.300/-	Rs.300/- to less than Rs.1000/-	Rs.1000 and above	All Size-classes by Amounts of Assistance	Less than Rs.300	Rs.300 to less than Rs.1000	Rs.1000 and above	All size-classes by Amounts of Assistance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
<u>SUBSIDY</u>												
1. Marginal	15.69	49.02	0.0	64.71	8.16	71.43	0.0	79.59	17.52	46.53	0.0	64.05
2. Small	18.92	36.49	0.90	56.31	18.62	46.15	0.0	64.77	14.33	51.10	0.53	65.96
3. Medium & Large	5.79	42.63	0.0	48.52	12.76	44.86	0.0	57.62	10.44	57.70	0.51	61.65
4. All Classes	13.17	40.39	0.43	53.99	15.03	47.87	0.0	62.90	12.40	50.47	0.47	63.34
<u>LOAN</u>												
5. Marginal	43.14	39.22	0.0	82.36	22.45	67.35	2.04	91.84	36.86	52.87	1.21	90.94
6. Small	44.14	37.39	5.41	86.67	48.18	45.34	0.81	94.33	33.97	50.04	4.47	88.48
7. Medium & Large	31.58	45.26	15.26	92.10	44.44	46.50	4.94	95.88	23.32	59.65	10.11	95.08
8. All Classes	38.88	40.82	8.86	88.56	44.16	47.87	2.78	94.81	29.32	55.73	7.38	92.43

landholding households among SC receiving some financial assistance from government (in whichever form) in respect of seeds, reported that they obtained loan-assistance of Rs. 1000/- or more. The corresponding proportion for the same category households among Non-SC/ST was 10 per cent.

(iv) As for the other two size-classes by amounts of assistance (less than Rs.300/- and Rs.300/- to less than Rs.1000/-), the bulk of the subsidy-receiving households belonging to each landholding class within a social group came under the size-class Rs.300/- to less than Rs.1000/-. The picture in respect of loan-assistance was the same only for Non-SC/ST, but not for SC/ST. Quite a sizeable proportion of SC/ST households received loan-assistance of less than Rs.300/-.

(v) The data in columns 5, 9 and 13, bring out an interesting aspect of the situation in respect of government financial assistance under seed schemes. The percentage of subsidy-receiving farmers was the highest among 'marginal' category cultivators, followed by those belonging to 'small' category and then 'medium and large' category, in that order. This was uniformly so for all the social groups. The picture in respect of loan-assistance was just the opposite, with the percentage of beneficiary households increasing with the size-class of landholdings. This was true for SC/ST and, more or less, so for Non-SC/ST.

Fertilisers

3.75 As in the case of seeds, we sought information on the sources of supply of and government assistance in respect of fertilisers. To begin with, we provide data on the proportion of total households who furnished some information on fertilisers, describing such households as 'reporting households'. The data are presented in the table that follows :

Table 3.25: Percentage of Households reporting information on Fertilisers

Landholding Class (1)	SC (2)-	ST (3)	Non-SC/ ST (4)
1. Marginal	44.79	28.99	50.68
2. Small	36.27	35.98	48.67
3. Medium and Large	41.95	47.36	53.04
4. All Classes	39.96	38.85	51.07

3.76 It is seen that the percentage in every column against every row is lower than the corresponding percentage in the case of seeds. While commenting on the percentages in Table 3.21 on seeds we said that a percentage less than 100 'probably indicates either some deficiency in investigational work or unwillingness of several households to part with information, for reasons not known'. In the case of fertilisers, however, the position could be different. The proportions in Table 3.25 may be indicating the percentage of households who were using fertilisers.

3.77 If we interpret the percentages in the table as revealing the extent of use of fertilisers, it is interesting to note that whereas the proportions for SC and ST were more or less the same, these were much below the proportion for Non-SC/ST. Then again, Non-SC/ST percentage was higher than SC/ST percentage in the case of every landholding class. All this would suggest that proportionately more landholding households belonging to Non-SC/ST used fertilisers than those among SC/ST, irrespective of the size-class of landholdings.

3.78 Furthermore, among Non-SC/ST the proportion for the 'medium and large' landholding households was somewhat higher than that for the 'small' and the 'marginal' category households. The same was true of the ST households, though not of those belonging to SC.

3.79 Let us now consider the sources of supply. In the tabulated data we have distinguished two sources of supply : (i) government and/or co-operative society and (ii) only market. The distinction thus was between public and non-public sources. The second source is an exclusive source. Those households which obtained fertilisers partly from the 'market' and partly from 'government and/or co-operative society' would not figure under (ii), but they would certainly come under (i). This means that households coming under (i) and (ii) would together exhaust the total number of 'reporting households'. In other words, the sum of proportions (to 'reporting households') of households coming respectively under (i) and under (ii) should be 100. We present in table 3.26 the data on these proportions.⁵

3.80 As in the case of seeds, here also the market was the relatively more important source of supply. The percentage of households depending exclusively on the market for the supply of fertilisers was, more or less, around 60 per cent in the case of all the three social groups. Considering that some households may have drawn their supplies partly from the market and also partly from the government and/or cooperative society, the proportion of households getting supplies, partly or wholly, from the market was evidently more than 60 per cent. The non-public source was thus the relatively more important source. This was true also in the case of each landholding class.

3.81 It is interesting to note that among SC/ST, the proportion of households depending on the public source of supply increased and that of households relying on the non-public source diminished as the size-class of landholdings increased.

5 It appears from the data in Table 3.26 that about 3 per cent each of SC and Non-SC/ST households and around 10 per cent of ST households, reporting some information on fertilisers, did not reveal the source(s) of supply. This indicates either some deficiency in investigational work or unwillingness on the part of the concerned households to part with information, for whatever reasons, or, may be, failure to transfer the relevant information to the CTS on the basis of which computer tables were prepared.

Table 3.26 : Percentage of Households (to 'Reporting Households') Obtaining Fertilisers from (i) Government and/or Cooperative Society or (ii) only Market

Landholding Class	SC			ST			Non-SC/ST		
	Govt. and/or Co.op. Society	Only Market	(2)+(3)	Govt. and/or Co.op. Society	Only Market	(5)+(6)	Govt. and/or Co.op. Society	Only Market	(8)+(9)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
1. Marginal	35.62	62.33	97.95	22.82	75.17	97.99	33.39	63.86	97.25
2. Small	40.20	57.53	97.73	26.71	62.27	88.98	39.25	57.87	97.12
3. Medium and Large	44.03	53.82	97.85	34.12	53.65	87.77	35.81	60.73	96.54
4. All Classes	40.17	57.65	97.82	29.40	60.11	89.51	36.72	60.13	96.85

In other words, the more disadvantaged landholding households belonging to SC/ST had to depend relatively more on the non-public source of supply of fertilisers. The same cannot be said of cultivators from Non-SC/ST.

Government Assistance in respect of Fertilisers

3.82 Annexure III-B to this Chapter, giving information principally for Pune district, shows that there are loan schemes of government in respect of fertilisers. The rates of assistance vary for the different crops from Rs. 75/- to Rs.380/- per acre. No subsidy schemes have been mentioned in the Annexure. However, the Performance Budget, 1980-81 cited above, does specify some subsidy schemes besides those for loan-assistance in respect of fertilisers. Thus, there are references in this publication to subsidy schemes for fruit development, for laying out demonstrations for oilseeds crops and to those under the Integrated Area Development Scheme.

3.83 The table that follows gives information on percentage of cultivator-households (to 'reporting households'), who received some financial assistance from the government in the form of subsidy and/or loan.

Table 3.27 : Percentage of Cultivator-Households who received some Financial Assistance from Government in the form of Subsidy and/or Loan

Landholding Class	SC	ST	Non-SC/ST	All Social Groups
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. Marginal	5.94	4.03	5.78	5.70
2. Small	9.94	10.02	10.94	10.73
3. Medium and Large	14.48	15.88	11.28	11.82
4. All Classes	10.28	11.81	10.41	10.51

3.84 We find as follows :

(i) Only about 11 per cent of the fertiliser-using households in all the social groups taken together reported that they

received some financial assistance from the government in the form of subsidy and/or loan. The percentage was, more or less, the same for all the three social groups.

(ii) The proportion of beneficiary households increased with the increase in the size-class of landholdings. This was true not only of all the social groups taken together but also separately for each social group. Again, the possession of larger landholding turned out to be a factor providing relative advantage.

3.85 As for the amount of assistance received by households, we followed the same procedure as in the case of seeds. For each of the two types of government assistance, subsidy and loan, in respect of fertilisers, we classified recipients of assistance into three following size-classes : (i) households getting less than Rs. 500/-, (ii) households getting Rs. 500/- to less than Rs. 3,000/-, and (iii) households getting Rs. 3,000/- or more. The table below (3.28) gives percentage of households by size-class of amounts of government assistance received, to households who received some government assistance in the form of subsidy and/or loan.

3.86 The percentage of households in each social group getting loan-assistance was substantially higher than that receiving subsidy. This also applied to each landholding class within a social group. In fact, the 'marginal' category of SC households did not receive any subsidy. Only about 1/6th of the ST households belonging to this landholding category and around 6 per cent of Non-SC/ST 'marginal' households received subsidy of less than Rs. 500/-; none of these households obtained anything more. On the other hand, an overwhelming percentage of 'marginal' category households in each social group received loan-assistance of at least less than Rs. 500/-.

3.87 Nearly 94 per cent of SC households, about 99 per cent

Table 3.28: Percentage of Households by Size-class of Amounts of Financial Assistance (Subsidy and/or Loan) from Government in respect of Fertilisers

Landholding Class	SC				ST				Non-SC/ST			
	Less than Rs.500	Rs.500 to less than Rs.3000	Rs.3000 or more	All Size-Classes by Amounts of Assistance	Less than Rs.500	Rs.500 to less than Rs.3000	Rs.3000 or more	All Size-Classes by Amounts of Assistance	Less than Rs.500	Rs.500 to less than Rs.3000	Rs.3000 or more	All Size-Classes by Amounts of Assistance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
(A) SUBSIDY												
1. Marginal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.67	0.0	0.0	16.67	5.83	0.0	0.0	5.83
2. Small	10.00	4.29	0.0	14.29	15.00	1.67	0.0	16.67	5.07	1.17	0.0	6.24
3. Medium & Large	5.41	1.35	0.0	6.76	3.45	0.0	0.0	3.45	4.44	0.67	0.0	5.11
4. All Classes	6.47	2.35	0.0	8.82	8.50	0.65	0.0	9.15	4.78	0.81	0.0	5.59
(B) LOAN												
5. Marginal	96.15	3.85	0.0	100.00	83.33	0.0	0.0	83.33	88.35	7.77	0.0	96.12
6. Small	54.29	35.71	0.0	90.00	53.33	41.67	3.33	98.33	59.84	34.89	1.36	96.09
7. Medium & Large	35.14	50.00	9.46	94.60	22.99	70.11	6.90	100.00	32.80	53.09	12.37	98.26
8. All Classes	52.35	37.06	4.12	93.53	37.25	56.21	5.23	98.69	47.21	42.79	7.28	97.28

of SC households and around 97 per cent of Non-SC/ST households, reported having received loan-assistance. In respect of loan assistance, the three social groups were more or less on par. However, a very small percentage of SC households (4.12 per cent), ST households (5.23 per cent) and Non-SC/ST households (7.28 per cent) were in receipt of loan-assistance of Rs. 3000/- or more in respect of fertilisers.

3.88 As for the other two size-classes of amounts of loan-assistance (less than Rs.500/- and Rs. 500/- to less than Rs.3000/-), the marginal category beneficiaries in each social group were mostly in the smallest size-class. But in the case of 'small' and 'medium and large' landholding households a sizeable proportion in each social group came also under the size-class, Rs. 500/- to less than Rs.3000/-. Interestingly, in each social group the percentage of beneficiary households in the 'medium and large' category receiving Rs. 500/- to less than Rs. 3000/- was, in fact, higher than that receiving less than Rs. 500/-. The opposite was true of the small category households in each social group. In sum, it appears that the 'medium and large' category households benefitted relatively more from loan-assistance schemes than the households belonging to the other two landholding categories.

Pesticides

3.89 In the case of pesticides also we attempted to elicit information on sources of supply and on government financial assistance. The table below gives information on percentage of landholding households (to total such households surveyed) who gave information on one or both of these items in respect of pesticides. These are described as the 'reporting households'

3.90 Nearly 20 to 25 per cent of households in the three social groups reported information on pesticides, indicating a smaller scale of use of pesticides. Considering that

Table 3.29 : Proportion of Households reporting Information on Sources of Supply of and/or Government Financial Assistance in respect of Pesticides

Landholding Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
Marginal	12.07	5.06	8.79
Small	20.81	17.84	19.43
Medium and Large	28.74	32.84	33.48
All Classes	21.08	21.07	24.80

pesticides are normally used only by farmers growing certain kinds of crops, such as cotton, fruits, oilseeds, the finding cited above was not unexpected.

3.91 Table 3.29 brings out that Non-SC/ST were somewhat better-placed in respect of the use of pesticides than SC/ST. Then again, the proportion of pesticide-using households increased sharply as the size-class of landholding increased, and this was true of each social group. If, broadly speaking, the scale of use of pesticides was larger, larger the size of landholding, then, prima facie, the benefit of assistance programmes of government in respect of pesticides accrued more to cultivator-households with larger landholdings than to those with smaller landholdings.

3.92 The sources of supply of pesticides were classified into (i) public (government and/or cooperative society) and (ii) non-public (market). In table 3.30 we give percentage of households (to 'reporting households') obtaining pesticides from the two types of sources.

3.93 In the first place, it is seen that nearly 39 per cent of the 'reporting' SC households, about 28 per cent of the 'reporting' ST households and around 44 per cent of the 'reporting' households belonging to Non-SC/ST, provided information on the source of supply of pesticides to them.

Table 3.30: Percentage of Households (to 'Reporting Households') Obtaining Pesticides from (i) Government and/or Cooperative Society and (ii) only Market.

Landholding Class (1)	SC			ST			Non-SC/ST		
	Govt. and/or Co-op. Society (2)	Only Market (3)	(2)+(3) (4)	Govt. and/or Co-op. Society (5)	Only Market (6)	(5)+(6) (7)	Govt. and/or Co-op. Society (8)	Only Market (9)	(8)+(9) (10)
1. Marginal	24.58	5.08	29.66	30.77	3.85	34.62	21.04	12.30	33.34
2. Small	35.15	4.21	39.36	20.54	5.72	26.26	26.34	12.77	39.11
3. Medium & Large	32.86	8.86	41.72	22.37	5.79	28.16	22.67	24.13	46.80
4. All Classes	32.80	6.19	38.99	21.91	5.69	27.60	23.67	20.20	43.87

Since the two sources mentioned together exhausted all the sources available and, therefore, the sum total of proportions was expected to be 100, the shortfall to a large extent observable in the table clearly suggests deficiency in investigational work. We have no option but to use for further analysis the data as is available on the alternative sources of supply of pesticides.

3.94 One fact which stands out from the data in the table is that in more or less all the landholding classes belonging to all the social groups, the percentage of households depending on the public source ('government and/or co-operative society') was significantly higher than that depending on the non-public source ('only market'). The picture here was different from that relating to either fertilisers or seeds. Considering the differential in percentages relating respectively to the two sources of supply of pesticides, it is not likely that the finding would have been different even if the 'coverage' at the investigational stage had been 100 per cent. However, due to low 'coverage' we do not feel it worthwhile to draw any further conclusions from table 3.30.

Government Assistance for Pesticides

3.95 Annexure III-B to this Chapter shows that there are loan-assistance schemes of the government in respect of pesticides. The rates of assistance vary from Rs.10/- to Rs.90/- per acre for the different crops. This information is primarily for Pune district. The Performance Budget for 1980-81 mentioned earlier in this Chapter, lists a subsidy scheme under Integrated Area Development Scheme under which 25 per cent of cost of pesticides/insecticides in campaign area organised by Agriculture and Co-operative Department, was met by the government. Additionally subsidy was available from the government to meet specified amount of cost of pesticides on demonstration plots for important fruit crops and for intensive oilseed development programme.

3.96 Table 3.31 that follows gives percentage of households (to 'reporting households') which received some assistance from the government (subsidy/loan) in respect of pesticides.

Table 3.31 : Percentage of Reporting Households who received some Assistance from Government (Subsidy/Loan) in respect of Pesticides

Landholding Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Marginal	62.71	88.46	65.05
2. Small	88.61	96.30	83.71
3. Medium and Large	92.00	98.16	92.87
4. All Classes	86.47	97.01	88.81

3.97 Among the social groups ST benefitted the most, nearly 97 per cent of their households having received government assistance as against 86 per cent of SC and 89 per cent of Non-SC/ST landholding households. Then again, in every social group the proportion of beneficiary households increased with the size-class of landholdings. This tallies with the conclusion reached in an earlier paragraph (3.91) that since the scale of use of pesticides rose with the size-class of landholdings, prima facie, the benefit from assistance programmes of the government accrued more to cultivator-households with larger landholdings than to those with smaller landholdings.

Writing-Off of Crop Loan Dues

3.98 In order to enable small landholders, with overdues on account of crop loans, to borrow afresh, the Government of Maharashtra announced a scheme of assistance under its G.R. NO. CCR-1480-3106(382)-2-S, dated 5th August, 1980 of the Agriculture and Co-operative Department. Under this scheme, the Government agreed to pay to the concerned lending agencies crop-loan overdues (including interest) of small landholders since 30-6-1979. This was to be treated as government grant to the defaulting

borrowers. A small landholder was defined for this purpose as one having upto 5 acres - in the drought-prone talukas, upto 7.5 acres - of dry land and having an annual non-agricultural income of not more than Rs. 2400/-. Land irrigated by well was to be treated as dry land.

3.99 In our questionnaire we included a query designed to find out how many households benefitted from this scheme. Clearly, it would be proper to relate the number of beneficiary-households to that of those from among the surveyed households which were eligible for assistance under this scheme, i.e., 'small landholders' as defined above. But our tabulated data did not permit such a finer exercise. The table that follows gives data on percentage of beneficiary landholding households under the scheme to total landholding households who received loans from agencies of institutional finance.

Table 3.32 : Percentage of Beneficiary Landholding Households Under Scheme for Writing-Off of Loan Overdues

Landholding Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Marginal	12.50	20.69	10.39
2. Small	23.08	19.27	10.46
3. Medium and Large	11.23	5.07	6.09
4. All Landholding Classes	16.64	12.54	7.86

3.100 It will be seen that given the definition of 'small landholders' eligible for assistance under the scheme these could be found among all the landholding classes identified in our tables, viz., 'marginal', 'small' and 'medium and large'. The table above brings out that SC benefitted the most, followed by ST and Non-SC/ST, in that order. This was true broadly of each landholding class as well. Then again, relatively speaking, the 'marginal' and 'small' landholding households in each social

group benefitted much more than the households belonging to the 'medium and large' category. This was as one would have expected since most of the landholders eligible under the scheme would come under these two categories in our tables viz. 'marginal' and 'small'.

3.101 We tried to find out from the respondents their perception about the reasons for non-receipt of benefit. Evidently those who did not receive any benefit under the scheme would answer this question. Four alternative reasons were suggested in the schedule for a household to choose from. These were : (1) We did not know this scheme, (2) We are not the type of farmers for whom the scheme was intended, (3) We never borrowed and (4) We had repaid our loans before the government scheme was announced. There was the residuary reason : 'any other'. We tabulated for every reason data on percentage of non-beneficiary households stating that reason, to total households who borrowed from agencies of institutional finance. We find that the proportion of households who mentioned reason (2) was the highest in every social group : SC (31.37 per cent); ST (31.99 per cent) and Non-SC/ST (49.60 per cent). Among SC/ST, the reason (i) i.e. ignorance of the scheme, was cited by the next highest percentage of households: SC (14.87 per cent) and ST (17.72 per cent). Among Non-SC/ST 9.65 per cent of the concerned households mentioned this reason. In fact, a slightly higher percentage of Non-SC/ST households (11.15) cited reason (4), viz. loan having been repaid before the announcement of the government scheme.

Area of Benefit of a River Valley Dam

3.102 In the questionnaire a landholding household was asked whether its land fell within the area of benefit of a river valley dam. If so, it was further asked whether during the preceding five years it got water from the dam regularly, rarely or not at all. These questions attempted to bring out

whether the concerned households benefitted directly from the government expenditure on a river valley dam.

3.103 We first give in the following table the proportion of landholding households (to total households) which reported that their lands came within the area of benefit of a river valley dam. We describe such households as 'reporting' households.

Table 3.33 : Percentage of Households Whose Lands Fell Within the Area of Benefit of a River Valley Dam

Landholding Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Marginal	18.00	8.85	18.17
2. Small	5.77	4.20	12.66
3. Medium and Large	5.83	4.06	10.24
4. All Classes	8.68	4.86	12.24

3.104 It is seen that the proportion of households among Non-SC/ST which reported that their lands came within the area of benefit of a river-valley dam, was significantly higher than the corresponding proportions for SC/ST. Again, in every landholding class the Non-SC/ST proportion was higher than the corresponding SC/ST proportions. Interestingly, in every social group the proportion was much higher for the 'marginal' landholding households than the proportions respectively for the 'small' and 'medium and large' landholding households.

3.105 We now turn to the degree of benefit to the 'reporting' households in the form of regularity or otherwise of the receipt of water from a dam. The percentage of 'reporting' households who gave one or the other of the three replies is given in the table below (Table 3.34).

3.106 Considering that percentages in the table are to landholding households who reported that their lands came within the area of benefit of a river valley dam and considering

Table 3.34 : Percentage of 'Reporting Households' with differing amounts of Benefit from a River Valley Dam

Landholding Class	SC				ST				Non-SC/ST			
	Water Taken Regularly (2)	Water Taken Rarely (3)	Water Not Taken At All (4)	(2)+(3)+(4) (5)	Water Taken Regularly (6)	Water Taken Rarely (7)	Water Not Taken At All (8)	(6)+(7)+(8) (9)	Water Taken Regularly (10)	Water Taken Rarely (11)	Water Not Taken At All (12)	(10)+(11)+(12) (13)
1. Marginal	56.82	12.50	2.84	72.16	75.56	20.00	2.22	97.78	56.81	20.60	8.61	86.08
2. Small	45.54	25.00	16.96	87.50	42.86	24.14	17.14	84.14	55.82	22.62	11.64	90.08
3. Medium & Large	43.66	16.90	15.49	76.05	65.96	10.64	10.64	87.24	53.06	20.49	16.64	90.19
4. All Classes	50.70	17.27	9.75	77.72	58.64	20.37	11.11	90.12	54.90	21.35	13.05	89.30

further that the three alternatives regarding extent of benefit mentioned exhausted all the possibilities in this regard, the total of proportions separately in columns (5), (9) and (13) should have added upto 100. In actual fact, these do not add up to 100. A possible explanation for this may be on lines such as follows. Code numbers were given to the three alternatives : (1) Taken Regularly, (2) Taken Rarely and (3) Not Taken At All. It is likely that on some of the schedules for which alternative No.3 applied, the investigators might have left all the columns blank and, therefore, such schedules were left out of account when data was transferred to the CTS. If that be so, the shortfall in percentages in relation to 100 in Columns (5), (9) and (13) would have to be added to the respective proportion against each landholding class within a social group, under column 'Water Not Taken At All'. It appears that in that case 32 per cent of all 'reporting' SC households, 21 per cent of all 'reporting' ST households and 24 per cent of all 'reporting' Non-SC/ST households did not take any water from a river valley dam.

3.107 It will be seen that even if figures in columns (4), (8) and (12) ('Water Not Taken At All') are adjusted in the manner suggested above, the majority of households in each landholding class within a social group obtained some benefit from a river valley dam. In fact, a large proportion of households got water regularly. Thus 51 per cent of SC households, 59 per cent of ST households and 55 per cent of Non-SC/ST households came under this category. What is more, the percentage of households getting water regularly was relatively higher among the 'marginal' landholding category of households than among those belonging the other two landholding classes. This was so particularly in the case of landholding households within SC/ST.

Assistance for Well-Digging And/Or For Lift-Irrigation

3.108 Annexure III-B mentions loan and subsidy schemes for

construction of wells. Loan is available to the maximum extent of Rs.14000/- and subsidy under the Integrated Rural Development Programme, to a limit of Rs. 5000/-. The Performance Budget, 1980-81 referred to earlier also cites schemes of assistance by government in respect of wells and lift-irrigation. These included subsidy/loan for lift-irrigation schemes and for construction of new wells as also for repairs to wells and deepening of old wells by boring and blasting.

3.109 In our questionnaire respondent-households were asked to state whether they received any assistance from three institutional agencies for well-digging and/or for lift irrigation, the three institutional agencies mentioned being (i) government (subsidy/loan), (ii) cooperative society and (iii) bank. Those that reported receipt of assistance were required to state the amount of assistance received from each agency.

3.110 We present below data in two stages. The first relates to the percentage of households(to total households)which reported receipt of assistance. These are the "reporting" households. The relevant data are presented in table 3.35. The second concerns the average amount of assistance (in Rupees) per 'reporting' household, given separately for each of the three agencies mentioned in the preceding para. The data in question are given in table 3.36.

Table 3.35 : Percentage of Households who received Assistance for Well-digging And/Or for Lift-Irrigation

Landholding Classes (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Marginal	1.64	0.78	1.91
2. Small	5.05	1.92	5.72
3. Medium and Large	10.43	4.84	8.98
4. All Classes	5.83	2.76	6.78

3.111 The percentage of beneficiary-households among all the three social groups was rather on the low side, that for ST being the lowest (2.76 per cent). In fact, in every landholding class the ST proportion was the lowest. The SC and Non-SC/ST proportions were at comparable levels. Secondly, the percentage of households in each social group which benefitted increased with the size-class of land-holding. Relatively speaking, the 'medium and large' landholding category benefitted to a larger extent than the other two categories.

3.112 We shall now turn to table 3.36. Consider first the figures against row 4 in columns 5, 9 and 13. These give the average amount per household for SC, ST and Non-SC/ST respectively. Amounts are not much different. Thus in respect of the total assistance per household, no one social group had relative advantage. However, the amount per household for the 'medium and large' category of households in every social group was significantly above the average for the 'marginal' or the 'small' category households.

3.113 Coming to the three different sources of assistance it is clear that bank was the major source in the case of each social group, in fact almost each landholding class within every social group. Only in the case of the 'marginal' category households belonging to ST the government assistance (Subsidy/Loan) per reporting household was substantially larger than assistance from the other two agencies. Assistance per household from banks increased with the size-class of landholding, and this applied to every social group.

3.114 In the case of the other two sources viz., the government and the cooperative society, whereas the latter was the more important for SC, the opposite was true for ST and Non-SC/ST. (Row 4, relevant column figures). In fact the government as a source of assistance was more important than the cooperative

Table 3.36 : Average Amount of Assistance (in Rupees) per Reporting Household

Landholding Class	SC				ST				Non-SC/ST			
	Govt. (Subsi- dy/ Loan) (2)	Co.op. Society (3)	Bank (4)	All Sour- ces (5)	Govt. (Subsi- dy/ Loan) (6)	Co.op. Society (7)	Bank (8)	All Sour- ces (9)	Govt. (Subsi- dy/ Loan) (10)	Co.op. Society (11)	Bank (12)	All Sour- ces (13)
1. Marginal	700	312	155	2568	2250	550	500	3300	563	205	1722	2490
2. Small	629	1047	2203	3879	1025	578	1612	3215	969	696	2338	4003
3. Medium & Large	655	962	2825	4482	808	307	3615	4730	1060	799	2644	4503
4. All Classes	669	954	2488	4111	946	411	2783	4140	1012	744	2511	4267

society for each landholding class belonging to ST and Non-SC/ST. Among SC households, the government was the more important source for the 'marginal' category, while the cooperative society was more important for the 'small' and 'medium' and 'large' categories. If we consider only the government as a source, the average amount for Non-SC (Rs.1012/-) was higher than that for ST (Rs.946) which, in turn, was way above that for SC (Rs.669/-). It appears that the government assistance schemes helped Non-SC/ST households relatively more than SC/ST households. Furthermore, among SC/ST the 'marginal' category of households got more of government assistance on an average than the 'small' and the 'medium and large' category households. In this respect, the 'marginal' landholding households belonging to Non-SC/ST were, however, worse-off than 'small' category households who, in turn, received less government assistance than the 'medium and large' category households.

Pumps on Well

3.115 The households surveyed were asked whether they had set up pumps on their wells. In the following table (3.37) we give the percentage of landholding households with pumps set on their wells, to total households with some irrigated land.

Table 3.37 : Percentage of Households with Pumps set on their wells, to Households with some land under Irrigation

Landholding Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
Marginal	13.90	10.00	28.03
Small	27.19	25.37	42.86
Medium and Large	53.78	55.42	63.70
All Classes	30.63	32.76	52.54

3.116 Two things stand out prominently in this table :

(1) The percentage of Non-SC/ST households with pumps on their wells was way above the percentage for SC/ST households. Again, this differential held in the case of every landholding class within Non-SC/ST vis-a-vis its counterpart within SC/ST.

(2) In every social group the percentage increased with the increase in the size-class of landholdings. In fact, in every group the percentage of households with pumps on wells within the 'medium and large' category was significantly higher than the percentages respectively for the 'small' and 'marginal' category households.

3.117 The government provides assistance in the form of subsidy and loan to agriculturists for setting pumps on wells. The Annexure III-B to this chapter which tabulates data (primarily for Pune district) shows that the government gives loans to a maximum limit of Rs.7500/- for the purpose. There are also subsidy schemes of the Zilla Parishads and within the Special Component Plan as also those under the Integrated Rural Development Programme. These also have their specified maxima. We also have information on similar lines in the Performance Budget, 1980-81 mentioned earlier. Thus upto 1974-75 in any case there was a scheme of installation of pumpsets under which subsidy of 25 per cent of cost was given subject to a maximum of Rs.800/-.

3.118 The table that follows gives percentage of landholding households who stated that they received assistance from the government in one form or another for the purpose, to total households who reported that pumps were set on their wells.

Table 3.38 : Percentage of Households who received Assistance from the Government for Pumps on wells

Landholding Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Marginal	13.89	30.00	25.64
2. Small	33.33	45.10	20.53
3. Medium and Large	29.69	28.26	19.45
4. All Classes	28.79	33.99	20.12

3.119 Interestingly, here the proportions for SC/ST were higher than the percentage for Non-SC/ST. In fact, the proportion for almost every landholding class belonging to Non-SC/ST was below the proportions for its counterparts within SC/ST. Government assistance here helped SC/ST more than Non-SC/ST.

3.120 Among SC/ST it was the 'small' landholding class which had the highest proportion of beneficiary households. On the other hand, it was the 'marginal' category households who had the highest proportion among Non-SC/ST.

3.121 In our tabulated data we have classified government assistance into two size-classes : (i) less than Rs.500/- and (ii) Rs.500/- or more, separately for subsidy and for loan. The proportion of landholding households (to those who obtained government assistance) falling under each of these size-classes, pertaining to the relevant type of assistance, is given in the table below (3.39).

3.122 The following conclusions follow from table 3.39.

(i) In each social group, the aggregate proportion of households getting assistance in the form of subsidy was higher than the aggregate proportion of those getting loan-assistance (compare figures in Columns 4, 7 and 10 against rows 4 and 8).

(ii) Nearly 72 per cent of the assistance-receiving SC households got subsidy, as against about 62 per cent of ST and around 64 per cent of Non-SC/ST. The SC seem to have benefitted relatively more among the three social groups. In fact, the proportion of subsidy-receiving households in every landholding class belonging to SC was higher than that in the case of its counterparts within ST or within Non-SC/ST. The picture in the case of loan-assistance was different. The percentage for Non-SC/ST was the highest, followed by that for ST and then, that for SC. This was true, more or less, in the case of landholding classes as well.

Table 3.39 : Percentage of Households in each Size-Class of Government Assistance (Subsidy/Loan), in respect of Pumpsets installed.

Landholding Class	SC			ST			Non-SC/ST		
	Less than Rs.500	Rs.500 or more	(2)+(3)	Less than Rs.500	Rs.500 or more	(5)+(6)	Less than Rs.500	Rs.500 or more	(8)+(9)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(A) SUBSIDY									
1. Marginal	100.00	0.0	100.00	66.67	33.33	100.00	78.57	7.14	85.71
2. Small	58.06	16.13	74.19	56.52	0.0	56.52	59.50	11.11	70.61
3. Medium & Large	44.74	21.05	65.79	57.69	3.85	61.54	51.16	7.10	58.26
4. All Classes	54.05	17.57	71.62	57.69	3.85	61.54	55.60	8.27	63.87
(B) LOAN									
5. Marginal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.33	33.33	1.43	35.71	37.14
6. Small	12.90	32.26	45.16	0.0	43.48	43.48	2.87	44.09	46.96
7. Medium & Large	0.0	44.74	44.74	7.69	43.31	50.00	2.15	56.44	58.59
8. All Classes	5.41	36.49	41.90	3.85	42.31	46.16	2.30	51.31	53.61

(iii) In each of the three social groups the highest proportion of recipients of subsidy were from among the 'marginal' landholding class. In the case of loan assistance, the proportion was the lowest for this category of households. In fact, it was fairly high for the 'medium and large' category households.

(iv) In all the social groups as also in the landholding classes belonging to them, the bulk of the recipients of subsidy got less than Rs. 500/-, whereas in the case of loan-assistance, the bulk of them obtained Rs. 500/- or more.

Fruit Gardens

3.123 We tried to find out from respondent-households whether they received any assistance (subsidy/loan) from the government for raising fruit gardens and, if so, how much. The percentage of households who reported that they received any such assistance during the preceding five years, was insignificantly small. The proportion was 0.24 for SC, 0.03 for ST and 0.36 for Non-SC/ST. There is no point, therefore, in analysing data on the amount of assistance received by the beneficiary households.

Training Camps and Demonstration Farms

3.124 The Government organises training camps for the benefit of farmers. It also subsidises agricultural demonstration on selected plots to highlight improved practices in respect of a variety of crops. In the case of training camps, we attempted to find out how many households were aware of such camps being run and how many of those aware, had been to any such training camp.

3.125 Our data show that 16.36 per cent of SC landholding households, 21.46 of ST landholding households and 23.09 per cent of Non-SC/ST landholding households were aware that training camps were being organised. The percentages for all the three social groups were on the low side. The proportion for the 'medium and large' category households was also not particularly high, being 18.56 per cent among SC, 29.65 per cent

among ST and 24.79 per cent among Non-SC/ST.

3.126 Let us now consider the landholding households (from among those aware) who reported that some member(s) of the household had been to such a training camp. The table below gives proportion of such households (to those aware).

Table 3.40 : Percentage of Households reporting that some member(s) of the Household attended a Training Camp organised by Government for Agriculturists

Landholding Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Marginal	24.57	29.82	30.85
2. Small	34.06	32.59	25.50
3. Medium and Large	37.61	39.65	36.15
4. All Classes	32.79	35.75	31.73

3.127 Nearly one third of the households in each social group (who knew about such training camps) reported that some member(s) of the household had been to a camp. The proportion was on the low side, and no one social group seems to have benefitted relatively more than other groups. All the same, as between the landholding classes in each social group, 'the medium and large' category households had a relatively higher percentage. The overall impression is that less than 1/4th of the landholding households within each social group were aware, and of those aware nearly 1/3 sent a member to attend the camp. The scale of 'benefit' was rather very low, though not insubstantial.

3.128 Coming to demonstration farms, we asked the respondent-households whether (i) any member of the household had seen such a farm and (ii) whether any representative of the government had taken a household member to see such a farm. We find that 6.41 per cent of SC households, 6.89 per cent of ST households and 9.46 per cent of Non-SC/ST households reported having seen

such a farm. All these proportions were quite low though Non-SC/ST seem to have had a slight edge over the SC/ST.

3.129 The proportion of households (to those with someone or other having seen a demonstration farm), who reported that a government representative took a member to a farm was as follows: SC (34.72); ST (46.52) and Non-SC/ST (37.81). The conclusion here also is that the scale of 'benefit' was quite low, though not insubstantial.

Gramsevak

3.130 Under the Panchayat Raj System in Maharashtra, Gramsevaks are posted in villages who are expected, inter alia, to provide guidance to farmers. We, therefore, asked the households whether gramsevaks had visited them and if so, whether, they had been of help to them. Our data brings out that 59.80 per cent of SC agriculturist households, 58.72 per cent of ST agriculturist households and 65.97 per cent of Non-SC/ST agriculturist households reported that gramsevaks had visited them. The proportion for Non-SC/ST was somewhat higher than that for SC/ST.

3.131 Of the agriculturist households which reported visit by Gramsevaks the percentage of households stating that they received assistance from the Gramsevaks were as follows : SC (67.52); ST (66.26); Non-SC/ST (68.33). In other words, in the case of each social group 2/3rd of the households reporting visits by Gramsevaks stated that they received assistance from them. In sum, the 'benefit' in this case was quite significant and it was uniformly so for all the social groups. Furthermore, our data reveals that the percentages for the different landholding classes within each social group did not diverge much from each other. They ranged between 62.05 per cent and 69.46 per cent in the case of SC landholding classes, between 62.96 per cent and 67.68 per cent for those belonging to ST and between 66.83 per cent to 69.35 per cent for those within Non-SC/ST.

Income from Agriculture

3.132 Evidently the expectation of the government would naturally be that the cultivator-households would be better-off as the incentive schemes of assistance got effectively operationalised, unless certain unexpected adverse factors intervened to off-set the beneficent impact of the incentive schemes. Probably one index of the impact of so many incentive schemes working together would be a change in income of cultivator-household, though it must be agreed that there is no one-to-one relationship between the operationalisation of the schemes and the change in income. All the same, we tried to find out whether there was an increase or not in the income from agriculture of the surveyed landholding households during the preceding five years.

3.133 We are aware of the pitfalls relating to the data on household incomes. Households are ordinarily not willing to share with investigators the information on their incomes. However, in view of the fact that in our survey scheme student-investigators from or nearabout the village to be surveyed were to collect information from the households, we expected that, enjoying the confidence of the villagers, they would be able to get fairly reliable answers to the question on change in a household's income from agriculture. The following table shows percentage of surveyed agricultural households which stated that their income from agriculture increased during the preceding five years, to total such households surveyed.

Table 3.41 : Percentage of Households whose income from Agriculture Increased

Landholding Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Marginal	29.04	22.76	40.13
2. Small	28.85	27.27	36.75
3. Medium and Large	31.94	37.08	40.98
4. All Classes	29.80	29.98	39.27

3.134 Again here Non-SC/ST had a higher percentage of cultivator-households reporting increase in income from agriculture than SC/ST. The proportion was around 30 per cent for SC/ST, whereas it was approximately 40 per cent for Non-SC/ST. Then again, the differential in percentages relating to the three landholding classes belonging to SC or, for that matter, even to Non-SC/ST, was quite less than the differential pertaining to ST landholding categories. In fact, among ST there was a clearcut trend showing the highest percentage of households with increased income among the 'medium and large' category, followed by the proportions for the 'small' and then the 'marginal' categories, in that order.

Annexure III-AAgriculturists : Assistance Programmes

Items (1)	Assistance Programme (2)	Item No. under Block 2 of the Questionnaire (3)
1. Land obtained	(i) Tenancy legislation	10
	(ii) Ceiling legislation	16
	(iii) Forest or other government land	22
2. Improvement of Land obtained under 1(i), (ii) and (iii)	Subsidy/loan from the government (amount)	35
3. Khar/Khajjan land if any, of the household	Subsidy/loan from the government in the form of capital expenditure on account of bunding, terracing etc. (Amount)	38,39,40
4. Land of the household other than Khar/Khajjan land	Subsidy/loan from the government in the form of capital expenditure on account of bunding, terracing, afforestation, etc.	41,42,
		43,44
5. Land of the household	(A) Bunds constructed by the government on this land	45
	(B) Levelling, shaping of land by the government	78
6. Bullocks owned by the household	Subsidy/loan from the government and/or loan from a co-operative institution for purchase of bullocks (Amounts)	46
7. Implements (ploughs, Spray Pump, Harrow, Chaff Cutters, Seed Drill and others) owned by the household	Subsidy/loan from the government and/or loan from a co-operative institution for purchase of implements	47
8. Seeds used	(a) Source of Supply : government/co.op.society	48 and 49
	(b) Government financial assistance in the form of (i) subsidy, (ii) loan. (Amounts)	
9. Chemical Fertilisers	(a) Source of Supply: government/co.op.society	50
	(b) Government financial assistance in the form of (i) subsidy, (ii) loan (Amounts)	

(1)	(2)	(3)
10. Pesticides	(a) Source of Supply: government/co.op. society	} 51
	(b) Government financial assistance in the form of (i) subsidy, (ii) loan (Amounts)	
11. Well digging and/or lift irrigation	(i) government subsidy/ loan for the purpose	} 80 to 82
	(ii) Loan from a co.op. institution (Amounts)	
12. Pump on Well	Government assistance for the purpose, if any: subsidy/loan (Amounts)	85, 86
13. Fruit Gardens	Government financial assistance for planting fruit trees : Subsidy/loan (Amounts)	88
14. Farmer Households	(a) Training Camps con- ducted by the govern- ment for farmers. (Awareness and visit)	89, 90
	(b) Demonstration farms (Seen; Taken there by government)	91, 92
15. Loan	Benefit of write-off of loan by the government	2 and 3 (Block 5)

Annexure III-B

Maximum Limits of Schemes of Government Financial Assistance to Agriculturists

(The information is principally for Pune District)

(in Rs.)

Sr. No.	Item	Loan (Maximum limit)	Subsidy		Remarks
			Zilla Parishad & Special Component Plan	I.R.D.P.	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	
1.	Govt. assistance for land improvement	9,000/-	4,500/-	5,000/-	
2.	Purchase of bullocks	3,000/-	3,000/-*	1,000/-	*For these two schemes maximum subsidy could be taken upto Rs.3000/- only
3.	Purchase of Agricultural implements	9,000/-	3,000/-*		
4.	Seeds	Rs.15/- to Rs.350/-** (per acre)	2,150/-	-	** Rates vary from crop to crop
5.	Fertilisers	Rs.75/- to Rs.380/-** (per acre)			
6.	Pesticides	Rs.10/- to Rs.90/-** (per acre)			
7.	(a) Pumps	7,500/-	50% of the loan or Rs.6000/- (maximum)	3,000/-	Electric motor pump
	(b) Construction of well	14,000/-		5,000/-	For digging & construction

(contd.)

Annexure III-B (contd.)

1	2	3	4	5	6
8.	Fruit Gardens	Rs.5,800/- ^{***} to Rs.17,620/- ^{***}	Rs.1933/- ^{***} to Rs.5872/- ^{***}	-	^{***} Rates vary from fruit to fruit
9.	Sugarcane	Rs.85/-per tonne or Rs.5000/-, whichever is less	-	-	Per acre

N.B.: For Special Component Plan an individual can take the subsidy for all the schemes together (which amounts to Rs.15,650/-); however, the ceiling limit is Rs.9,650/- only.

Source: See text (Chapter III, para 3.10)

CHAPTER IV

LIVESTOCK : ASSET-HOLDING AND ASSISTANCE PROGRAMMES

Introduction

4.1 This chapter deals mainly with the various government schemes relating to animal husbandry in rural Maharashtra and the extent to which SC and ST households benefitted from these, relatively to population belonging to Non-SC/ST. For the purpose of this chapter the livestock include milch animals (cows and she-buffaloes), goats and sheep, pigs and poultry. Bullocks and other drought animals have been discussed in the preceding chapter on agriculture, and are not included here. The chapter begins with a presentation of the pattern of ownership of these different types of livestock among the three main social groups within the surveyed households, and then examines the impact of the government assistance programmes relating to animal husbandry on these households.

4.2 The ownership of livestock by the surveyed households is being discussed below with reference to the (a) extent of ownership and (b) level of ownership. As a rough indicator of the 'extent' of ownership we take into account the percentage of households owning a given type of livestock, to total households surveyed. The 'level' of ownership may be represented by the average number of livestock of different types per household reporting ownership of the respective types.

Asset-Holding : Extent of Ownership

4.3 Table 4.1 gives percentage of households owning a given type of livestock to the total households surveyed in each landholding class within a social group.

4.4 The table shows that in the matter of extent of ownership by households, the milch animals (cows and she-buffaloes) were in a category different from the other three. A much larger percentage of Non-SC/ST households (53.59%) possessed milch

Table 4.1 : Percentage of Surveyed Households Owning Livestock

Land-related Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
<u>(A) MILCH ANIMALS</u>			
1. Landless	20.07	18.02	23.72
2. Marginal	39.06	37.55	47.27
3. Small	37.76	49.67	58.34
4. Medium & Large	55.09	71.22	78.54
5. All Classes	28.87	35.28	53.59
<u>(B) GOATS & SHEEP</u>			
1. Landless	21.90	20.19	19.28
2. Marginal	20.76	27.04	18.40
3. Small	22.87	24.68	24.56
4. Medium & Large	27.59	30.94	27.90
5. All Classes	22.61	23.45	23.50
<u>(C) PIGS</u>			
1. Landless	0.31	1.68	0.29
2. Marginal	0.10	1.56	0.14
3. Small	0.21	0.36	0.20
4. Medium & Large	0.49	1.21	0.33
5. All Classes	0.29	1.29	0.26
<u>(D) POULTRY</u>			
1. Landless	17.80	17.78	16.33
2. Marginal	34.15	34.05	31.46
3. Small	23.49	35.38	24.92
4. Medium & Large	23.97	33.71	19.14
5. All Classes	20.98	25.57	20.98
<u>(E) ONE OR MORE OF LIVESTOCK SPECIES</u>			
1. Landless	41.88	40.93	43.22
2. Marginal	59.61	61.87	67.95
3. Small	56.52	68.23	71.06
4. Medium & Large	67.00	82.54	83.33
5. All Classes	48.91	55.42	66.45

animals than either SC (28.87%) or ST (35.28%). This could be explained as follows. About the same percentage of landless households in the three social groups (around 20%) had milch animals. But it is found that as the size of landholding increased, the percentage of Non-SC/ST households owning any milch animals was larger than for either SC or ST households. In this respect ST households were better placed than their SC counterparts. Since Non-SC/ST households had more and better (including irrigated) lands, it is not surprising that a larger percentage of them had milch animals as well. As for ST households, many of them live in or near forests where grazing on forest/common land is easier, facilitating thereby ownership of milch cattle. If nevertheless among ST not even as large a proportion as Non-SC/ST households had milch animals, that is partly because there is poor marketing facility for milk products, and partly because, in some socio-economic settings, milk is not consumed by tribals and hence no great need for such animals, except for occasional meat. Then again, since SC/ST households were predominantly landless, the proportion of all SC/ST households with milch animals turned out to be lower than for Non-SC/ST.

4.5 On the other hand, the proportion of households owning sheep and goats, or poultry, or pigs was about the same for all three social groups. Hardly 1 per cent of households had pigs; so we shall not discuss this category of animals any further. As for goats and sheep as well as poultry, these are small animals and the cost of upkeep per animal is much less for them than for cow or buffalo. The sheep and goat are grazing animals, rarely stall-fed. There are certain ST groups who are traditionally shepherds. For all these reasons we find the percentage of households with such livestock about the same in all three social groups. Indeed amongst the landless and marginal farmers within SC/ST the percentages were somewhat

larger than in the case of Non-SC/ST for reasons stated.

Asset-Holding : Level of Ownership

4.6 So far we centred attention on the 'proportion of households reporting ownership of livestock to the total households surveyed', as an index of the extent of ownership of this asset. We may now turn to the second indicator signifying the level of ownership, viz., 'the number of livestock (belonging to a species) per household on an average'. The households in view here are not all those surveyed but only those which reported ownership of livestock.

4.7 The table below (4.2) gives information (drawn from the survey) on the average number of livestock of each category per household, reporting ownership of that category of livestock.

Table 4.2 : Average Number of Livestock per 'Reporting Household'.

Land-related Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
<u>(I) MILCH ANIMALS</u>			
1. Landless	1.9	2.3	2.0
2. Marginal	1.6	2.0	1.8
3. Small	2.0	2.1	2.1
4. Medium & Large	2.7	2.9	3.1
5. All Households	2.1	2.4	2.6
<u>(II) GOATS & SHEEP</u>			
1. Landless	2.9	3.0	2.9
2. Marginal	2.1	3.2	2.5
3. Small	2.7	3.2	2.7
4. Medium & Large	2.9	3.4	3.2
5. All Households	2.8	3.2	2.9
<u>(III) POULTRY</u>			
1. Landless	4.3	3.9	4.1
2. Marginal	3.8	4.3	3.8
3. Small	4.0	4.5	4.5
4. Medium & Large	4.3	4.4	5.2
5. All Households	4.2	4.2	4.5

Table 4.2 (contd.)

N.B.: Pigs have been omitted from this table since, as stated earlier, hardly 1 per cent of the households belonging to a land-related class within a social group, owned pigs.

4.8 We find that in the case of 'milch animals' the Non-SC/ST average was significantly above that for SC and was also somewhat above the average for ST. The privileged position relative of Non-SC/ST in respect of 'milch animals' brought out by the data on the 'extent of ownership' is also supported by that on the 'level of ownership'. Furthermore, in each social group the 'medium and large' category households were comparatively better-placed than those belonging to the other land-related classes. What is more, among the three social groups the average for the 'medium and large' category Non-SC/ST households was higher than that for their counterparts belonging to SC/ST. All the same, one basic fact that emerges from this table is that households within all the social groups had, generally speaking, few heads of any type of livestock. This applies not merely in the case of 'milch animals' which is easier to understand but also of 'goats and sheeps' and 'poultry' as well. This emphasises the very inadequacy of the resources at the disposal of the rural households as a whole.

4.9 We have data in our tables on the number of households who owned 9 or more of a species of livestock. It would be interesting to go over these in the current context. The table below gives percentage of households owning 9 or more of a livestock species to total households owning that species.

Table 4.3 : Percentage of Households Owning 9 or more of a Livestock Species

Livestock Species (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
Milch Animals	3.06	2.99	3.57
Goats and Sheep	6.15	9.72	9.68
Poultry	16.67	18.85	20.02

4.10 The difference in percentage figures respectively for the three social groups was quite marginal. What is more, quite a small percentage of livestock-owning households in every social group reported ownership of 9 or more of (a) milch animals and (b) goats and sheep. In the case of poultry the situation was somewhat better, about 17 to 20 per cent of households in the groups owning 9 or more of the species. Poultry is, however, a relatively small species.

Cross-bred Cows

4.11 Our computer tables provide data on the number of households having cross-bred cows. The percentage of such households to total households having milch animals is given in the following table.

Table 4.4 : Percentage of Households having Cross-bred Cows, to Total Households with Milch Animals.

Land-related Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Landless	1.48	4.31	1.09
2. Marginal	1.31	1.04	0.84
3. Small	1.50	0.60	1.28
4. Medium & Large	1.04	0.73	1.48
5. All Classes	1.37	1.69	1.32

4.12 The table shows that most animals were of local breed and that the cross-bred were few. The percentage of households with cross-bred cows was very low for all social groups, viz. at less than 2 per cent. The picture for the different land-related classes within the social groups was not much different.

Artificial Insemination

4.13 The households were asked to state whether artificial insemination was done to their cows during the preceding five years, and if so, to how many cows. The following table gives the percentage of households (to those having milch animals)

which gave an affirmative answer to the question on whether artificial insemination was done.

Table 4.5 : Percentage of Households Reporting that Artificial Insemination was done to their Cows

Land-Related Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1 Landless	5.63	8.62	5.39
2 Marginal	3.93	2.07	5.17
3 Small	4.09	5.08	6.83
4 Medium & Large	5.96	6.92	9.71
5 All Classes	5.13	6.42	7.93

4.14 The proportion of Non-SC/ST households at 7.93 per cent was quite higher than that for ST households (6.42 per cent) and SC households (5.13 per cent). Then again, in each landholding class Non-SC/ST were better-placed than SC/ST. Furthermore, among the landholding classes in each social group, the percentage increased as the size-class of land-holding increased. All the same, the percentage for the landless households in each social group was, comparatively speaking, on the high side.

4.15 Let us now consider the number of cows subjected to artificial insemination. The following table gives the proportion of cows subjected to artificial insemination to total milch animals owned by the households in the respective groups.

Table 4.6 : Percentage of Cows subjected to Artificial Insemination

Land-related Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Landless	4.23	3.32	4.58
2. Marginal	2.50	3.54	2.77
3. Small	2.46	2.73	3.64
4. Medium & Large	3.05	2.71	4.28
5. All Classes	3.33	2.92	4.07

4.16 Again, the proportion for Non-SC/ST was higher than that for SC or ST. Among the landholding classes, the 'medium and large' category households were relatively better-placed than those belonging to the other two categories, in the case of Non-SC/ST and SC. As in the case of table 4.5, here also the percentage for the landless households in each social group was, comparatively speaking, on the high side.

4.17 One last point needs to be noted. While 5 to 8 per cent of households reported recourse to artificial insemination for their cows during the preceding five years (table 4.5), the percentage of households reporting possession of cross-bred cows was 1.7 or less (table 4.4). Of course, there would be some cases of artificial insemination, the result of which was still awaited at the time of the survey. But these could not have been 3/4th or more of instances of artificial insemination. There is thus reason to conclude that even among the very small percentage of households that reported recourse to artificial insemination on cows, a fairly large percentage of such efforts did not succeed.

Assistance Programmes

4.18 The two Performance Budgets of the Agriculture and Co-operation Department of the Government of Maharashtra, mentioned in the preceding chapter give some details about assistance programmes coming under 'Animal Husbandry'¹. Annexure IV-A provides a list of schemes under 'Animal Husbandry' drawn from Performance Budget, 1980-81. It was stated in the preceding chapter that the rates of subsidies and loans as shown in the Performance Budget were uniform in all districts upto 1974-75 and that these rates from 1975-76 onwards differed from district

1. Government of Maharashtra (i) Performance Budget, 1976-77, Agriculture and Cooperation Department, Statement C., Pp. 21-23 and (ii) Performance Budget, 1980-81, Agriculture and Cooperation Department (Agriculture), Part II, Appendix VII, Pp. 782-784.

to district according to patterns suggested by District Planning and Development Councils. All the same the information in Annexure IV-A gives us in broad dimensions the government assistance schemes in the field under review. The assistance programmes selected for the purpose of setting questions in the questionnaire, are listed in Annexure IV-B to this chapter.

Purchase of Livestock

4.19 The questionnaire seeks to find out the sources of funds raised by a respondent household for the purchase of livestock. At the tabulation stage we used information under this item to find out (a) the number of households who reported purchase of livestock during the preceding five years (separately for each category of livestock) and the percentage of these to total households in the relevant group (b) the number of livestock of each type per purchasing household and (c) the receipt of government assistance for the purchase of livestock.

4.20 In the analysis in this section we shall leave out pigs since, as we saw earlier, a negligibly small proportion of the surveyed households reported possession of pigs. The table that follows (4.7) gives percentage of households (to total households) reporting purchase, during the preceding five years, of milch animals/goats and sheep/poultry/one or more of livestock species.

4.21 Consider portion (D) of the table. This portion gives us the proportion of households which purchased, during the preceding five years, one or more of the livestock species. Non-SC/ST with a proportion of 18.50 per cent were better-placed than ST (16.57 per cent) and SC (14.90 per cent). In each social group the landholding households had significantly higher percentages than the landless households. Among the landholding households the 'medium and large' category households had a higher proportion than the other two categories, in the case of SC/ST. As for Non-SC/ST, the respective percentages were not very different from one another.

Table 4.7: Percentage of Households Reporting Purchase of Milch Animals/Goats and Sheep/Poultry/One or More of Livestock Species.

Land-related Classes (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
<u>(A) MILCH ANIMALS</u>			
1. Landless	5.71	5.28	5.65
2. Marginal	10.53	8.95	13.94
3. Small	9.38	12.43	15.14
4. Medium and Large	16.34	18.67	18.87
5. All Classes	7.99	9.35	13.40
<u>(B) GOATS AND SHEEP</u>			
1. Landless	5.50	4.84	4.52
2. Marginal	4.50	5.64	4.69
3. Small	5.36	6.37	5.81
4. Medium and Large	7.14	7.35	6.13
5. All Classes	5.57	5.64	5.42
<u>(C) POULTRY</u>			
1. Landless	5.52	4.61	4.13
2. Marginal	8.90	8.17	8.67
3. Small	7.37	10.81	6.65
4. Medium and Large	7.47	8.82	3.92
5. All Classes	6.37	6.97	5.15
<u>(D) ONE OR MORE OF LIVESTOCK SPECIES</u>			
1. Landless	12.85	12.19	11.61
2. Marginal	17.48	16.15	22.07
3. Small	16.64	20.42	20.69
4. Medium and Large	21.43	25.84	21.99
5. All Classes	14.90	16.57	18.50

4.22 If we turn to the other three portions (A, B and C) of the table we find as follows :

(1) In all the landholding classes belonging to all the social groups, a larger percentage of households purchased 'milch animals', than either 'goats and sheeps' or 'poultry'.

(2) The percentage of Non-SC/ST households purchasing 'milch animals' (13.40) was significantly higher than the corresponding percentages for ST (9.35) and SC (7.99). Then again, ST were better placed than SC. In the case of 'goats and sheep' and of 'poultry', SC/ST proportions were higher than those for Non-SC/ST.

(3) Broadly speaking, the landless households belonging to all the three social groups had the lowest percentages in the case of 'milch animals' 'goats and sheep', and 'poultry'. On the other hand, among the landholding category households, the percentage, more or less, increased as the size-class of landholding increased, so far as the purchase of 'milch animals' and 'goats and sheep' were concerned.

4.23 Since 'milch animals' are the most important type of livestock, we present in the table below only the average number of 'milch animals' purchased per household reporting purchase.

Table 4.8 : Average number of 'Milch Animals' purchased per Reporting Household

Land-related Classes (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Landless	1.4	1.5	1.6
2. Marginal	1.2	1.3	1.4
3. Small	1.4	1.5	1.6
4. Medium and Large	1.8	1.7	2.0
5. All Classes	1.5	1.5	1.8

4.24 The average number was higher for Non-SC/ST than SC/ST; it was higher, in fact, for Non-SC/ST in each land-related class.

Among the landholding classes we come across the usual trend, viz., that the average number rose as the size-class of landholding increased. We see, however, that the average for the landless households was comparatively higher than that for the 'marginal' category households and was on par with that for the 'small' category households.

4.25 We now consider government assistance (which, in most cases, was in the form of subsidy) for the purchase of livestock. The table that follows gives percentage of households (to those reporting purchase of the relevant^{type}/of livestock) who received subsidy from the government for purchase.

Table 4.9 : Percentage of Reporting Households which received Government Subsidy for Purchase of Livestock

Livestock Category (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1 Milch Animals	1.61	5.20	2.19
2 Goats and Sheep	0.99	0.25	0.50
3 Poultry	0.72	1.20	1.90
4 One or more of Livestock Species	1.05	3.02	1.62

4.26 Evidently, an extremely small proportion of purchasing households belonging to each social group received government subsidy for the purchase of the different types of livestock. This is best seen by figures against row 4, showing percentage of households (to all livestock-purchasing households) which received subsidy from government. ST had the highest percentage of 3.02, followed by Non-SC/ST with 1.62 per cent and then SC with 1.05 per cent. It is worth-noting, however, that in each social group the highest proportion was in the case of 'milch animals'.

Subsidy for the Purchase of Cross-bred Cows and Other Schemes

4.27 There are government schemes of subsidy for (a) the

purchase of cross-bred cows, (b) raising cross-bred calves and (c) purchase of chickens. Information on these types of assistance was sought in the questionnaire. The table below gives percentage of households (to those having cross-bred cows) who received government subsidy for purchase of cross-bred cows.

Table 4.10 : Percentage of Households (having Cross-bred Cows) who received Government Subsidy for purchase of Cross-bred Cows

Land-related Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Landless	75.00	90.00	34.48
2. Marginal	60.00	50.00	50.00
3. Small	27.27	40.00	22.22
4. Medium & Large	0.0	66.67	22.76
5. All Classes	48.84	79.07	25.38

4.28 The table shows that around 4/5th of ST households having cross-bred cows received government subsidy for purchase as against nearly half in the case of ^{the} corresponding SC households and about 1/4th for the relevant Non-SC/ST households. Then again, among SC/ST the landless households benefitted more than the landholding households. Even among Non-SC/ST the marginal category of households followed by those belonging to the landless category were the major beneficiaries. It may, however, be noted that among households reporting ownership of milch animals in every land-related class within a social group, a negligibly small percentage of households reported that they possessed cross-bred cows. Thus only 1.37 per cent of such SC households, 1.69 per cent of their ST counterparts and 1.32 per cent of the relevant Non-SC/ST households stated that they had cross-bred cows (Table 4.4). The percentages for the land-related classes belonging to all social groups possessing cross-bred cows, ranged between 0.60 per cent to 1.50 per cent, with the only exception of landless ST households, the proportion

in whose case was somewhat higher at 4.31 per cent. This means that, though the proportion of cross-bred-cows-owning households who received government subsidy for the purchase of cross-bred cows was significantly large, the scheme of assistance in fact benefitted an insignificantly small proportion of landholding households reporting milch animals in our survey.

4.29 We have also made a reference above to government schemes of subsidy for raising cross-bred calves and for the purchase of chickens. The table below gives proportion of households who received government subsidy for raising cross-bred calves to households who reported having cross-bred cows.

Table 4.11 : Percentage of Households receiving Government Subsidy for raising Cross-bred Calves to Households possessing Cross-bred Cows.

Land-related Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1 Landless	20.00	0.0	3.45
2 Marginal	0.0	0.0	0.0
3 Small	0.0	0.0	0.0
4 Medium and Large	0.0	16.67	5.52
5 All Classes	9.30	2.33	3.46

4.30 All percentages of beneficiary households were on the low side. All the same SC households were relatively better-off than ST or Non-SC/ST. Among SC one-fifth of the relevant landless households benefitted from government subsidy scheme.

4.31 Let us now turn to the government scheme of subsidy for the purchase of chickens. The table below gives percentage of households who reported having received government subsidy for the purchase of chickens, to households who purchased poultry in the five years preceding the survey.

Table 4.12 : Percentage of Households who reported having received Government Subsidy for the purchase of Chickens, to Households who purchased Poultry

Land-related Classes (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1 Landless	0.53	0.0	0.43
2 Marginal	1.15	0.0	0.33
3 Small	0.0	0.0	0.16
4 Medium and Large	0.0	0.0	0.41
5 All Classes	0.43	0.0	0.32

4.32 The clear impression one gets is that an insignificantly small proportion of poultry-purchasing households received government subsidy for the purchase of chickens. This was true of all the three social groups as also of land-related classes within each social group.

Goats Received from Government

4.33 In Annexure IV-A there is a reference to government scheme of supply of goats. Accordingly we tried to find out the number of households which received goats under this scheme. As per our tabulated data none of the goat-possessing SC or ST households reported having received assistance under the scheme. The percentage of beneficiary households among Non-SC/ST was insignificantly small at 0.05.

Veterinary Treatment

4.34 One important aspect of animal husbandry relates to the veterinary treatment which sick livestock belonging to a household may be getting. We tried to obtain information on whether households ordinarily arranged for veterinary treatment to livestock with them falling sick. The percentage of households reporting arrangement of veterinary treatment to livestock falling sick, to households possessing one or more species of livestock, is given in the following table.

Table 4.13 : Percentage of Households reporting arrangement of Veterinary Treatment to Livestock falling Sick, to Households possessing one or more species of Livestock

Land-related Classes (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1 Landless	40.11	38.77	43.24
2 Marginal	49.40	39.62	54.67
3 Small	47.40	37.85	56.61
4 Medium and Large	50.49	48.59	64.02
5 All Classes	44.23	40.93	56.92

4.35 Nearly 57 per cent of Non-SC/ST households reported that they ordinarily arranged for veterinary treatment of livestock with them falling sick. The corresponding percentages for SC and ST respectively were about 44 and 41 per cent. Two conclusions follow. Firstly, in each social group a fairly large proportion of households, - nearly 43 per cent among Non-SC/ST, 55 per cent among SC and 59 per cent among ST - did not, probably could not, arrange for veterinary treatment to sick livestock. These households administered customary treatment or no treatment at all. This is not a happy state of affairs. Secondly, among the social groups, Non-SC/ST had a percentage of those arranging for veterinary treatment significantly higher than those for SC and ST.

4.36 As between the land-related classes the 'medium and large category households had the highest proportion in each social group and the landless, more or less, the lowest proportion. Interestingly, the percentage was not very different for the landless belonging to all the three social groups. On the other hand, the percentage for each landholding category households belonging to Non-SC/ST was much higher than for the corresponding category households among SC/ST. Thus here also we find that Non-SC/ST were relatively better-placed and the

'medium and large' category households among them were particularly so placed.

4.37 It may be interesting to review the position in respect of arrangement for veterinary treatment regionwise. The table below gives regionwise data on percentage of households who reported that arrangement was made for veterinary treatment to their livestock fallen sick, to households who possessed one or more species of livestock.

Table 4.14 : Percentage of Households who reported that arrangement was made for Veterinary Treatment to Livestock fallen sick (Regionwise).

Region (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
Konkan	28.03	1.61	27.48
Western Maharashtra	40.12	39.18	58.80
Marathwada	58.78	75.92	72.01
Vidarbha	38.06	40.31	49.32
Maharashtra	44.23	40.93	56.92

4.38 The interesting thing to note is that the proportion for every social group was higher in Marathwada districts than those in the other three district-groups. This may be the result as much of a relatively greater resort to veterinary treatment to sick livestock by the Marathwada farmers as of a relatively greater provision of veterinary service in Marathwada. What is more, in the Marathwada region, a higher percentage of livestock-owning ST households reported that arrangement was made for veterinary treatment to livestock fallen sick, than was the case with SC or Non-SC/ST. Thus in these two respects Marathwada marked a contrast with the rest of Maharashtra.

Free Inoculation

4.39 In our questionnaire we asked a household to state whether during the preceding five years free inoculation to its

animals/poultry was made available by the government. Data on percentage of (i) households (to total households owning one or more of the animal categories mentioned) reporting that free inoculation was given to their animals and (ii) households (to total households owning poultry) reporting that free inoculation was given to their poultry, are presented in the table that follows.

Table 4.15: Percentage of Households Reporting Free Inoculation by Government to their Animals/Poultry.

Land-related Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
(A) <u>ANIMALS</u>			
1 Landless	28.55	26.53	26.54
2 Marginal	34.37	27.34	43.37
3 Small	27.75	27.50	39.75
4 Medium & Large	31.64	26.61	43.03
5 All Classes	29.50	26.90	39.19
(B) <u>POULTRY</u>			
1 Landless	18.46	17.76	30.18
2 Marginal	24.25	30.29	41.41
3 Small	30.26	18.68	39.78
4 Medium and Large	20.21	21.79	49.43
5 All Classes	21.90	20.10	40.72

4.40 In respect of free inoculation by government both to animals (portion 'A' of the table) and to poultry (portion 'B' of the table), the percentage of Non-SC/ST households giving an affirmative answer was much higher than those in the case of SC/ST. About 39 per cent of Non-SC/ST households stated that their animals received inoculation free of charge, the corresponding percentage for SC and ST being around 30 and 27 respectively. In the case of the free inoculation to poultry the relevant percentages were : Non-SC/ST (41), SC (22)

and ST (20). Non-SC/ST seem to have benefitted to a larger extent than SC/ST. Then again, in each landholding class, Non-SC/ST percentage was much higher than those for SC/ST, whether it is inoculation free of charge to animals or to poultry. As for the landless, the relative advantage for Non-SC/ST held in respect of the scheme of free inoculation to the poultry. On the other hand, the percentage of households which reported having benefitted from the scheme pertaining to their animals, was, more or less, the same for the landless households belonging to all the three social groups. Finally, there appears to be no particular correspondence between the size-class of landholding and the extent of benefit received, as evidenced by the percentage of beneficiary households.

Sale of Milk

4.41 Besides the assistance programmes of government in the field of animal husbandry mentioned thus far, there is another kind of facility provided by the government or by co-operative organisation which the government encourages. This is the facility for the purchase of milk/eggs which the rural households wish to sell.

4.42 Let us consider the sale of milk, to begin with. We have data on (a) the number of households which sold milk and (b) the number of households from among those mentioned at (a) which sold milk to (i) co-operative milk producers' society and (ii) government milk centre. The following table gives percentage of households (to those possessing milch animals) which reported sale of milk.

Table 4.16 : Percentage of Households Reporting Sale of Milk

Land-related Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1 Landless	39.63	39.80	36.58
2 Marginal	44.50	42.49	49.40
3 Small	30.01	37.48	40.48
4 Medium and Large	31.59	36.77	39.05
5 All Classes	36.26	38.27	40.00

4.43 A significantly large proportion of households possessing 'milch animals' reported that they sold milk. The proportion for Non-SC/ST (40 per cent) was somewhat higher than that for SC (36 per cent) and for ST (38 per cent). This was also true of the comparison between Non-SC/ST and SC/ST belonging to each of the three landholding classes. SC/ST landless households had a somewhat higher percentage than that for their counterparts among Non-SC/ST. Interestingly, it was the marginal category households which had the highest proportion among the land-related classes in each social group.

4.44 In our questionnaire we had identified five different sale outlets : (i) selling to buyers in the village on one's own, (ii) selling to buyers in nearby towns on one's own, (iii) private trader, (iv) co-operative milk producers' society and (v) government milk centre. In our tabulated data, however, we confined ourselves to the last two outlets. In the table (4.17) below we give percentage of households (to those reporting sale of milk) which sold milk (a) only to co-operative milk producers' society, (b) only at government milk centre and (c) both to the co-operative milk producers' society and at government milk centre.

4.45 It is seen that the fourth column under every social group (5th under SC, 9th under ST and 13th under Non-SC/ST) gives a sumtotal of proportions against every row. This sumtotal measures the aggregate percentage of households which sold milk to the co-operative organisation and/or at the government milk centre. These two outlets are, in fact, public agencies, whereas the other three outlets mentioned above (private-trader etc.) are of a non-public nature. The sumtotal of proportions in the fourth column under every social group thus gives, by implication, also the percentage of households which sold milk through non-public agencies.

Table 4.17 : Percentage of Households Selling Milk to Coop.-Milk Producers' Society and at Government Milk Centre

Land-related Class	SC				ST				Non-SC/ST			
	Only C.S.	Only Govt.	Both C.S. and Govt.	(2)+(3)+(4)	Only C.S.	Only Govt.	Both C.S. and Govt.	(6)+(7)+(8)	Only C.S.	Only Govt.	Both C.S. and Govt.	(10)+(11)+(12)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
1 Landless	24.86	3.36	0.75	28.97	25.63	7.58	1.08	34.29	27.32	3.40	1.24	31.96
2 Marginal	45.88	3.53	0.0	49.41	25.61	1.22	1.22	28.05	46.16	5.24	0.85	52.25
3 Small	24.55	10.45	1.82	36.82	11.29	0.65	0.65	12.59	38.22	4.04	1.89	44.15
4 Medium & Large	15.09	8.49	0.47	24.05	8.91	1.98	1.65	12.54	29.62	5.19	1.21	36.02
5 All Classes	26.12	5.72	0.79	32.63	15.84	3.09	1.13	20.06	33.54	4.64	1.37	39.55

C.S. : Co-operative Milk Producers' Society.

4.46 We may conclude that more than half of the households sold milk either on their own or to private traders. This is true for all the three social groups. We find that nearly 33 per cent of SC households, 20 per cent of ST households and 40 per cent of Non-SC/ST households sold milk to public agencies. In other words, though more than half of SC/ST or Non-SC/ST households had to turn to non-public outlets for sale of their milk, SC/ST households had to depend on these outlets to a larger extent than Non-SC/ST. We also find that in each landholding size-class ('marginal'/'small'/'medium and large') a larger proportion of SC/ST households had to sell milk through the non-public outlets, than Non-SC/ST households. Then again, in each social group the dependence on public agencies among the landholding households declined (i.e. the dependence on non-public agencies increased) as the size-class of landholding increased.

4.47 As between the two public agencies mentioned, the co-operative milk producers' organisation was evidently a far more important outlet for the sale of milk than the government milk centre. (First two columns under every social group). Here again, the percentage of Non-SC/ST households selling milk to the co-operative organisation (33.54) was higher than that for SC (26.12) or ST (15.84). Furthermore, in each social group the dependence on the co-operative organisation among the land-holding households declined as the size-class of landholding increased.

Sale of Eggs of Hens

4.48 We shall now consider the sale of eggs of hens by the respondent-households. The following table shows the percentage of households (to total households reporting ownership of poultry) who stated that they sold eggs.

Table 4.18 : Percentage of Households Selling Eggs

Land-related Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1 Landless	38.35	28.97	28.75
2 Marginal	38.32	36.00	29.29
3 Small	28.95	24.79	36.65
4 Medium and Large	31.16	13.08	44.48
5 All Classes	35.54	24.93	36.14

4.49 The percentage of egg-selling households was, more or less, the same for SC and Non-SC/ST households (viz., a little more than 1/3rd) and this proportion was much higher than the one for ST (viz. nearly 1/4th). Thus ST households lagged much behind those of SC and Non-SC/ST in the case of sale of eggs, unlike in the case of sale of milk. Another conclusion following from the table is that in the case of Non-SC/ST, the 'medium and large' and the 'small' categories of landholders had relatively higher percentage than the landless and the 'marginal' categories. In fact, 44.48 per cent of the 'medium and large' category Non-SC/ST households reported sale of eggs. The position in the case of SC/ST was different. Here, the percentage was higher for the landless and the 'marginal' category households than that for the 'small' and the 'medium and large' category households.

4.50 As for the selling outlets the questionnaire identified five outlets for the households to choose from : (a) selling to buyers in the village on one's own, (b) selling to buyers in nearby towns on one's own, (c) private trader, (d) co-operative organisation and (e) government centre. It will be seen that (d) and (e) are public agencies and the first three, non-public outlets. In the following table (4.19) we give

percentage of households (to those reporting sale of eggs) which stated that they sold eggs (i) only to the co-operative organisation (ii) only to the government centre and (iii) to both these agencies.

4.51 Table 4.19 shows that a negligibly small percentage of households in all the social groups and in all the land-related classes, sold eggs to the public agencies mentioned. The proportion for SC was 0.74 per cent, for ST, a little higher at 1.30 per cent and for Non-SC/ST, still higher at 3.26 per cent. Most of the SC and Non-SC/ST households which sold to public agencies sold, in fact, to the co-operative organisation. In brief, the bulk of the households belonging to the social groups or to the land-related classes within the social groups, sold eggs either directly to buyers on their own or to private traders. The benefit, if any, due to the existence of an alternative outlet made available by the co-operative organisation or the government, was only marginal.

Table 4.19 : Percentage of Households Selling Eggs to Public Agencies

Land-related Class (1)	SC				ST				Non-SC/ST			
	Only C.O. (2)	Only Govt (3)	Both (4)	(2+3 +4) (5)	Only C.O. (6)	Only Govt. (7)	Both (8)	(6+7 +8) (9)	Only C.O. (10)	Only Govt. (11)	Both (12)	(10+ 11+12) (13)
1 Landless	0.22	0.0	0.0	0.22	0.50	1.01	0.0	1.51	1.33	0.57	0.0	1.90
2 Marginal	1.56	0.0	0.0	1.56	1.59	0.0	0.0	1.59	4.32	0.62	0.31	5.25
3 Small	1.52	0.76	0.0	2.28	0.68	0.68	0.0	1.36	2.27	0.45	0.0	2.72
4 Medium and Large	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.55	1.13	0.09	3.77
5 All Classes	0.62	0.12	0.0	0.74	0.65	0.65	0.0	1.30	2.44	0.75	0.07	3.26

C.O. : Cooperative Organisation.

Annexure IV-A

Statement showing loans and subsidy given to Cultivators by the Government of Maharashtra under various Schemes coming under 'Animal Husbandry'

<u>Item</u>	<u>Rate of Subsidy</u>	<u>Loan (Type/Rate)</u>
1. Supply of Cows	1/3rd of the cost	-
2. Supply of Buffaloes	1/3rd of the cost	-
3. Supply of sheep and goats	(A) 50 per cent of the cost (B) Subsidy at 25 per cent for small holders, 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent for Agricultural Labourers for purchase of unit of 6 sheep and 1 goat, at Rs.200 per she-goat and Rs.125 per sheep.	-
4. Supply of calves	Rs.30 p.m. per female cross-breed calf for 18 months	-
5. Supply of ducks	Rs.15 p.m. per duck	-
6. Establishment of Small Poultry houses (Ratnagiri)	Not exceeding Rs.100 per beneficiary	-
7. Loans for Poultry Development	-	50 per cent
8. Training of ladies for maintaining poultry	Stipend of Rs.25 per per head	-
9. Construction of and repairs to cement flooring to the cow sheds	50 per cent	-
10. Setting up of small poultry houses with capacity not exceeding 25 birds	Not exceeding Rs.100 per beneficiary	-
11. Construction of cattle sheds by co-operative societies	Rs.1000 per society	-
12. Community cattle sheds	Subsidy to the extent of Rs.150 per beneficiary	-
13. Animal Husbandry	25 per cent for small farmers and 33.3 per cent subsidy for marginal farmers & agricultural labourers	Medium term loan: a) Supply of cows b) Bulls c) Sheep d) Poultry

Source: Performance Budget, 1980-81, Agriculture and Co-operation Department (Agriculture), Part II, Pp. 782-784 and p. 796.

Annexure IV-BLivestock : Assistance Programmes on which Questions were set

Item	Assistance Programme	Item No. Under Block 4 of the Questionnaire
(1)	(2)	(3)
1. Purchase of Livestock during the preceding five years	a) Government Subsidy b) Loan from Co-operative Society	1 (Columns 6 and 7)
2. Cross-bred Cows	Government Subsidy for purchase	3 (1)
3. Cross-bred calves	Government Subsidy for raising cross-bred calves	3 (2)
4. Chickens	Government Subsidy for Purchase	3 (3)
5. Milk: Sale	(a) Co-operative Milk Producers' Society (b) Government Milk Centre	5
6. Eggs: Sale	(a) Cooperative Society (b) Government Centre	6
7. Inoculation	Given free by Government : (a) Animals (b) Poultry	9 10

CHAPTER V

WAGE - LABOUR

Introduction

5.1 The most important programme of the State Government affecting directly the wage workers in rural Maharashtra is the Employment Guarantee Scheme (EGS). In this chapter information relating to the extent of participation of households in different social groups in EGS works and related matters is presented. As a general background to this, the participation of households in the different social groups in wage work in rural Maharashtra, is reported. At a later stage we also analyse the survey data on the perception of the households on the trend of employment and wage-income in the farm-sector during the five years preceding the survey.

Households Reporting Wage-Labour

5.2 The following table gives percentage of households (to total households) which reported some information on wage-labour being performed by their members.

Table 5.1 : Percentage of Households with One or More Members Performing Wage-Labour

Land-related class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1 Landless	92.80	93.27	84.45
2 Marginal	68.51	73.74	52.25
3 Small	64.40	60.90	41.03
4 Medium and Large	36.04	31.98	18.40
5 All Classes	79.18	74.54	47.65

5.3 We find that the proportion of households with one or more members doing wage-labour was between 75 to 79 per cent among SC/ST, whereas among Non-SC/ST it was much lower at around 48 per cent. In fact, in every landholding class, the percentage

of Non-SC/ST households with one or more members doing wage-labour, was significantly lower than the corresponding proportions among SC/ST. All this also tallies with the findings in the data presented in table 2.7 (P. 46 above) on the percentage distribution of the gainfully employed in the surveyed households into the three types of main occupations viz., cultivation, wage-labour and non-agriculture. In that table we found that the percentage of wage-labourers to the gainfully employed, was significantly lower among Non-SC/ST than among SC/ST. The conclusion also held for the wage-labourers in each landholding class belonging to Non-SC/ST vis-a-vis those in each landholding class within SC/ST. There is another interesting correspondence between the data in the two tables, 2.7 and 5.1. In table 2.7 we found that whereas the percentage of wage-labourers to the gainfully employed was higher among the 'marginal' category ST households than among the 'marginal' category households belonging to SC, the opposite was the case in respect of the 'small' and the 'medium and large' category households belonging respectively to the two groups. We get a similar picture in table 5.1, this time with reference to percentage of total households among SC and ST with one or more members performing wage-labour.

5.4 Interestingly, even among the landless households, the proportion of Non-SC/ST households with one or more members performing labour in the rural sector was lower at 84.45 per cent than the proportion for SC and ST of 92.80 and 93.27 per cent respectively. This was evidently due to the fact brought out by table 2.7 (P. 46 above) that the gainfully employed of the landless Non-SC/ST households enjoyed relatively more opportunities of employment in the non-agricultural sector than the gainfully employed belonging to the landless SC/ST households. Thus 16 per cent of gainfully employed in the landless Non-SC/ST households reported that their main occupation

was non-agriculture as against 9.71 per cent and 8.72 per cent of the gainfully employed belonging respectively to the landless SC and ST households.

5.5 Another finding from table 5.1 is that in each social group, the percentage of households with one or more members performing wage-labour was the highest in the landless category and it went on declining as the size-class of landholding increased. This is as one would expect. Clearly the 'medium and large' landholding households with a larger amount of land at their disposal would depend relatively less on wage-labour for getting income than the 'small' category households, and it would continue this way down the line. In sum, the need for household members to put in wage-labour is governed primarily by their landholding status. SC/ST had a larger percentage of households with members doing wage-labour than Non-SC/ST because the landholding status of the former was, by and large, inferior to that of the latter.

5.6 We have tabulated data on the average number of wage-labourers per household for households reporting some wage-labour by members. The following table presents this data.

Table 5.2: Average Number of Wage-Labourers Per Reporting Household

Land-related Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1 Landless	2.5	2.4	2.1
2 Marginal	2.4	2.4	2.0
3 Small	2.7	2.7	2.2
4 Medium and Large	2.7	2.5	2.0
5 All Classes	2.5	2.5	2.1

5.7 This table brings out that the average number of wage-labourers was less among Non-SC/ST households than among SC/ST households. This relative position of Non-SC/ST vis-a-vis

SC/ST was also to be found in each land-related class. Interestingly, in every social group the average number of wage-labourers was not very different for the various land-related classes, including the landless.

Saldars

5.8 'Saldars' are contract-labourers on an annual basis working in the rural sector. The following table gives the average number of saldars per household for households reporting wage-labour by members.

Table 5.3 : Average Number of Saldars Per Household for Households Reporting Wage-Labour by Members

Land-related Class	SC	ST	Non-SC/ST
1. Landless	0.1	0.1	0.2
2. Marginal	0.2	0.2	0.2
3. Small	0.1	0.2	0.2
4. Medium & Large	0.1	0.3	0.3
5. All Classes	0.1	0.2	0.2

5.9 Considering that the average number of wage-labourers per household for those reporting some wage-labour by members was 2.5, 2.5 and 2.1 respectively for SC, ST and Non-SC/ST, the average number of saldars per reporting household was extremely small for all the three social groups. But then one does not expect too many saldars among wage workers.

5.10 The saldars were asked to state whether they could or could not leave the job of the employer. There could be various possible reasons why a saldar cannot leave his job. Saldars often borrow from their employers. If the loan remains to be repaid the borrower would not be able to leave his job. Or again, a saldar may not leave the job for fear of the employer not approving of the saldar's action. Furthermore, a saldar may be dissuaded from leaving his job if he does not perceive

any possibility of getting work anywhere else. There is one more possibility also. A saldar may prefer to work with the present employer, and hence would not like to leave him. The percentage of saldars who stated that they could not leave the job (to total number of saldars) is given in the following table:

Table 5.4 : Percentage of Saldars Who Could Not Leave Job

Land-related class	SC	ST	Non-SC/ST
1. Landless	41.08	39.92	39.55
2. Marginal	20.91	45.71	40.81
3. Small	40.94	28.74	38.51
4. Medium & Large	39.68	35.64	42.17
5. All Classes	38.73	36.80	39.94

5.11 It is seen that a sizeable proportion of saldars in each social group—ranging from about 37 to 40 per cent — informed that they could not leave the job. The data does not suggest that the difficulty in leaving job was peculiar to any particular social group or to any specific land-related class. We may, however, find out if there were any inter-regional differences.

5.12 The following table gives regionwise data on percentage of saldars who stated that they could not leave the job, to total number of saldars.

Table 5.5 : Percentage of Saldars Who Could Not Leave Job (Regionwise data)

Region	SC	ST	Non-SC/ST
1. Konkan	35.00	5.15	78.05
2. Western Maharashtra	13.62	14.29	13.37
3. Marathwada	26.27	38.10	33.04
4. Vidarbha	71.00	64.19	57.82
5. Maharashtra	38.73	36.80	39.94

5.13 If the inability of a saldar to leave his job is regarded as indicative of a 'fetter' on his choice and the Maharashtra percentage for any social group is interpreted as the average strength of this 'fetter', then we can conclude as follows from the data in table 5.5 :

- (i) The Vidarbha percentage for each social group was much higher than the corresponding percentage in Maharashtra. This means that the 'fetter' on choice of saldars belonging to each social group in Vidarbha was much stronger than was the case for the corresponding group in the State as a whole.
- (ii) A similar conclusion applied in the case of saldars belonging to Non-SC/ST in Konkan.
- (iii) The proportions for all social groups in Western Maharashtra were significantly lower. The saldars in this region were thus relatively better-placed.

Employment Guarantee Scheme

5.14 An important part of the effort by the Government of Maharashtra to assist those who enter the market for wage-labour in the rural sector, is the scheme of giving guarantee of employment to wage-labourers. This is known as the 'Employment Guarantee Scheme' (EGS). It may be useful to find out how many among rural wage-workers (agricultural or otherwise) turn to EGS for work. The following table gives percentage of persons working on EGS to persons who are wage-workers, agricultural or otherwise.

Table 5.6 : Percentage of Persons working on EGS to Persons who are wage-workers, agricultural or otherwise.

Land-related Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
Landless	9.30	12.81	9.28
Marginal	16.02	15.12	13.68
Small	11.89	19.09	10.62
Medium and Large	11.39	27.90	10.07
All Classes	10.36	15.28	10.12

5.15 It will be noted that SC and Non-SC/ST proportions (10.36 and 10.12 per cent respectively) were more or less on par and that these were quite lower than the proportion for S.T. (15.28 per cent). The proportion for every land-related class belonging to ST was mostly higher than the corresponding proportions for SC and Non-SC/ST. It appears that ST wage-workers availed of the opportunity provided by EGS to a greater extent than SC or Non-SC/ST. Probably ST wage-workers were also in greater need of EGS. Interestingly, in every social group the percentage for the landless was the lowest among land-related classes though they were likely to have been in greater need of EGS.

5.16 We may now consider the average number of persons working on EGS, per household (reporting any wage-labourer). The table that follows provides the requisite information.

Table 5.7 : Average Number of Persons Working on the EGS, per Reporting Household

Land-related class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Landless	0.2	0.3	0.2
2. Marginal	0.4	0.4	0.3
3. Small	0.3	0.5	0.2
4. Medium and Large	0.3	0.7	0.2
5. All Classes	0.3	0.4	0.2

5.17 The average per household was very low for all the social groups and for all the land-related classes within the social groups, considering that the average number of wage-labourers per household was 2.5 each for SC and ST, and 2.1 for Non-SC (See table 5.2 above). All the same, relatively speaking, the average in table 5.7 was the highest for ST, followed by that for SC and then, that for Non-SC/ST. This tallies with the findings of table 5.6. It seems that ST and also SC depended more on the EGS than Non-SC/ST. Then again, among the SC/ST, it appears

that the wage-labourers from the land-holding households availed of the EGS relatively more than those from the landless households.

5.18 It may be worthwhile finding out the inter-regional differences in this respect. The relevant data are presented in the table below.

Table 5.8: Average Number of Persons Working on EGS, per Household Reporting any Wage-Labourer (Regionwise Data).

Region (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
Konkan	0.0	1.5	0.1
Western Maharashtra	0.7	0.6	0.5
Marathwada	0.2	0.0	0.2
Vidarbha	0.1	0.1	0.1
Maharashtra	0.3	0.4	0.2

5.19 One conclusion that emerges from this table is that the average was the highest, more or less, for every social group in Western Maharashtra than in any other region. This probably indicates that more EGS works were available in Western Maharashtra than elsewhere. Then again, in Western Maharashtra the average was the highest for SC, followed by that for ST and then Non-SC/ST.

5.20 In the questionnaire we tried to find out the number of days in a year that a person working on the EGS could get work. The days reported by the EGS workers were totalled up, converted into months, and from these were deduced the average man-months per person working on the EGS. The data are presented in the table that follows . (5.9)

5.21 One thing that stands out in this table is that the EGS provided work only for a limited period to persons from the surveyed households who worked on the EGS. Then again, the

Table 5.9 : Average Man-months Per Person on EGS

Land-related class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Landless	1.2	1.4	1.5
2. Marginal	1.0	1.6	2.0
3. Small	1.7	1.7	1.9
4. Medium & Large	1.8	1.2	2.2
5. All Classes	1.5	1.5	1.7

average for Non-SC/ST at 1.7 man-months was higher than that for SC/ST, viz., 1.5 man-months. This was also true of every land-related class belonging respectively to Non-SC/ST and SC/ST. This means that though the average number of persons (per reporting household) working on the EGS was less for Non-SC/ST (table 5.7), these persons could get work on the EGS for a relatively longer period on an average. Furthermore, it seems that, broadly speaking, the average man-months per person on EGS were more for the landholding households in a social group than for the landless households. Thus tables 5.7 and 5.9 bring out that, as compared to the landless households, the landholding households had more persons per household working on the EGS and these persons could get work for a relatively longer period, on an average.

5.22 We may now consider the inter-regional differences in respect of average man-months per person on EGS. The table below provides the necessary information based on the survey.

Table 5.10 : Average Man-months per Person on EGS (Regionwise)

Region (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
Konkan	1.0	1.4	5.9
Western Maharashtra	0.8	1.2	1.0
Marathwada	2.3	1.3	2.3
Vidarbha	2.5	2.4	2.4
Maharashtra	1.5	1.5	1.7

5.23 The table brings out that the average man-months per person on EGS were rather on the high side in Vidarbha in the case of each social group. The same was true in relation to SC and Non-SC/ST in Marathwada. Surprisingly, the average man-months were quite low in the case of Western Maharashtra. The average at 5.9 man-months for Non-SC/ST in Konkan was rather too high. The reason appears to be that the number of persons in the survey working on EGS among Non-SC/ST in Konkan was insignificantly small, yielding a high average of man-months even for a moderate total of months on EGS works. This finding may, therefore, not be representative of the situation in Konkan.

5.24 We may now summarise the findings in tables 5.6 to 5.10 relating to EGS in rural Maharashtra. These are as follows :

(i) About 15 per cent of wage-workers among ST reported that they worked on EGS. The proportion was lower at about 10 per cent for SC and Non-SC/ST. Among the land-related classes in each social group the percentage was the lowest for the landless.

(ii) The average number of persons working on EGS, per household report any wage-labour, was on the low side for all social groups. All the same, even here the participation by ST as evidenced by its average, was greater than that by SC or Non-SC/ST. Among SC/ST the wage-labourers belonging to landholding households availed of the EGS relatively more than those from the landless households. We also noted that there were considerable inter-regional differences in respect of the average number of persons working on EGS per reporting household. The average was the highest, more or less, for every social group in Western Maharashtra.

(iii) The data on average man-months per person on EGS brings out that though the average number of persons (per reporting household) working on EGS was less for Non-SC/ST, these persons could get work on EGS for a relatively longer period on an

average. Furthermore, the average man-months per person on EGS were, broadly speaking, more for landholding households in a social group than for the landless households. Besides we also found considerable inter-regional differences in respect of average man-months per person on EGS. Those working on EGS in the Vidarbha and Marathwada regions could get work for a longer period than those in Western Maharashtra and Konkan. Thus Western Maharashtra which had the highest average number of persons working on EGS per reporting household had the lowest average man-months per person on EGS.

Difficulties in Getting Work on EGS

5.25 In our questionnaire we also asked respondent-households to state whether they experienced difficulties in getting work on EGS. The data on percentage of households who replied in the affirmative, to total households with one or more members doing wage-labour, is given in the following table :

Table 5.11 : Percentage of Reporting Households experiencing Difficulties in getting Work on the EGS

Land-related Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Landless	35.13	30.72	32.02
2. Marginal	40.15	33.25	37.51
3. Small	39.76	43.39	38.69
4. Medium and Large	32.80	44.86	29.45
5. All Classes	36.08	34.27	33.77

5.26 It is seen that a little more than one-third of the households (with one or more members doing wage-labour) in each social group, stated that they experienced difficulties in getting work under the EGS. The proportions, broadly speaking, were higher for the landholding households in each social group than for the landless households.

5.27 The table which follows gives regionwise data on percentage of households experiencing difficulties in getting work on the EGS, to total households with one or more members doing wage-labour.

Table 5.12 : Percentage of Reporting Households experiencing Difficulties in getting Working EGS (Regionwise Data)

Region (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
Konkan	55.24	85.90	47.51
Western Maharashtra	19.47	20.83	20.50
Marathwada	57.38	59.43	57.13
Vidarbha	28.92	30.18	27.69
Maharashtra	36.08	34.27	33.77

5.28 Broadly speaking, it was in Konkan and in Marathwada that a fairly high percentage of households (with one or more members doing wage-labour) experienced difficulties in getting work on EGS. This was true for every social group in the two regions. The situation in Vidarbha for every social group was much better. So was the case in Western Maharashtra which had the lowest percentage of households in each social group experiencing difficulties in getting work on EGS.

5.29 We also tried to find out the types of difficulties faced by the concerned households, i.e. those that reported that they faced difficulties. We identified three specific types of difficulties, with a residuary category of 'any other'. The three specific difficulties mentioned were : (1) We do not get the necessary information from the government officials, in spite of enquiries made, (2) The EGS works are not found near the village, (3) Acceptance of work under the EGS will not be liked by the landlord. The households were to choose from among these alternatives, or state a difficulty, not listed here, under the residuary category.

5.30 Our data reveal that the bulk of the concerned households cited difficulty (1), i.e. lack of co-operation from government officials and difficulty (2) i.e. inconvenient location of the EGS works. The data on percentage of the concerned households in each social group which mentioned difficulty, (1) or difficulty (2) is given in the table below:

Table 5.13 : Percentage of Households Reporting Difficulties Citing One or the Other Difficulty in Getting Work on the EGS.

Social Group (1)	Lack of Cooperation by Government officials (2)	Inconvenient loca- tion of EGS works (3)
1. SC	55.17	40.03
2. ST	53.29	36.32
3. Non-SC/ST	45.64	45.39

5.31 We see that a much larger percentage of reporting households belonging to SC/ST, cited difficulty (1); i.e. difficulty in getting the necessary information from the government officials, relatively to those households that mentioned difficulty (2), i.e. the EGS works are not found near the village. On the other hand, in the case of Non-SC/ST households, the percentage of reporting households mentioning one or the other difficulty was, more or less, the same.

Days of Wage-Labour in Agriculture

5.32 The questionnaire required the respondent-households to state whether, during the preceding five years, the number of days for which household members could get wage-labour in the farm-sector, increased, decreased or remained constant. The data on percentage of households (to those reporting wage-labour by members) who gave one or the other reply as regards the change in the number of days of wage-labour in the farm-sector, is presented in the table 5.14 below (P. 167).

5.33 The percentages given in the table are to households reporting wage-labour by members and the three categories listed exhaust all possible trends in employment to wage-labour in agriculture. This means that the sum total of proportions (shown under col.5 for SC, Col.9 for ST and Col. 13 for Non-SC/ST) should be 100. In fact the sum total is 83 per cent for SC, 81 per cent for ST and 82 per cent for Non-SC/ST. This means that the responses of some of the concerned households were not available for tabulation. This probably was an investigational lapse. However, the bulk of the households in question did respond to the query. We shall, therefore, make observations on the basis of available responses.

5.34 In each social group, a somewhat higher percentage of the concerned households reported that the number of days of agricultural labour decreased during the preceding five years. All the same, nearly 24 per cent of SC households, about 20 per cent of ST households and around 23 per cent of Non-SC/ST households stated that the number of days of agricultural labour for their members, increased. These are, more or less, comparable proportions. The benefit from increase in the number of days of work has gone to the three social groups almost to the same extent. Similarly, about 25 per cent of SC households, around 26 per cent of ST households and nearly 28 per cent of Non-SC/ST households reported that the number of days of work neither increased nor decreased. These are also comparable percentages. Thus the impact of change in the amount of work in the agricultural sector on the three social groups, was more or less the same.

5.35 In the case of SC, ST and Non-SC/ST households belonging to each land-related class, the percentage of households reporting decrease in the number of days of work, was somewhat higher, than the proportion reporting an increase/stability in the number of days of work. Then again, the conclusion as regards the increase or stability in the number of days of work in the

Table 5.14 : Percentage of Households Reporting that the Number of Days of Wage Labour Increased/Decreased/Remained Constant

Land-related Class	SC				ST				Non-SC/ST			
	Increased	Decreased	Remained constant	(2+3+4)	Increased	Decreased	Remained constant	(6+7+8)	Increased	Decreased	Remained constant	10+11+12
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
1. Landless	23.15	34.01	24.72	86.88	21.29	34.97	24.62	80.88	21.31	30.00	29.81	81.12
2. Marginal	25.37	35.82	24.18	85.37	15.04	34.83	31.13	81.00	27.60	30.65	26.02	84.27
3. Small	25.28	37.60	25.36	88.24	15.88	39.15	28.21	83.24	25.52	35.28	24.25	85.05
4. Medium & Large	21.64	41.91	23.23	86.78	19.46	29.73	22.16	71.35	19.57	31.11	25.64	76.32
5. All Classes	23.56	35.08	24.69	83.33	19.70	35.39	25.59	80.68	22.69	31.40	27.61	81.70

case of land-related classes was also, more or less, the same as the one in the preceding paragraph, except that the percentages of ST households, belonging to the 'marginal' and 'small' categories which reported an increase in the number of days of work were on the low side relatively to the percentages for their respective counterparts among SC and Non-SC/ST.

Income from Agricultural Labour

5.36 Finally, we tried to find out from the concerned households whether their income from wage-labour in the agricultural sector increased, decreased or remained constant. The data on percentage of households (to those reporting wage-labour by members of the households) stating that this income increased/^{is} decreased/ remained constant/ presented in the table 5.15 below.

5.37 It is evident from the figures in the table that not all of the households reporting wage-labour by members, responded to the query about the change in income from agricultural labour (See figures under columns 5, 9 and 13). All the same, around 4/5th of the households have responded. We shall base our analysis on these responses.

5.38 It is seen that in the three social groups 32 to 36 per cent of the concerned households stated that the income in question diminished. This means that in the case of a significantly large percentage of households belonging to SC, ST and Non-SC/ST, the income either increased or remained stable. The trend of the change in income was, more or less, the same for the three groups. By and large, the same conclusion holds in the case of each land-related class within the three groups.

**Table 5.15 : Percentage of Households Stating that Income from
Agricultural Labour Increased/Decreased/Remained Constant**

Land-related Class	SC				ST				Non-SC/ST			
	Incre- ased	Decre- ased	Rema- ined con- stant	(2+3+4)	Incre- ased	Decre- ased	Rema- ined con- stant	(6+7+8)	Incre- ased	Decre- ased	Rema- ined con- stant	(10+ 11+ 12)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
1. Landless	24.13	33.18	22.17	79.48	22.05	34.03	20.65	76.83	23.16	30.39	23.29	76.84
2. Marginal	33.43	31.49	18.96	83.88	22.16	39.84	20.84	82.84	34.84	29.12	19.27	83.30
3. Small	27.04	38.40	19.92	85.36	24.26	44.38	15.78	84.42	27.19	37.38	20.26	84.43
4. Medium & Large	18.91	41.23	22.55	82.69	20.54	29.19	21.35	71.08	20.75	37.72	17.82	76.29
5. All Classes	25.01	34.22	21.61	80.84	22.44	36.06	19.79	78.29	24.98	32.14	21.47	78.59

Chapter VI

Welfare Programmes

Introduction

6.1 It was stated in Chapter I that though the study was designed initially to bring out the impact of the agricultural development programmes — including, to be sure, programmes of assistance in the allied field of 'animal husbandry' and also the programmes designed to assist rural wage-labour — on Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes sections in Maharashtra, it was felt that since a survey covering over 50000 rural households spread over 25 districts was to be undertaken, it may be worthwhile to use this opportunity to find how far have some of the welfare programmes of the Government benefitted SC/ST relatively to Non-SC/ST. The welfare programmes considered were the programmes of assistance relating to education, house construction, drinking water supply, electricity supply, and medical assistance. We shall consider these one by one.

Education

6.2 The assistance schemes intended to benefit particularly SC and ST sections of population in the state, which include, inter alia, schemes relating to education as well, are under the control of the Department of Social Welfare of the Government of Maharashtra. This department is concerned with programmes for the weaker sections in the state, including, among others, the Backward Classes (B.C.) such as Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, Denotified Tribes and Namadic Tribes.

6.3 An important part of the assistance of an educational nature provided principally to B.C. students by the Department of Social Welfare, consists of the provision of hostel facilities to these students. The bulk of the total expenditure incurred for providing these facilities, is borne directly by the government either through the department concerned or in the form of grants to Zilla Parishads. The admissions to

these hostels are to be strictly on the basis of merit. A minor part of expenditure takes the form of grant-in-aid by the government to B.C. hostels run by voluntary agencies to enable them to meet expenditure on the various facilities provided to the inmates. The benefits from government expenditure on this account to the students residing in the hostels are in the form of free food and accommodation during their stay in hostels and certain additional amenities provided to them such as furniture, bedding and linen, utensils, textbooks, stationery articles, school uniforms, bus passes, medical facilities and so on.¹ It is important to note that 20 per cent of the seats in these hostels are reserved for the economically backward class (E.B.C.) students, who would include students from the Non-SC/ST group. This is done with a view to effecting integration among students belonging to the different social groups.² There are also government hostels for B.C. and E.B.C. girls. Every such hostel has a sanctioned strength of 80 inmates. Of these seats, half are for meritorious girls belonging to B.C. group and the remaining half for meritorious girls categorised as E.B.C.³

6.4 There is also a scheme of book banks, under which about 25 percent of the total students are supplied textbooks free of charge, which are to be returned by the students at the end of the year. This scheme is now being operated in all the standards upto the secondary stage. "It is observed that the enrolment and attendance of pupils belonging to Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, Vimukta Jatis, Nomadic Tribes in primary schools and especially of girl students amongst them is very low and far from satisfactory. Moreover, drop-outs from these

1. Performance Budget, 1983-84, Social Welfare, Cultural Affairs, Sports and Tourism Department (Social Welfare), Government of Maharashtra — this publication is to be referred to hereinafter as 'Performance Budget, 1983-84' —, p.16 and Pp. 64-65.
 2. Ibid, Pp. 64-65.
 3. Ibid, P.77.

communities are comparatively larger with the result that the enrolment in the secondary stage of education is comparatively low. It is, therefore, necessary to take all possible steps for increasing the enrolment of pupils belonging to Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, Vimukta Jatis, Nomadic Tribes in primary schools and assisting these children in continuing and completing at least their primary education. Towards this end, a scheme of supply of two sets of uniforms per year per pupil belonging to these communities studying in standards I and II has been formulated and is being implemented from 1978-79. Writing material such as slates, pencils, exercise books etc. is also supplied free of charge to these pupils at a cost upto Rs.10 per pupil per annum⁴. Furthermore, there is a Zilla Parishad scheme, supported by grants from the State Government, under which milk and eatables are provided free of charge to students of Balwadis. It is worth-noting that the students of Balwadis are drawn from both B.C. and non-B.C. sections.

6.5 Certain aspects of the educational concessions given by the Government of Maharashtra may now be noted. In the first place, several of these concessions are available to students residing in government hostels or to those in government-aided hostels which are being run by voluntary agencies. Evidently, the capacity of these hostels being limited, all those students who may have to stay in other types of hostels during their years of study are not eligible to get these concessions. Secondly, all the inmates of government hostels do not come from SC/ST sections. Some Non-SC/ST students also are provided with free accommodation and therefore with concomitant benefits in these hostels, in the interest of social integration. Finally, there

4. Government of Maharashtra, Planning Department : Sixth Five-Year Plan, 1980-85, Annual Plan, 1981-82, p.171, paras 12 and 13. (This publication will be referred to hereinafter as 'Sixth Five-Year Plan, 1980-85').

are schemes of assistance even to students who do not reside in hostels. Illustrations are provided by the book-bank scheme, the scheme for the supply of uniforms and writing material and the provision of milk and eatables.

6.6 We may now turn to the findings of our survey. As a backdrop, we may go over briefly the information thrown up by the survey on the percentage of households (to total households in a group) in which adults and/or minors were being educated. The table below gives the requisite information.

Table 6.1: Percentage of Households (to total households in a group) in which Adults and/or Minors were being educated

Land-related Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Landless	37.48	28.45	38.39
2. Marginal	53.17	38.52	55.86
3. Small	49.00	39.40	51.47
4. Medium and Large	52.87	47.19	55.06
5. All Classes	42.68	34.71	49.13

6.7 Slightly less than half of the Non-SC/ST households surveyed had adults and/or minors who were being educated. The corresponding proportions for SC (43 per cent) and ST (35 per cent) were much lower. Thus the households belonging to ST were worse-off than SC households, who, in turn, were worse-off than Non-SC/ST households. Then again, in each social group the landholding households were better-placed than the landless households.

6.8 Clearly the benefit from the provision by government of assistance (mentioned above) to students free of charge, was relevant only in the case of households which figure in Table 6.1, viz., those in which adults and/or minors were being educated. We have listed two types of assistance: (i) hostel facilities with free food and accommodation and (ii) accompanying amenities in the form of supply of certain materials and

services needed by students. As stated above, some of these materials/services are provided to day-students as well. To begin with, we shall consider assistance (ii) above.

6.9 In the questionnaire we asked the respondent-households to state whether the following materials were supplied by the government during the preceding year free of cost to students in the households: (i) slates and pencils, (ii) exercise books, (iii) books, (iv) uniforms, and (v) eatables, in the morning or in the afternoon. In the table that follows we give information on the percentage of households (to total surveyed, in which adults and/or minors were being educated), who reported that at least one of the materials mentioned above was received free of charge by students in the households.

Table 6.2 : Percentage of Households who Received at least one of the Materials Free of Charge for its School-going Members

Land-related Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Landless	17.61	18.84	10.97
2. Marginal	24.81	34.85	12.27
3. Small	18.72	31.55	11.01
4. Medium & Large	13.66	18.13	7.68
5. All Classes	18.10	23.29	9.88

6.10 The proportion of the beneficiary Non-SC/ST households (10 percent) was much less than that of the corresponding SC (18 per cent) and ST households (23 per cent). The same relative position held within a land-related class belonging to the three respective groups. Furthermore, it may be noted that ST households were better-placed in this respect than even those belonging to SC. This is one area of assistance in which SC/ST fared better than Non-SC/ST, with ST being better-off than SC.

6.11. Turning to the land-related classes within every social group we find that roughly one-third of the 'marginal' as well as 'small' category ST households received the benefit under review. The corresponding percentages in the case of SC 'marginal' and 'small' category households were around 25 and 19 respectively, and for the relevant Non-SC/ST households, just 12 and 11 respectively. In sum, the 'marginal' category households in each social group benefitted the most, followed by the 'small' category households. Interestingly, in each social group, the percentage of beneficiary households within the 'medium and large' category was the lowest — in fact, lower than that even for the landless households.

6.12 We shall now present in the table below the percentage of households (to households with adults and/or minors being educated) who received free of charge from the government slates and pencils/exercise books/books/uniforms/breakfast or lunch, during the preceding year.

Table 6.3: Percentage of Households Receiving Slates & Pencils/Exercise Books/Books/Uniforms/Breakfast or Lunch, Free of Charge

Land-related Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
<u>(A) SLATES & PENCILS</u>			
1. Landless	7.10	10.01	4.36
2. Marginal	10.19	22.22	4.02
3. Small	7.68	21.04	4.03
4. Medium & Large	6.68	11.54	2.70
5. All Classes	7.52	14.21	3.60
<u>(B) EXERCISE BOOKS</u>			
1. Landless	7.06	7.10	3.75
2. Marginal	6.73	16.16	1.37
3. Small	7.99	19.97	2.32
4. Medium & Large	5.59	11.36	2.41
5. All Classes	7.01	12.12	2.59

(contd.)

	(C) <u>BOOKS</u>		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1. Landless	13.17	12.83	8.27
2. Marginal	20.38	23.74	7.48
3. Small	14.20	24.70	6.59
4. Medium & Large	10.56	14.65	5.17
5. All Classes	13.83	17.21	6.55
	(D) <u>UNIFORM</u>		
1. Landless	4.40	4.19	1.47
2. Marginal	6.73	10.61	2.14
3. Small	5.05	15.40	1.01
4. Medium & Large	3.73	9.34	0.44
5. All Classes	4.70	8.76	1.02
	(E) <u>BREAKFAST OR LUNCH</u>		
1. Landless	2.14	2.18	1.23
2. Marginal	1.73	8.59	2.44
3. Small	2.42	9.45	2.20
4. Medium & Large	1.55	8.06	1.69
5. All Classes	2.07	5.88	1.80

6.13 If we go over the different portions of the table we find that ST households benefitted the most in the case of each of the materials cited. The percentage of beneficiary SC household was lower and that of the concerned Non-SC/ST households, the lowest in each portion of the table. In fact, in portions (A) to (D) of the table the percentage in the case of Non-SC/ST was significantly lower than the percentages for SC/ST. In portion (E) of the table ('breakfast or lunch'), the proportion relating to ST was the highest, those for SC and Non-SC/ST being, more or less, on par.

6.14 In each social group, the largest proportion of households obtained books free of charge, among the different amenities

cited. For example 13.83 percent of SC households, 17.21 percent of ST households and 6.55 percent of Non-SC/ST households, obtained this material free of cost, and in each social group this percentage was indeed the highest among all those pertaining to the different materials available free of charge. The materials next in importance from the point of view of the percentage of beneficiary households, were 'slates and pencils' and 'exercise books' in that order. The proportion of beneficiary households in every social group in respect of the remaining two materials ('uniform' and 'breakfast or lunch') was much lower.

6.15 Among ST households those belonging to the 'small' and 'marginal' categories benefitted the most from each scheme. This was, more or less, true of SC households as well. The same cannot be said, however, about the 'marginal' and 'small' category Non-SC/ST households.

6.16 Apart from the materials supplied freely, there is also one further assistance provided by the government to selected students from SC, ST and Non-SC/ST households, which has been mentioned above. This is in the nature of hostel facilities provided. If we take all the students in surveyed households who stayed in hostels - government, government-aided or purely private - during their years of studies, there must have been some students whose expenses were fully covered by government assistance, some whose expenses were partially covered and some who had to bear all expenses themselves.

6.17 In the questionnaire we had asked households with boys/girls staying in hostels as students to state the extent to which they had to bear hostel expenses. The three alternatives from which they were required to select were : (1) All expenses borne by the households, (2) Part of the expenses so borne, (3) None of the expenses so borne. It will be seen

that all the households who responded to this query one way or the other had their wards staying in hostels. The percentage of such households with wards staying in hostels to total households in which adults and/or minors were being educated, is given in the following table.

Table 6.4: Percentage of Households with Wards staying in Hostels, to Total Households in which Adults and/or Minors were being educated

Land-related Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Landless	8.49	5.10	7.60
2. Marginal	5.96	12.12	3.87
3. Small	9.78	19.36	8.23
4. Medium and Large	13.35	18.13	11.52
5. All Classes	9.15	12.24	8.85

6.18 It is seen that around 10 percent of the concerned households among each of the three social groups (SC, ST and Non-SC/ST) had wards staying in hostels. It may be noted, however, that ST had a somewhat higher percentage than either SC or Non-SC/ST. Furthermore, in each social group the households belonging to 'small' and 'medium and large' landholding categories had higher percentages of households with wards staying in hostels than those belonging to either 'marginal' or landless categories. Finally, in each landholding category ST proportion was significantly higher than that for SC or Non-SC/ST.

6.19 Let us now turn to classification of households (with wards staying in hostels) from the point of view of the portion of hostel expenses borne by them. In the following table we give information on the percentage of households (to total households with wards staying in hostels) who reported that they had to bear none of the expenses/a part of the expenses/all the expenses.

Table 6.5: Percentage of Households who had to bear None of the Hostel Expenses/Part of these Expenses/All of these Expenses, to Households with Wards staying in hostels

Portion of Hostel Expenses borne (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. None of the Expenses borne	33.49	40.52	3.19
2. Part of the Expenses	35.14	33.66	36.40
3. All the Expenses	31.37	25.82	60.41

6.20 It is seen that about 41 percent of the concerned ST households did not have to bear any of the hostel expenses. Nearly one-third of the relevant SC households came under this category. The corresponding proportion for Non-SC/ST was minuscule at about 3 percent. Then again, nearly 26 percent of the concerned ST households, about 31 percent of the relevant SC households and around 60 percent of the corresponding Non-SC/ST households, had to bear all the hostel expenses. In other words, about 75 percent of ST households with wards staying in hostels, benefitted from either full or partial relief in respect of hostel expenses. The corresponding proportion for SC was about 70 percent and for Non-SC/ST, much lower at around 40 percent. In sum, SC/ST benefitted much more from this scheme of assistance than Non-SC/ST. On the whole, in the field of education ST households were the principal beneficiaries of governmental schemes of assistance, followed closely by households belonging to SC. The benefit to Non-SC/ST households was much less.

Housing

6.21 There are several governmental schemes of housing which are intended to benefit the rural population. One of these "envisages construction of pucca houses for those persons in rural areas who are having houses with thatched roofs and who have been living in such houses at least for the (preceding)

five years. Priority is given to Vimukta Jatis and Nomadic Tribes. Under the scheme, assistance is given from Government in the form of building material and labour charges....Assistance is also given from village community etc. in the form of locally available material... This scheme is implemented through Zilla Parishad"⁵ Under another scheme the government provides free to the landless and houseless rural labourers suitable house sites measuring 100 square yards each and also constructs huts for them.⁶ Besides, there is a Local Sector scheme within the jurisdiction of a Zilla Parishad for providing financial assistance for house construction to SC/ST households holding less than one acre of land. A concerned household gets from the Zilla Parishad Rs. 750/- by way of grant and it is to provide Rs. 250/- from its own resources, either in the form of cash or kind or in the form of manual labour performed. The total experience on account of a house would be Rs. 1000/-. It may be mentioned that even some Non-SC/ST households belonging to E.B.C. are eligible to get the same concessions under this scheme.⁷ Then again, the government encourages backward class persons to construct their own houses on co-operative basis by giving them financial assistance in the form of loan and subsidy to cover the cost of purchase of private land and construction of house. This financial assistance is available only to co-operative housing societies with 10 percent non-B.C. members, who also are entitled to get the same concessions. Similarly, B.C. persons joining co-operative housing societies with non-B.C. persons are also entitled to financial assistance. The loan is interest-free, and the ratio of loan to subsidy is fixed by the government. The ceiling cost to be met from

5 Sixth Five-Year Plan, 1980-85, p.218, para 9.

6 Ibid : p.219, paras 11,12 and 13.

7. Performance Budget, 1983-84, p.187, Column 18.

government assistant under this scheme is fixed. What is more, a beneficiary is required to meet a portion of the cost through personal contribution.⁸

6.22 In our questionnaire there were questions seeking to find out whether respondent-households received land from the government for house-construction and whether the government constructed houses on these lands. An attempt was also made to elicit information on financial assistance for house construction from the government. Since the scheme of giving land for house-construction and setting up huts on these lands was intended for rural labourers we try to find out the percentage of households from among those with one or more members performing wage-labour, who stated that they received land from government for house-construction. The table that follows gives the necessary data.

Table 6.6 : Percentage of Households receiving Land from Government for House Construction, to total Households with one or more members performing Wage-labour

Land-related Classes (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Landless	16.40	17.32	14.03
2. Marginal	10.45	9.50	8.06
3. Small	14.00	20.41	8.98
4. Medium & Large	17.54	38.65	12.84
5. All Classes	15.65	18.82	12.11

6.23 It is seen that SC/ST had a larger proportion of households getting land from government for house construction than Non-SC/ST. Only 12 percent of the concerned Non-SC/ST households reported that they received such land against 16 percent in the case of SC and 19 percent for ST. The households belong-

8. Performance Budget, 1983-84, p.210.

ing to ST benefitted the most.

6.24 As for the land-related classes, we observe as follows:

(i) In each land-related class SC/ST households benefitted more than their Non-SC/ST counterparts, (ii) The respective proportions for SC and ST landless households were, more or less, the same. The same was true also in the case of the 'marginal' category households belonging to SC and ST. This suggests that the same extent of benefit accrued to households belonging to the concerned land-related class within the two social groups mentioned. But ST households belonging to the 'small'/'medium and large' categories had higher proportions than their respective counterparts among SC. (iii) In each social group the 'marginal' category households seem to have benefitted the least. The percentages for the landless and the 'medium and large' category households within SC were, more or less, the same and these were somewhat higher than that for the 'small' category SC households. The same conclusion applied, by and large, in the case of Non-SC/ST section. Among ST, however, the largest percentage pertained to the 'medium and large' category households followed by those respectively for the 'small' and the landless households in that order.

6.25 We now consider benefit in the form of construction of houses by government. The following table gives percentage of households (to those with one or more members performing wage-labour) who reported that government constructed houses for them

Table 6.7: Percentage of Households reporting that Government Constructed Houses for them, the Households with one or more members performing Wage-labour

Land-related Classes (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Landless	11.47	11.85	10.70
2. Marginal	3.88	3.96	0.93
3. Small	8.96	6.61	2.28
4. Medium & Large	8.88	4.32	5.16
5. All Classes	10.38	9.78	7.05

6.26 In this table we find as follows :

(i) Households belonging to SC/ST (nearly 10 percent) benefitted more than those within Non-SC/ST (about 7 percent),

(ii) In each land-related class households belonging to SC/ST were, more or less, better-placed than their counterparts among Non-SC/ST,

(iii) In each social group the landless households benefitted more than the landholding households,

(iv) A comparison between table 6.6 and table 6.7 suggests that not all the households who received land from the government for house construction, had houses constructed for them by the government.

6.27 Let us now turn to households who reported receipt of financial assistance from government for house-construction. The data drawn from the survey giving percentage of such beneficiary-households to total households surveyed, are presented in the table that follows :

Table 6.8: Percentage of Households Receiving Government Financial Assistance for House Construction, to Total Households

Land-related Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Landless	3.52	5.85	3.31
2. Marginal	5.42	3.31	1.19
3. Small	3.19	2.88	1.35
4. Medium & Large	2.79	0.95	1.09
5. All Classes	3.55	4.20	1.84

6.28 A relatively small percentage of households in each social group/land-related class reported receipt of financial assistance from government for house-construction. All the same the percentages pertaining to SC/ST were higher than that for Non-SC/ST. This applied, more or less, in the case of each

land-related class within SC/ST on the one hand and Non-SC/ST on the other.

Drinking Water Supply

6.29 The supply of pure drinking water to rural areas was to be ensured as a part of the Minimum Needs Programme in the Sixth Five-Year Plan (1980-85) of the Government of Maharashtra.⁹

There was also a scheme of improvement of Harijan Bastis, under which, inter alia, the work of providing essential facilities like tap water, drinking water in Harijan localities, was to be carried out.¹⁰

6.30 We tried to elicit from the surveyed households information on the distance at which the source of drinking water supply available was located. In the tabulated data we classified distances mentioned into three types : (i) Source in the village, (ii) Source at a distance of 1 to 3 miles and (iii) Source at a distance of more than 3 miles. The following table gives information on percentage of households (to total households) who mentioned one or the other distance specified (Table 6.9).

6.31 The three distance-classes mentioned in table 6.9 are mutually exclusive and together must cover all the surveyed households, each of which must be having some source of drinking water. This means that the sum-total of percentages pertaining to the households belonging to any social group/land-related class, mentioning one or the other of the three alternatives, should add up to 100. Unfortunately, this is not so in the case of table 6.9. Let us take by way illustration the sumtotal of percentages for, say, SC households (Row 5, cols.2+5+8). The sumtotal comes to 88.29. This means

9. Sixth Five-Year Plan, 1980-85, Pp.209-210.

10. Ibid, p-229, para 31.

Table 6.9 : Percentage of Households Getting Drinking Water in the Village/
at a Distance of 1 to 3 miles/at a Distance of More Than 3 miles

Land-related Class (1)	In the Village			1 to 3 Miles			More than 3 Miles		
	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non- SC/ST (4)	SC (5)	ST (6)	Non- SC/ST (7)	SC (8)	ST (9)	Non- SC/ST (10)
1. Landless	85.41	81.80	79.45	3.63	5.93	3.22	0.07	0.60	0.17
2. Marginal	74.44	73.93	77.10	8.90	13.04	7.14	0.51	0.58	0.26
3. Small	83.31	78.02	81.36	3.30	11.11	4.54	0.31	0.66	0.53
4. Medium & Large	86.04	83.23	86.84	3.12	7.87	2.85	0.33	0.00	0.36
5. All Classes	84.12	80.59	82.23	3.99	7.95	3.81	0.18	0.51	0.34

that the responses of about 12 percent of SC households remained to be recorded. A similar conclusion applies in the case of the other social groups or to each land-related class within every social group. This was an investigational lapse. All the same, it is worth-noting that over 4/5th of the households in each social group stated that they obtained water in the village itself. The percentages for the land-related classes belonging to each social group were also, more or less, of the same magnitude, the only exception being those for the 'marginal' category households within each social group. However, even here the proportion was as high as nearly 75 per cent.

6.32 In our survey we made an attempt to elicit information on whether households obtained drinking water from one or more of the seven different sources cited in the questionnaire. The seven sources identified were : (1) Private Well, (2) Public Well, (3) Tank, (4) River, (5) Rivulet (Nala), (6) Government Tube-well and (7) Water tap. To begin with, this information enabled us to classify households obtaining drinking water by the number of sources from which they got water. The following table gives data on the percentage of households (to total households) who reported having obtained drinking water from (i) only one source and (ii) two sources.

Table 6.10 : Percentage of Households Obtaining Water from Only One Source/Two Sources

Land-related classes	SC		ST		Non-SC/ST	
	Only one source	Two sources	Only one source	Two sources	Only one source	Two sources
1. Landless	87.01	12.04	88.79	10.20	86.48	12.35
2. Marginal	88.34	11.15	79.57	20.04	84.07	15.59
3. Small	88.77	10.36	86.85	12.73	87.97	11.56
4. Medium & Large	83.17	16.01	86.86	12.53	86.39	13.06
5. All Classes	87.01	12.11	87.37	11.86	86.61	12.69

6.33 It is seen that about 87 per cent of SC, ST and Non-SC/ST households depended on only one source for drinking water.

Nearly 12 to 13 per cent obtained it from two sources. There was not any marked difference in this respect between the households belonging to even the different land-related classes within the three social groups.

6.34 Let us now consider the different sources of drinking water. The table that follows (6.11) gives percentage of households (to total households) who obtained drinking water from each source mentioned. It is important to note at this stage that among the sources listed in the table, those at No.2(Public Well), No.3(Tank), No.6(Government Tube-well) and No.7 (Water Tap), are the ones in respect of which some public agency (government or the local body) is directly involved in the provision of drinking water to residents.

Table 6.11 : Percentage of Households Obtaining Drinking Water from the Source Mentioned

Land-related Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
<u>I. PRIVATE WELL</u>			
1. Landless	16.01	15.01	20.95
2. Marginal	11.04	20.62	22.33
3. Small	16.54	14.17	27.93
4. Medium & Large	19.87	15.38	33.46
5. All Classes	16.09	15.28	27.14
<u>II. PUBLIC WELL</u>			
1. Landless	65.24	59.95	62.78
2. Marginal	56.65	62.26	52.56
3. Small	62.96	62.88	52.45
4. Medium & Large	64.70	53.50	51.03
5. All Classes	64.00	59.76	55.12

(contd.)

Table 6.11 (contd.)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<u>III. TANK</u>			
1. Landless	0.07	1.04	0.07
2. Marginal	0.31	0.97	0.43
3. Small	0.05	0.24	0.19
4. Medium & Large	0.00	0.17	0.08
5. All Classes	0.08	0.71	0.14
<u>IV RIVER</u>			
1. Landless	8.67	10.90	7.90
2. Marginal	19.73	13.62	14.68
3. Small	7.73	6.49	9.24
4. Medium & Large	8.37	8.56	6.05
5. All Classes	9.46	9.70	8.27
<u>V RIVULET</u>			
1. Landless	0.85	3.83	1.09
2. Marginal	3.07	5.25	1.62
3. Small	2.16	5.83	1.22
4. Medium & Large	1.56	8.38	1.08
5. All Classes	1.36	5.13	1.17
<u>VI GOVERNMENT TUBE WELL</u>			
1. Landless	9.17	5.93	7.32
2. Marginal	5.01	4.28	4.84
3. Small	7.06	6.01	6.16
4. Medium & Large	11.08	7.00	10.05
5. All Classes	8.63	6.00	7.70
<u>VII WATER TAP</u>			
1. Landless	11.08	12.53	11.07
2. Marginal	14.83	12.65	18.80
3. Small	12.98	16.70	13.91
4. Medium & Large	9.61	18.93	10.76
5. All Classes	11.59	14.53	12.45

6.35 The table brings out as follows :

(1) Evidently the most important source of drinking water for all social groups as also for all land-related classes within each, was the public well. About 50 to 65 per cent of households in the different classes depended on this source for the supply of drinking water. All the same, the proportion of SC/ST households using this source was higher than that of Non-SC/ST households. While nearly 55 per cent of Non-SC/ST households mentioned this source, the corresponding proportion was 64 percent for SC and 60 percent for ST.

(2) A comparison between the land-related classes within the three social groups depending on public wells, reveals as follows : (a) The percentage of the landless households getting drinking water from public wells was, more or less, comparable in magnitude for the three social groups, viz. SC (65 percent), SC (60 percent), and Non-SC/ST (63 percent). (b) The percentages for the landholding Non-SC/ST households — ranging between 51 to 53 percent — were much lower than that for the landless Non-SC/ST households. The dependence on public wells of the landless relatively to the landholding households within SC/ST, however, did not present so clear-cut a picture. (c) The proportion for the households belonging to every landholding class within Non-SC/ST was lower than those for its counterparts among SC/ST. In brief, the relatively better-off households among Non-SC/ST had to depend somewhat less on public wells for the supply of drinking water than (i) the landless amongst them and (ii) also the landholding households within SC/ST.

(3) Tank was an absolutely minor source of drinking water to all the three social groups. So was, more or less, rivulet, particularly to SC and Non-SC/ST households. River was not an insignificant source of supply of drinking water. About 8 to 10 percent of households belonging to the three

groups used this source. Within the land-related classes, it was the marginal category households belonging to each social group among whom the highest percentage of households reported that they got supply of drinking water from rivers.

(4) Next to public wells, private wells were a somewhat important source of drinking water to the surveyed households. It is true that the proportion of households in each social group using this source was much less than that in the case of public wells. All the same, the inter-group differences here, somewhat opposite in nature to those pertaining to public wells as a source, are of interest to us. We find that 27.14 per cent of Non-SC/ST households could obtain water from private wells, as against 16.09 per cent of SC and 15.28 per cent of ST households. Non-SC/ST depended relatively more on this source than

SC/ST. Thus though all the social groups had to depend relatively more on public wells than on private wells, the fact that the proportion of households using public wells was more in the case of SC/ST than in the case of Non-SC/ST whereas a larger proportion of Non-SC/ST households had private wells to draw from than SC/ST, indicates the superior economic position of Non-SC/ST, relatively to SC/ST.

(5) Let us now consider the data for the land-related classes. In each land-related class the percentage of Non-SC/ST households using private wells was higher than those of SC/ST. Furthermore, among Non-SC/ST the percentage of households increased with the size-class of landholdings. There was no such clear-cut trend in the case of SC/ST, except that among SC, the percentage increased among the landholding households as the size-class of landholding increased.

(6) We have said above that 'government tube well' and 'water tap' were sources provided for by public agencies. Relatively speaking, the latter was somewhat more important for the surveyed households than the former. If we take each

source separately, the percentage of SC households getting drinking water from government tubewell (8.63) was higher than the corresponding Non-SC/ST percentage (7.70) and ST percentage (6.00). On the other hand the proportion of ST households using water-tap was the highest at 14.53 per cent, followed by that pertaining to Non-SC/ST (12.45) and then that of SC (11.59).

6.36 The respondent-households were asked whether they got drinking water throughout the year. It would be proper to take into account the percentage of households stating that they got drinking water throughout the year, to households whose responses were recorded in table 6.9 above, and not to the total households. The information on the percentages in question is provided in the following table.

Table 6.12 : Percentage of Households Getting Drinking Water All the Year Round

Land-related Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Landless	89.26	86.75	97.66
2. Marginal	85.98	70.44	91.65
3. Small	91.64	76.86	88.56
4. Medium and Large	87.89	88.14	89.37
5. All Classes	89.24	83.53	91.79

6.37 It is true that an overwhelming proportion of the concerned households in each social group stated that water was available all the year round. All the same ST percentage at 84 was significantly below that for SC (89), which was lower than the percentage pertaining to Non-SC/ST (92). Non-SC/ST were thus relatively better-placed in this respect than SC/ST, ST turning out to be the most disadvantaged of the three groups. It is indeed disturbing that about 10 to 15 per cent of SC/ST households and around 8 per cent of Non-SC/ST households did not get drinking water throughout the year.

6.38 In each land-related class the position of Non-SC/ST was, more or less, better than that of SC/ST. Again, the land-related classes belonging to ST were at the maximum disadvantage. It is particularly a matter for concern that among ST about 30 per cent of the 'marginal' category households and roughly 23 per cent of the 'small' category households, reported that they could not get drinking water the whole year round.

Electricity and Gobar Gas

6.39 According to the official statistics of the Government of Maharashtra the total number of towns and villages in the state that were electrified as on 31-3-1982 was 29,139.¹¹ Then again, there were in all 276 towns and 39,354 villages in Maharashtra according to Census of India, 1981.¹² Thus the total number of towns and villages in the state was 39,630. This means that 73.53 percent of towns and villages in Maharashtra were electrified as on 31-3-1982. Allowing for the fact that all the 276 towns were electrified we have 28,863 (i.e. 29,139-276) electrified villages in Maharashtra as on 31-3-1982. These electrified villages as a proportion of the total number of villages (39,354) come to 73.34 percent. In other words, a little less than 3/4th of the villages in Maharashtra State were electrified by the end of 1981-82.

6.40 In our survey we tried to find out how many households in rural areas had electricity in their houses. The percentage of households stating that they had electricity in houses, to total households surveyed is given in the following table.

Table 6.13 : Percentage of Households with Electricity in Houses

Land-related Class	SC	ST	Non-SC/ST	All Social Groups
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. Landless	13.29	9.81	20.95	16.61
2. Marginal	42.33	14.40	31.83	32.09
3. Small	21.33	13.27	28.75	25.71
4. Medium & Large	30.21	23.94	37.37	35.74
5. All Classes	19.24	13.21	29.59	25.39

11. Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay (DESM): Statistical Abstract of (contd.)

6.41 We see from the data in column 5 that only 1/4th of the surveyed households belonging to all the social groups taken together, reported that they had electricity in their houses, though as we saw earlier, a little less than 3/4th of the Maharashtra villages were electrified by the end of 1981-82. This underlines the obvious point that electrification of a village does not mean electrified houses.

6.42 Table 6.13 brings out that in respect of availability of electricity in houses Non-SC/ST households were better-placed than SC/ST. While nearly 30 per cent of Non-SC/ST households had electricity in their houses, this was so in the case of 19 per cent of SC and 13 per cent of ST households surveyed. It is worth-noting, however, that even among Non-SC/ST, about 70 per cent of households were without electricity in their houses. Furthermore, in each social group the landless households were worse-off than any of the landholding category households. If we leave out the rather high percentage (42.33) of 'marginal' category SC households having electricity in their houses, the broad picture that emerges is that among the landholding classes in each social group, the 'medium and large' category households were better-placed than those belonging to the other two landholding categories.

6.43 The programme of encouraging the construction of gober gas plants came to be undertaken since 1973-74. The government gives to rural households a grant of 20 to 50 percent for construction of these plants. Our questionnaire tried to find out how many of the surveyed households had gober gas plants. The percentage of households (to total households) who reported having gober gas plants, is given in the table below.

11 (contd.)

Maharashtra State, 1981-82, Table 9.2, column 10, Pp.215-216.

12 Reproduced in DESM :op.cit., table 1.4, column 3, Pp.50-51 (for towns) and table 1.3, column 3, Pp.48-49 (for villages).

Table 6.14 : Percentage of Households with Gobar Gas Plants

Land-related Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Landless	0.37	0.23	0.32
2. Marginal	1.33	0.19	0.46
3. Small	0.52	0.42	0.70
4. Medium & Large	0.82	1.47	1.31
5. All Classes	0.53	0.47	0.77

6.44 In all the social groups and among all the land-related classes, the percentage of households who reported that they had gobar gas plants was insignificantly small. There is no point in making any further comparison.

6.45 We also enquired of those with gobar gas plants whether they received any government subsidy for the plant. It was found that the percentage of households (to those with gobar gas plants) among the three social groups who received government subsidy was as follows : SC (24.14); ST (38.24) and Non-SC/ST (23.76). There was a larger proportion of beneficiaries among the concerned ST households than among those belonging to SC and Non-SC/ST.

6.46 We also tried to find out from the concerned surveyed households whether their gobar gas plants were functioning well. The following table gives data on the percentage of households (to those with gobar gas plants) who stated that their plants functioned well.

Table 6.15: Percentage of Households Whose Gobar Gas Plants Functioned Well

Land-related Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Landless	52.00	55.56	66.67
2. Marginal	46.15	0.00	43.75
3. Small	70.00	57.14	58.21
4. Medium & Large	50.00	70.59	78.53
5. All Classes	53.45	61.76	70.21

6.47 A sizeable proportion of households in each social group reported that the plants functioned well. All the same the highest proportion was in the case of Non-SC/ST (70.21 per cent), followed by that for ST (61.76 per cent) and then SC (53.45 per cent). Among the land-related classes within ST and within Non-SC/ST, the highest proportion was for the 'medium & large' category households, whereas it was for the 'small' category households among SC. It does not appear that the landless were particularly disadvantaged. We ought to remember, however, that all these proportions related to a small number of households who stated that they had go-bar gas plants (Table 6.14).

Medical Aid and Family Planning

6.48 In respect of medical assistance, we have data on the following three counts: (i) Proportion of households (to total households) reporting illness in the family during the preceding one year. (These will be described as 'reporting' households); (ii) Percentage of households (to 'reporting' households) who visited government dispensary for treatment; and (iii) Percentage of households (to those who visited government dispensary for treatment) who received medicines free of charge.

6.49 Let us consider proportions under (i) above. These are presented in the following table.

Table 6.16 : Percentage of Households Reporting Illness in the Family

Land-related Class (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Landless	66.19	57.86	60.39
2. Marginal	68.71	61.48	62.43
3. Small	66.98	69.37	64.98
4. Medium & Large	64.12	69.58	65.54
5. All Classes	66.33	62.66	63.53

6.50 It is seen that between 63 to 66 per cent of the surveyed households in the three groups reported illness in the family during the preceding one year. The proportions for the three social groups were not quite different from one another. There were no marked differences among the land-related classes either.

6.51 Let us now see what proportion of households from among these, visited government dispensary for treatment. Table 6.17 presents the data.

Table 6.17 : Percentage of Households who Visited Government Dispensary for Treatment, to those reporting illness in the Family

Land-related Classes (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Landless	69.79	62.60	68.90
2. Marginal	70.98	65.82	68.02
3. Small	67.54	58.27	59.93
4. Medium & Large	61.08	63.35	55.19
5. All Classes	68.55	61.85	61.63

6.52 Nearly 60 to 70 percent of the concerned households belonging to the three social groups visited government dispensaries for treatment. The proportion relating to SC (69 percent), however, was higher than the corresponding proportion of nearly 62 percent each pertaining to ST and Non-SC/ST households. It is worth-noting, however, that in each social group over 60 percent of the households in question depended on government dispensary for treatment. Among the land-related classes also a fairly high percentage of households reported having had recourse to the same agency for treatment. It may also be mentioned that the 'small' and 'medium and large' category households within Non-SC/ST and SC had relatively lower percentages than the landless and 'marginal' category households belonging to the respective groups.

6.53 Turning now to medicines received free of charge in government dispensaries, we present in the table that follows percentage of households (to those who visited government dispensaries for treatment) who received medicines free of charge in these dispensaries.

Table 6.18 : Percentage of Households who received Medicines Free of Charge in Government Dispensaries

Land-related Classes (1)	SC (2)	ST (3)	Non-SC/ST (4)
1. Landless	74.77	82.63	77.24
2. Marginal	86.79	86.06	87.47
3. Small	81.66	78.75	79.74
4. Medium & Large	75.89	79.02	68.22
5. All Classes	77.26	81.29	76.13

6.54 The percentage of ST households getting free medicines at 81.29 was higher than the corresponding percentage for SC (77.26) and for Non-SC/ST (76.13) households. The lowest percentage in the table is to be seen in the case of the 'medium and Large' category households belonging to Non-SC/ST. However, even for these households the percentage was as high as 68.22. For all other category of households, the proportion ranged between 75 to 87 percent. The impression one gets is that the bulk of the households who visited government dispensaries for treatment received medicines free of charge.

6.55 We turn finally to the data on adoption of family planning by the surveyed households. The table below gives percentage of households (to total households) with a member having undergone family planning surgery (table 6.19).

6.56 Nearly one third of the households belonging to each social group had a member having undergone family planning surgery. There was thus not much of a difference in this

Table 6.19 : Percentage of Households with a Member Having Undergone Family Planning Surgery

Land-related Class	SC	ST	Non-SC/ST
1. Landless	32.01	29.90	27.98
2. Marginal	41.21	39.11	37.23
3. Small	38.85	37.12	38.18
4. Medium & Large	40.31	38.03	39.18
5. All Classes	34.99	33.53	35.32

respect as between the three social groups. Another conclusion that emerges from the table is that the percentages for the landholding households in each social group were significantly higher than those for the landless households. Among the landholding households the differential in percentages for the three categories was quite small.

Chapter VII

Summary and Findings

Introduction

7.1 The starting-point of the work culminating in this Report was a survey of a little less than 55000 rural households from 219 villages distributed over all the districts of Maharashtra State (except that of Greater Bombay). The survey was undertaken mostly over the period, May 1981 to May 1982. Though the initial focus of this research project was on the extent of benefit from the agricultural development programmes of the State Government to the Scheduled Castes (SC) and Scheduled Tribes (ST) sections in Maharashtra relatively to that to other sections (Non-SC/ST), it was later decided to bring within the purview of this study the relative benefits from certain welfare programmes in the fields of education, house-construction, drinking water supply and so on also, in view of the fact that the survey was going to cover such a massive number of rural households spread all over the State.

7.2 The survey design and the research methodology employed have been explained in Chapter I of this Report. The survey was designed by the Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics, Pune (GIPE) in consultation representatives of seven Universities in the State participating in the research project — their names have been given in Annexure I-A to Chapter I of this Report — and those of the Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Government of Maharashtra (DESM). The representatives of the participating Universities, assisted by college teachers, appointed by them as supervisors, in turn, conducted the actual survey through college students selected for the purpose - two students residing in or nearabout every surveyed village - by administering to the households a questionnaire (Appendix II to this Report), also prepared by the GIPE in consultation with

the representatives of the Universities and the DESM. The idea behind enlisting village-based college students for the survey work was to give to these students a healthy exposure to this type of academic activity. It was also felt that as the student-investigators were resident in or nearabout a surveyed village, two additional advantages would accrue. Evidently, the cost of the survey would be minimised. Secondly, it was not too much to expect that resident-investigators would be able to elicit from the households fairly dependable responses. However, judging by the investigational lapses referred to in the different parts of the Report, one feels that the investigational effort put in was not fully upto expectations. All the same, it must be observed that the data thrown up by the survey seem to yield several meaningful conclusions. These conclusions are being summarised in the pages that follow.

Profiles of Surveyed Households

7.3 The total number of households surveyed in rural Maharashtra was 54833, excluding those among the surveyed which had to be dropped at the stages of scrutiny of schedules and tabulation of data, for reasons set out in Chapter I. Of these 54833 rural households, nearly 20 per cent belonged to Scheduled Castes, 13 percent to Scheduled Tribes and the remaining about 67 percent to Non-SC/ST. The survey percentage relating to ST was almost the same as that in rural Maharashtra according to the Census of Population, 1981. The survey proportion for SC was higher than the Census proportion by 12 percentage points and that for Non-SC/ST, corresponding lower. However, this was not considered undesirable since a wider coverage of SC/ST households was expected to give us a better empirical basis for our conclusions.

7.4 The survey data for these 54833 rural households was classified to yield, as a background material, information on

profiles of households surveyed. The information related to the ownership pattern in respect of land and livestock, possession of assets important for agricultural operations, viz. bullocks and implements, accessibility to important inputs such as fertilisers and credit, availability of gainful employment, demographic characteristics and the incidence of education. The profiles brought out by this information are being presented below.

(A) Land and Related Assets of Households

7.5 The surveyed households were classified according to the size of their operational landholding. These size-classes were : (i) landless; (ii) those cultivating less than 2 acres; (iii) those cultivating 2 acres to less than 6 acres and (iv) those cultivating 6 acres or more. Following roughly the usage at the national level we decided to describe households in size-classes (ii), (iii) and (iv) as "marginal", "small" and "medium and large" landholding households respectively.

7.6 In respect of the relative landholding status of the households within the three social groups, we found that whereas the landless preponderated among SC (62 per cent) and ST (54 per cent) households surveyed, the landholding category formed an overwhelming proportion (70 per cent) among Non-SC/ST. Then again, the 'medium and large' category households formed quite a significant proportion at nearly 34 per cent among Non-SC/ST as against only 11 per cent among SC and 16 per cent among ST. It also appears that Non-SC/ST were the relatively more advantaged group in respect of the extent of irrigation facilities available. While 35 per cent of the landholding Non-SC/ST households had some irrigated land, only 20 per cent of the corresponding SC households and 14 per cent of the relevant ST households reported having any irrigation facility. Then again, among the landholding Non-SC/ST households 4.5 per cent households had irrigated land of 6 acres or more. The corres-

ponding proportions for SC and ST were minuscule at 1.6 and 1.4 percent respectively. It is not surprising then that whereas 53 percent of Non-SC/ST landholding households with some irrigated land had pumps set on their wells, the proportions for the corresponding SC and ST households were much lower at 31 and 33 percent respectively.

7.7 Other assets, beside land, of significance to agriculturist are bullocks and farm implements. About 64 to 65 percent of landholding ST and Non-SC/ST households reported having bullocks; the percentage for the landholding SC households was much lower at 47 per cent. In the case of ownership of at least one farm implement, we arrive at a similar conclusion. The proportions of owning landholding households among ST (68 percent) and Non-SC/ST (66 percent) were way above that for the corresponding SC households (50 percent). Secondly, both in the case of ownership of bullocks and of farm implements we find that the percentage of owning households among cultivators within every social group increased significantly with the increase in the size-class of landholdings. The relative advantage of Non-SC/ST households in respect of the ownership of bullocks and implements is easily explained by the relatively higher landholding status of these households, with nearly one-third of them belonging to the 'medium and large' category landholders. It is worth-noting, however, that among the surveyed households those belonging to ST had a relatively better landholding status than SC households. Nearly 46 percent of the surveyed ST households were landholders as against about 38 percent among the surveyed SC households. Then again, the percentage of 'marginal', 'small' and 'medium and large' category households among SC and ST respectively were as follows : 'marginal' (SC:9 percent; ST : 7 percent); 'small' (SC : 18 percent; ST : 23 percent); and 'medium and large' (SC : 11 percent; ST : 16 percent). With the percentage of households owning bullocks/at least one farm

implement, increasing with the size-class of landholding within each social group, it is not surprising that the proportion of owning households among ST as a whole turned out to be higher than that in the case of SC.

7.8 The upshot of the information presented above is that the overwhelming bulk of SC and ST households belonged to what is described as 'the weaker section' of our rural society. It is necessary to note in this context that the assistance programmes of the government intended for agriculturists, however small, simply could not have reached more than 60 percent of SC and more than 50 percent of ST households in the state who were landless. Non-SC/ST were much less disadvantaged in this respect. A further point also needs to be made here. The programmes of assistance from government, in several cases, covered only a portion of the expenditure required to be incurred by an agriculturist. This means that the beneficiary agriculturist had to bear the remaining portion of the cost himself. Though this is a salutary principle to follow, one necessary consequence of this procedure may be noted. An agriculturist with more resources and, therefore, a greater capacity to bear the portion of the cost payable by him, was in a better position to take advantage of the government schemes of assistance. In the background of the information provided above the relative advantage in this respect to Non-SC/ST households vis-a-vis those belonging to SC/ST is self-evident.

(B) Accessibility to Inputs: Fertilisers and Credit

7.9 One of the important inputs to a cultivator is fertiliser. Our survey data suggests that 51 percent of landholding Non-SC/ST households reported use of fertilisers. The corresponding proportions for SC at 40 percent and ST at 39 percent, were much lower. Then again, the percentage for Non-SC/ST was higher than the SC/ST percentage in every landholding class.

All this suggests that proportionately more Non-SC/ST cultivating households used fertilisers than those among SC/ST, irrespective of the size-class of landholdings.

7.10 Credit is needed both for consumption and production purposes. The amount which a household can borrow and the agencies (public or private) of finance to which it has access, indicate, in some measure, the household's relative economic position.

7.11 In the first place, we found that the bulk of the households in each social group borrowed upto less than Rs. 3000/-. In the case of loans received by surveyed households from the different sources we find that 26 per cent of Non-SC/ST households reported having received credit from one source or more, as against 17 percent of SC and 23 percent of ST households. SC households were the most disadvantaged here. Then again, in each social group the landless were at a relative disadvantage, and the 'medium and large' landholding households were the most advantaged in this respect. Furthermore, it appears that the agencies of institutional finance (comprising cooperative credit institutions, commercial banks and government) were more accessible to Non-SC/ST than to SC/ST households. Thus, whereas 30.76 percent of SC and 26.30 of ST households borrowed only from the agencies of institutional finance, the relevant proportion for Non-SC/ST was 50.87 percent. As opposed to this, 56.27 percent of SC and 52.03 percent of ST households borrowed only from private agencies of finance (including 'relatives & friends', 'money-lenders' and 'landlord') compared to 36.24 per cent in the case of Non-SC/ST households. Besides, superimposed on the fact of relatively greater accessibility of public agencies of finance to Non-SC/ST was the fact that percentage of households borrowing from the public agencies increased significantly with the size-class of landholdings in every social group. Considering that the private agencies are less rule-

bound and more 'exploitative' than the public agencies the information presented in this paragraph brings out the relative advantage enjoyed by Non-SC/ST among the social groups and the comparatively larger landholders among the land-related classes.

(C) Ownership of Livestock

7.12 Livestock ownership data from our survey yield percentage of households within a social group/a land-related class owning the following livestock species : (i) milch animals, (ii) goats and sheep, and (iii) poultry. Nearly 54 percent of Non-SC/ST households reported ownership of milch animals as against 29 percent of SC and 35 percent of ST households. Among the landless households belonging to the three social groups, about the same percentage (around 20 percent) had milch animals. But the landholding Non-SC/ST households had significantly higher percentage owning milch animals than their SC/ST counterparts. As between SC and ST landholding households, ST were better-placed from the point of view of ownership of milch animals. Since Non-SC/ST households had more and better (including irrigated) lands, it is not surprising that a larger percentage of them had milch animals as well. As for ST households, many of them live in or near forests, where grazing on forest/common land is easier, facilitating thereby ownership of milch animal. As for the remaining livestock species (goats and sheep/poultry) the proportion of households owning these was about the same for all three social groups. These are small animals and the cost of upkeep per animal is much less for them than for cow or buffalo. Hence SC/ST were not behind Non-SC/ST in respect of ownership of these livestock species. Indeed among the landless and marginal farmers within SC/ST the percentages of owning households were somewhat larger than in the case of Non-SC/ST.

7.13 The data on average number of livestock per "reporting

household" brings out that the average number of milch animals was higher for Non-SC/ST than for SC/ST. All the same, one basic fact that emerges from the data on average number per "reporting household" is that households within all the social groups had, generally speaking, few heads of any type of livestock. This applies not merely in the case of milch animals which is easier to understand but also of goats & sheep and poultry as well. This emphasises the very inadequacy of resources at the disposal of the rural households as a whole.

(D) Gainful Employment

7.14 The proportion of the gainfully employed was lower among Non-SC/ST (46 percent) than among either SC (55 percent) or ST (58 percent). This is palpably explained partly by smaller degree of adult female gainful employment among Non-SC/ST (36 percent) than among SC (57 percent) and ST (58 percent), and partly by the greater degree of education among minors belonging to Non-SC/ST, resulting in, inter alia, a smaller proportion (viz. 9 percent) of Non-SC/ST minors being gainfully employed relatively to SC minors (14 percent) and ST minors (19 percent). Both these facts bear testimony to the relative advantage enjoyed by Non-SC/ST vis-a-vis SC/ST. Among the land-related classes in every social group, the proportion of the gainfully employed was higher for the landless households than for those holding land. This differential is again seen to reflect the relatively larger degree of gainful employment among adult females and minors belonging to the landless households than among those within landholding households in every social group.

7.15 One more aspect of gainful employment relates to the main source of earnings of a household. Among Non-SC/ST cultivation was the main source whereas among SC/ST it was wage-labour. Thus 55 percent of the gainfully employed Non-SC/ST persons reported cultivation as their main occupation whereas

39 percent of such persons stated wage-labour as the main occupation. On the other hand, the proportions of the gainfully employed among SC/ST mentioning the two main occupations were as follows : SC (20 percent, cultivation and 74 percent, wage labour); ST (33 percent, cultivation and 65 percent, wage labour). It is natural that the main occupation of persons belonging to the landless households within all social groups was wage-labour. The point of interest to note here is that even in the case of such households there was a larger proportion of persons gainfully employed in non-agricultural activity among Non-SC/ST households than among those within SC/ST. The workers belonging to SC/ST had less opportunity to work in the non-agricultural occupations, and this was to their relative disadvantage.

(E) Demographic Profiles

7.16 Our survey brings out that the average size of the rural household (i.e. number of persons per household on an average) was more or less the same among SC and ST in Maharashtra and that this average was somewhat smaller than that for Non-SC/ST in the State. This finding tallied with the relative average size of rural household among the three groups in Maharashtra State as per the data of the Census of Population, 1981. Furthermore, according to our survey data the average size of the rural household in every social group increased with the size-class of landholdings.

7.17 The survey data on education in the households brings into focus some interesting facts. The first point to note is that less than half of the surveyed households in every group had anyone going to school/college. The proportion among Non-SC/ST was 49 percent, while among SC and ST it was 43 percent and 35 percent respectively. This quite a substantial proportion of households in each social group had none going to school/college. All the same, the condition in this respect was worse among SC/ST than among Non-SC/ST households, and

among ST than among SC households. However, there is reason to believe that the differential in respect of education between Non-SC/ST on the one hand and SC/ST on the other is being narrowed, considering the relative incidence of education among the upcoming generation as compared to that among the older generation within the two sets of groups. In every group males fared considerably better than the females. But in the case of the male-female divide as well there is evidence of the gap being narrowed. Finally, the landholding households were better-placed in point of incidence of education than the landless households in every social group and further, among the landholding classes, the 'medium and large' category fared better than the other two landholding categories, again in every social group.

Comparative Assessment of Benefits

7.18 All throughout we attempted to gauge the extent of relative benefit from a scheme to social groups/land-related¹ classes by comparing the percentage of households belonging to a social group/land-related class getting the benefit with similar percentages for the other social groups/land-related classes. Thus, for example, there is a scheme under which the government gives subsidy/loan to cultivators for purchasing farm implements. The information on the percentage of households belonging to social groups/landholding classes who reported having received such subsidy/loan for the purchase of implements during the preceding five years, was used to compare benefits to groups/classes. In some cases we also calculated the average quantity of a certain magnitude (e.g. the average number of persons working on the Employment Guarantee Scheme) per household

1 In the case of schemes, other than those in the agricultural sector, the benefit could accrue to the landless as well as the landholding classes. The landless and the landholding are together described in this Report as the 'land-related classes'. In the case of benefits from agricultural schemes, however, it is the 'landholding classes' which have to be compared as the landless are not eligible for assistance under these schemes.

separately for social groups/land-related classes for comparing benefits to groups/classes.

7.19 There is one more preliminary point to make. The percentage of households or the average per household has to be with reference to a base number of households. In some cases the base number consisted of the total households surveyed in each social group/land-related class. However, where not all the households surveyed reported information on a relevant item, the base number of households consisted of those who reported information. For example, households were asked to give information on sources of supply of seeds and on financial assistance in respect of seeds. Since the list of alternative sources of supply of seeds mentioned in the questionnaire was exhaustive, it was expected that every cultivating household surveyed would have some information to provide. However, there were some households who gave information on neither the sources of supply of seeds nor on financial assistance received. Those that reported information on either or both of these items were set apart as 'reporting households', and these 'reporting households' were taken as the base with reference to which the percentage of households receiving, say, financial assistance from the government in respect of seeds, was arrived at for purposes of comparison between groups/classes. Evidently the same procedure had to be followed when a scheme was open not to all households surveyed but to a selected category among them. This selected category of households then constituted the 'reporting households' and provided the base for calculating percentages/averages in the case of beneficiary households. For example, there was a Government of Maharashtra decision in August 1980 according to which the government agreed to pay to the concerned lending agencies of institutional finance, crop-loan overdues (including interest) since 30.6.1979 of small landholders. Clearly only

the landholding households who received loans from agencies of institutional finance could be considered for benefit under this scheme. These then were the 'reporting households', and then we give for each group/class data on the percentage of beneficiary households under the scheme of writing-off of loan overdues, to the 'reporting households' identified above. Thus when we compare percentages/averages in the analysis below, it must be remembered that these percentages/averages are with reference to the relevant total of households.

7.20 It will be seen that a comparative assessment of benefits to the different social groups/land-related classes may be made from three different angles. There is, firstly, a comparison between the three social groups (as between SC, ST and Non-SC/ST, particularly SC/ST in comparison with Non-SC/ST). Secondly, there can be a comparison across land-related classes within a social group, i.e. between the 'landless', 'marginal', 'small' and 'medium and large' category households, separately within each social group. Finally, we may make a comparison across social groups within a land-related class, i.e. between SC, ST and Non-SC/ST households belonging to each land-related class.

Assistance Schemes in the Agricultural Sector : Relative Benefits

7.21 There have been a myriad schemes of assistance of the Government of Maharashtra intended to benefit the cultivators. For reasons mentioned in Chapter I (para 1.33, p.21) we selected only some of these programmes to elicit information from the surveyed households on the degree of benefit received. The schemes of assistance relating to agriculture on which question were set in our questionnaire, are briefly listed in Annexure III-A to Chapter III (Pp.122-123). In the paragraphs that follow immediately we deal with the flow of benefits from the agricultural assistance scheme selected.

7.22 As we look through the tables in Chapter III (Agriculturists)

we find that there were schemes the benefit from which accrued to a small percentage of households (i.e. between 3 to 7 percent; in a few cases, even less than 3 per cent) belonging to most social groups/landholding classes. Such schemes may be described as those yielding a "small" degree of benefit to the target group. The following schemes of assistance to cultivators resulted in a "small" degree of benefit : tenancy legislation; ceiling legislation; transfer of forest or other land; financial assistance for land improvement; subsidy/loan for capital expenditure on land other than Khar/Khajjan land; levelling/shaping of land by government; financial assistance for purchase of bullocks, and assistance for well-digging and/or for lift irrigation.

7.23 In the case of a few schemes the proportion of beneficiary households within several groups/classes ranged broadly between 10 to 20 percent, though, to be sure, a few landholding classes belonging to social groups had percentages lower than 10. We shall describe benefit in such cases as of a "moderate" degree. Only three schemes in our list could be categorised as the ones with a "moderate" degree of benefit. These were : subsidy/loan for capital expenditure on Khar/Khajjan land; financial assistance (subsidy/loan) from government in respect of fertilisers; and writing-off of loan overdues.

7.24 A large number of schemes from within our list benefitted a fairly high percentage of households within several groups/classes - the percentage being above 20 for a substantial number of groups/classes. These were cases of "large" degree of benefit. The following schemes yielded the benefit of this size : construction of bunds by government; subsidy/loan by government for the purchase of farm implements; financial assistance by government in respect of seeds; supply of fertilizers by government and/or cooperative society; supply of pesticides by government and/or cooperative society; financial assistance

by government in respect of pesticides; regular supply of water from river valley dam; financial assistance from government for pumps set on wells; training camps organised by government for agriculturists; and demonstration farms. Finally, it may not be out of place to mention here that about 30 to 40 percent of households belonging to landholding classes within social groups reported that their income from agriculture increased during the preceding five years.

7.25 Among the first category of schemes, i.e. those with a 'small' degree of benefit, the proportion of beneficiary households was uniformly low (less than 3 percent) in all social groups/landholding classes in the case of the following three schemes: transfer of land under ceiling legislation; subsidy/loan for capital expenditure on land other than Khar/Khajjan land; and levelling/shaping of land by government. No further observations on these schemes are called for.

7.26 The transfer of land under tenancy legislation, the transfer of forest or other land and financial assistance for the improvement of land obtained under the land transfer schemes, were three other schemes under the 'small' benefit category. We may reproduce our observations on the benefits from these three schemes taken together : "... a relatively larger proportion of ST households benefitted under tenancy legislation and under the scheme for gift of forest and other government land. But the percent of 'reporting households' getting financial assistance was the lowest among ST. The opposite was true in the case of SC, with low proportions of beneficiary households under the two land-receipt schemes mentioned above, but relatively higher proportions in respect of receipt of financial assistance. For Non-SC/ST the proportions were quite low on both accounts" (para 3.24, p.69 above).

7.27 This leaves two schemes yielding a 'small' degree of

benefit, viz. financial assistance for the purchase of bullocks and assistance for well-digging and/or for lift irrigation. The data on these two schemes brought forth the two following conclusions, common to both the schemes : (i) the percentage of beneficiary households among Non-SC/ST was higher than that among SC/ST and (ii) in each social group the proportion of beneficiary households increased with the size-class of landholding.

7.28 We may now turn to the schemes with a 'moderate' degree of benefit. As mentioned above, this category comprised only three schemes. In the case of two of these schemes (viz. subsidy/loan for capital expenditure on Khar/Khajjan land and Writing-off of loan overdues), the percentage of beneficiary households was higher among SC/ST than among Non-SC/ST. The benefit from the remaining scheme (viz. financial assistance from government (subsidy/loan) in respect of fertilisers) accrued to more or less the same proportion of households (nearly 10 to 12 percent) within the three social groups. As for benefit to the different landholding classes within each social group, this benefit (indicated by the percentage of households getting the assistance) increased with size-class of landholdings in each group in the case of only one scheme, viz. financial assistance from the government (subsidy/loan) in respect of fertilisers. The benefit in the form of subsidy/loan for capital expenditure on Khar/Khajjan land went largely to the 'small' landholders in each group, followed by the 'medium and large' landholders. The marginal category cultivators did not receive any benefit. As for the third scheme, viz. writing-off of loan overdues, the 'marginal' and the 'small' category households within each group benefitted the most.

7.29 We have mentioned above that the last category of schemes (those with a 'large' degree of benefit) included a large number of schemes from among those selected for study. The benefit from

one of these ('bunds constructed by government) accrued to a sizeable percentage of households within each social group/landholding class only in the Marathwada region. In this region the percentage of beneficiary households among ST (72) was much higher than that among SC or Non-SC/ST (about 55). This relative advantage of ST households held within each landholding class. Furthermore, within SC/ST, the benefit increased with the size-class of landholding, whereas among Non-SC/ST the 'medium and large' category benefitted the most, with the benefit to the 'marginal' and 'small' categories being, more or less, on par.

7.30 In the context of two schemes (viz. the supply of fertilisers by government and/or co-operative society and the supply of pesticides by government and/or cooperative society), we distinguished broadly between two alternative sources of supply. These were: (i) the public sources, i.e. government and/or co-operative society and (ii) the market. We were interested in finding out to what extent the households depended on the public sources. We found that whereas the non-public source (the market) was the more important source in the case of fertilisers, the opposite was true in the case of pesticides. In respect of fertilisers, we additionally concluded as follows: "It is interesting to note that among SC/ST, the proportion of households depending on the public source of supply increased and that of households relying on the non-public source diminished as the size-class of landholdings increased. In other words, the more disadvantaged landholding households belonging to SC/ST had to depend relatively more on the non-public source of supply of fertilisers. The same cannot be said of cultivators from Non-SC/ST" (pp.95-97, para 3.81 above).

7.31 There were two schemes in respect of which we tried to find out the percentage of households receiving subsidy and those receiving loan from the government (a) for the purchase of farm implements and (b) for pumps set on wells. ^{The percentage} of households

receiving subsidy for the purchase of farm implements was the highest among ST in each landholding class, whereas the same was the case for SC among loan-recipients also in each landholding class. Under this scheme (subsidy/loan) the percentage of beneficiary households in each social group was seen to have increased with the size-class of landholdings. As for the second scheme (pumps set on wells) we found that SC had the highest percentage in each landholding class among receivers of subsidy. In respect of loan-assistance, however, Non-SC/ST fared the best in each landholding class.

7.32 That leaves five schemes, viz., financial assistance by government for seeds; financial assistance by government in respect of pesticides; regular supply of water from river valley dam; training camps organised by government for agriculturists; and demonstration farms (in the case of which we tried to find out the percentage of households whose members were taken by the government representatives to such farms). We found that in respect of these scheme ST had the highest percentage of beneficiary households. Non-SC/ST households had the next highest percentage except in the case of the scheme relating to the training camps organised by government for agriculturists. Finally, the proportion of beneficiary households increased with the size-class of landholdings in each social group in respect of the two financial assistance schemes intended for seeds and for pesticides.

Assistance Schemes for Owners of Livestock :
Relative Benefits

7.33 Several schemes of the Government of Maharashtra are intended to benefit owners of livestock. Those among these which were included in our questionnaire administered to the surveyed households are given in Annexure IV-B to Chapter IV (P.152), above. These were as follows : government subsidy for the purchase of livestock; government subsidy for the

purchase of cross-bred cows; government subsidy for raising cross-bred calves; government subsidy for the purchase of chickens; supply of goats by the government; arrangement for veterinary treatment; and free inoculation to animals/poultry. Besides, we also tried to find out the extent to which households selling milk/eggs availed themselves of selling outlets made available by the government and the cooperative organisation.

7.34 We found that the percentage of beneficiary households in every social group/land-related class was insignificantly small in the case of the following schemes: government subsidy for the purchase of livestock; government subsidy for the purchase of chickens; and supply of goats by the government.

Inter-group and/or inter-land-related class comparisons pertaining to benefits from these schemes seem pointless.

7.35 A similar conclusion applies, in fact, to one more scheme of assistance, viz., government subsidy for raising cross-bred calves. It is true that the percentage of households receiving such a subsidy to households possessing cross-bred cows was 9.30 for SC, 3.46 for Non-SC/ST and 2.33 for ST. However, only the landless SC households, the 'medium and large' category households among ST and the landless as well as 'medium and large' category households belonging to Non-SC/ST, reported having obtained the subsidy mentioned. What is more, the percentages mentioned above were to households possessing cross-bred cows, which, in turn, formed a minuscule proportion of households owning milch animals in every social group/land-related class.

7.36 Quite a high percentage of households (from among those possessing cross-bred cows) reported having received subsidy for the purchase of cross-bred cows. The proportion was substantially high at 79 percent for ST as against 49 percent and 25 percent for SC and Non-SC/ST respectively. SC/ST fared much better than Non-SC/ST, with ST percentage being significantly higher than that even for SC. Furthermore, among

SC/ST the landless households benefitted more than the landholding households; and even among Non-SC/ST it was the marginal category households followed by those within the landless category who were the major beneficiaries. However, as pointed out in the preceding paragraph households possessing cross-bred cows formed a minuscule percentage of households with milch animals in every social group/land-related class — the percentages being mostly in the range of 1.00 to 1.50. This means that, though the percentage of cross-bred-cows-owning households who received government subsidy for the purchase of cross-bred cows was significantly large, the scheme of assistance, in fact, reached an insignificantly small percentage of households in our survey who reported having milch animals.

7.37 As for veterinary treatment to livestock falling sick nearly 57 percent of Non-SC/ST households stated that they ordinarily arranged for such treatment. The corresponding proportions for SC and ST were about 44 and 41 percent respectively. Two conclusions follow from this. Firstly, among the social groups, Non-SC/ST had an edge over SC/ST in this respect. However — and this is the second observation to make — a fairly large proportion of households (nearly 43 percent among Non-SC/ST, 56 percent among SC and 59 percent among ST) did not, probably could not, arrange for veterinary treatment for livestock fallen sick. These households administered customary treatment or no treatment at all. This is not a happy state of affairs.

7.38 In respect of free inoculation by government both to animals and poultry, the proportion of the relevant Non-SC/ST households reporting benefit was significantly higher than the corresponding ones for SC/ST households concerned. The percentages were as follows : (a) Animals : Non-SC/ST (39); SC(30); ST (27) and (b) Poultry: Non-SC/ST (41); SC (22); ST (20).

This relative position of Non-SC/ST vis-a-vis SC/ST in respect of the scheme for free inoculation to animals/poultry held in the case of each landholding class within the groups. As for the landless households, Non-SC/ST fared better than SC/ST in the case of the scheme pertaining to poultry. However, the percentage of beneficiary households in respect of the scheme for the animals was, more or less, the same for the landless households belonging to all the three social groups. Finally, there appeared to be no particular correspondence between the size-class of landholdings and the extent of benefit received, as evidenced by the percentage of beneficiary households.

7.39 Coming to the sale of milk by households owning milch animals we find that 40 percent of Non-SC/ST, 33 percent of SC and 20 percent of ST households selling milk availed of the selling outlets provided by public agencies such as Government Milk Centre and Cooperative Milk Producers' Society. However, as between the two public agencies, the co-operative society was far more important than the Government Milk Centre to the milk-selling households. About 34 percent of Non-SC/ST, 26 percent of SC and 16 percent of ST households concerned sold milk only to the Cooperative Milk Producers' Society. Furthermore, it is worth-noting that nearly 60 percent of Non-SC/ST, about 67 percent of SC and 80 percent of ST households selling milk had to depend on non-public selling outlets such as private traders, etc. Finally, it was found that in each social group the dependence on public agencies among the landholding households declined (i.e. the dependence on non-public agencies increased) as the size-class of landholding increased.

7.40 We now turn to sale of eggs by poultry-owning households. It is seen that 3.26 percent of Non-SC/ST, 1.3 percent of ST, and 0.74 percent of SC households selling eggs sold these to the government centre and cooperative organisation. In other words, the sellers of eggs had to turn almost entirely to the

non-public agencies for disposing off the eggs. There seems to be no point, therefore, in making comparisons either between land-related classes within each social group or between social groups within a land-related class.

Wage Labour

7.41 The most important programme of the State Government affecting directly the wage workers in rural Maharashtra is the Employment Guarantee Scheme (EGS). Our findings relating to EGS in rural Maharashtra are as follows :

(i) About 15 percent of wage-workers among ST reported that they worked on EGS. The proportion was lower at about 10 percent for SC and for Non-SC/ST. Among the land-related classes in each social group the percentage was the lowest for the landless.

(ii) The average number of persons working on EGS, per household reporting any wage-labour, was ^{on} the low side for all social groups. All the same, even here the participation by ST as evidenced by its average, was greater than that by SC or Non-SC/ST. Among SC/ST the wage-labourers belonging to landholding households availed of the EGS relatively more than those from the landless households. We also noted that there were considerable inter-regional differences in respect of the average number of persons working on EGS per reporting household. The average was the highest, more or less, for every social group in Western Maharashtra.

(iii) The data on average man-months per person on EGS brings out that though the average number of persons (per reporting household) working on EGS was less for Non-SC/ST, these persons could get work on EGS for a relatively longer period on an average. Furthermore, the average man-months per person on EGS were, broadly speaking, more for the landholding households in a social group than for the landless households.

Besides, we also found considerable inter-regional differences in respect of average man-months per person on EGS. Those working on EGS in the Vidarbha and Marathwada regions could get work for a longer period than those in Western Maharashtra and Konkan. Thus Western Maharashtra which had the highest average number of persons working on EGS per reporting household had the lowest average man-months per person on EGS.

7.42 We also tried to find out whether the respondent-households experienced difficulties in getting work on EGS, and if so, the types of difficulties they faced. Our survey revealed that 36.1 percent of SC, 34.3 percent of ST and 33.8 percent Non-SC/ST households (with one or more members doing wage-labour) stated that they experienced difficulties in getting work under the EGS. The proportions, broadly speaking, were higher for the landholding households in each social group than for the landless households.

7.43 As for the types of difficulties faced by households reporting difficulties, it is seen that a substantial percentage of households mentioned the following two difficulties : (1) The lack of cooperation from government officials and (2) The inconvenient location of the EGS works. A much larger percentage of the reporting households among SC/ST cited difficulty (1) above whereas, in the case of Non-SC/ST households, the percentage of the concerned households mentioning one or the other difficulty was, more or less, the same.

Welfare Programmes

7.44 It has been stated above that though the main focus of the study in this project was the impact of the agricultural development programmes — including, to be sure, the programmes of assistance in the allied field of 'animal husbandry' and also the programmes to assist rural wage-labour — on SC/ST sections in Maharashtra, it was felt that since the survey

was going to cover a massive number of rural households spread all over Maharashtra State, it would be worthwhile to use the opportunity to find out how far have some of the welfare programmes of the government benefitted SC/ST relatively to Non-SC/ST. The welfare programmes considered were the programmes of assistance relating to education, house construction, drinking water supply, electricity supply, and medical assistance. A summary of findings relating to welfare programmes in these fields is given in the following pages.

(A) Education

7.45 It has already been mentioned in para 7.17 above that Non-SC/ST had a higher percentage of households with anyone going to school/college than SC/ST. In this respect SC were better-placed than ST. Furthermore, we also found that in each social group the landholding households had higher percentages than the landless ones.

7.46 The schemes of assistance of an educational nature have included those providing hostel facilities to Backward Class (B.C.) students, with some seats reserved for non-B.C. students categorised as economically backward class (E.B.C.) to promote social integration. Hostel facilities have entailed besides free food and accommodation, also concomitant amenities in the form of supply of text-books, stationery articles, school uniforms and so on. Even day-students are provided assistance in the form of supply of school uniforms, textbooks, writing materials such as slates, pencils, exercise books, etc. Then again, eatables are provided to students of Balwadis, who are drawn from both B.C. and non-B.C. sections.

7.47 Consider first the percentage of households who received at least one of the materials (slates and pencils, exercise books, etc.) free of charge. The proportion of the beneficiary Non-SC/ST households (with adults and/or minors being educated)

which was 10 percent was much less than that of the corresponding SC (18 percent) and ST (23 percent) households. A comparison between households belonging to the three social groups within each land-related class brings out the same finding about relative benefits. Furthermore, it may be noted that in each land-related class ST households were better-placed in this respect than SC households. Then again, in each social group, the percentage of beneficiary households within the 'medium and large' category was the lowest — in fact, lower than that even for the landless households. Finally, even if we consider each of the materials separately we find that the percentage of ST households receiving each material free of cost was higher than that for the relevant SC households, who, in turn, had a higher percentage of beneficiaries amongst them than Non-SC/ST.

7.48 The same picture of relative benefits emerges in respect of hostel facilities to the three sets of households. About 12 percent of ST, 9.2 percent of SC and 8.9 percent of Non-SC/ST households (in which adults and/or minors were being educated), reported that they had wards staying in hostels. Furthermore, in each landholding category ST proportion was the highest followed by those for SC and then Non-SC/ST respectively.

Besides, within each social group, households with larger landholdings ('small' and 'medium and large' categories) reported a higher percentage with wards in hostels than households with smaller or no landholding (viz. 'marginal' and landless categories).

7.49 A comparison between social groups/land-related classes from the point of view of the portion of hostel expenses borne by the households reveals as follows : while 41 percent of ST and 33 percent of SC households concerned did not have to bear any of the hostel expenses, only 3 percent of Non-SC/ST households belonged to this totally exempted category. What is more,

about 75 percent of ST and 70 percent of SC households (with wards staying in hostels) benefitted from either full or partial relief in respect of hostel expenses; the corresponding proportion for Non-SC/ST was much lower at around 40 percent. On the whole, our data brings out that in the field of education ST households were the principal beneficiaries of the governmental schemes of assistance, followed closely by the households belonging to SC. The benefit to Non-SC/ST households was much less.

(B) Housing

7.50 There have been several governmental schemes of housing which are intended to benefit the rural population. These have been designed primarily to ease the housing problem faced by the weaker sections in rural Maharashtra which includes besides the backward classes, persons belonging to the economically backward class as well.

7.51 Under one of the schemes the government has been endeavouring to help the landless and the houseless rural labourers by giving them land for house-construction and also by setting up huts on the land. We find that whereas 12 percent of Non-SC/ST households (with one or more members performing wage-labour) reported having obtained land for house construction, this was true in the case of 16 percent of SC and 19 percent of ST households concerned. Thus, SC/ST seem to have benefitted relatively more than Non-SC/ST from this scheme. Then again, in each land-related class as well SC/ST were ahead of Non-SC/ST in point of receipt of benefit. So far as the construction of houses by government was concerned, the picture in respect of accrual of benefit was again the same — SC/ST being relatively better-off than Non-SC/ST in each land-related class. As could be expected, the landless in each social group benefitted more than the landholding households. There was reason to believe that not all the households who received land from government for house construction, had houses constructed for them by the

government.

7.52 There have also been schemes of providing financial assistance for house-construction. A relatively small percentage of households in each social group/land-related class reported receipt of such assistance. Even then the proportion in the case of SC/ST (about 4 percent for each group) was higher than that for Non-SC/ST (about 2 percent). The benefit to each land-related class within SC/ST was, by and large, greater than that to its counterparts among Non-SC/ST.

(C) Supply of Drinking Water

7.53 Over 4/5th of the households in each social group stated that they obtained water from a source in the village itself. There are various sources of drinking water available to the rural population. Some of these, such as public well, tank, government tube-well and water tap are provided by some public agency (government or local body). It was found that the most important source of drinking water for all social groups/land-related classes, was the public well, with anywhere between 50 to 65 percent of households in the different classes depending on this source. Next in importance was the private well. The proportion of households within groups/classes relying on this source ranged between 11 to 28 percent. The water tap as a source of drinking water was not far behind, with 10 to 20 percent of households turning to this source for the purpose.

7.54 Our data also brought out as follows :

(1) The relatively better-off households among Non-SC/ST could depend relatively less on public wells than (a) the landless amongst them and (b) also the landholding households within SC/ST.

(2) Though all the social groups had to depend relatively more on public wells than on private wells, the fact that the percentage of households using public wells was more in the

case of SC/ST than Non-SC/ST whereas a larger percentage of Non-SC/ST had private wells to draw from than SC/ST, indicated the superior economic position of Non-SC/ST, relatively to SC/ST.

(3) However, the proportion of ST households using water tap was the highest among social groups at 14.53 percent. The proportion pertaining to Non-SC/ST and SC was 12.45 percent and 11.59 percent respectively.

7.55 Apart from the sources of drinking water supply, we also tried to find out whether the households got drinking water throughout the year. Almost 92 percent of the Non-SC/ST households, 89 percent of SC households and 84 percent of ST households stated that they got drinking water the whole year round. Thus Non-SC/ST were better-placed in this respect than SC/ST, ST turning out to be the most disadvantaged among the social groups. The same relative position among the groups was also found, more or less, within each land-related class. It is indeed disturbing that about 10 to 15 percent of SC/ST households and nearly 8 percent of those within Non-SC/ST did not get drinking water throughout the year. In this connection the finding of the survey that about 30 percent of 'marginal' category and nearly 23 percent of 'small' category ST households could not get drinking water the whole year round, is a matter of great concern.

(D) Electricity and Gobar Gas

7.56 Our survey brought out that only 1/4th of the surveyed households taken together reported that they had electricity in their houses, though it can be deduced from the official statistics that a little less than 3/4th of the Maharashtra villages were electrified by the end of 1981-82. This underlines the obvious point that electrification of a village does not mean electrified houses.

7.57 A comparison between the social groups revealed that while 30 percent of the surveyed Non-SC/ST households had

electricity in their houses, the corresponding proportions respectively for SC and ST were 19 and 13 percent. Besides, within each social group the landless households were worse-off than those belonging to any of the landholding categories. Finally, among the landholding households within the three groups the broad picture that emerges is that those from the 'medium and large' category were better-placed than the correspondings households belonging to the other two landholding categories.

7.58 As for the gobar gas plant, an insignificantly small percentage of the surveyed households in each social group/land-related class stated that they had such plants. The proportions were as low as 0.77 percent for Non-SC/ST, 0.53 percent for SC and 0.47 percent for ST households. The groupwise proportions of households having gobar gas plants who reported that they received government subsidy for the plants were as follows: ST (38 percent); SC (24 percent) and Non-SC/ST (24 percent). Lastly, a sizeable percentage of households in each social group/land-related class having gobar gas plants reported that their plants functioned well. The relevant figures for the social groups were : Non-SC/ST (70 percent); ST (62 percent) and SC (53 percent). We ought to remember, however, that all these percentages related to a very small number of households who had gobar gas plants.

(E) Medical Aid and Family Planning

7.59 Between 63 to 66 percent of the surveyed households within the three groups reported illness in the family during the preceding one year. Of the illness-reporting households, 68.6 percent of SC, 61.9 percent of ST and 61.6 percent of Non-SC/ST households stated that they visited government dispensary for treatment. Of the households visiting government dispensary, the proportion in each social group reporting that they received medicines free, was as follows : ST (81.3 percent);

SC (77.3 percent) and Non-SC/ST (76.1 percent). The percentages were quite high for the land-related classes within each group. The impression one gets is that the bulk of the households who visited government dispensaries for treatment received medicines free of charge.

7.60 As for the adoption of family planning by the surveyed households we found that nearly one-third of these within each group had a member having undergone family planning surgery. Furthermore, the relevant percentages for the landholding households in each group were significantly higher than those for the landless households.

Appendix I

Evaluation study for assessing impact of the agricultural programmes on S.C./S.T. population - Sanction for expenditure on T.A./D.A. of the invitees for meeting-in connection with the-

GOVERNMENT OF MAHARASHTRA
Planning Department,
Resolution No.EVA-1078/Div.II
Mantralaya, Bombay 400 032.

Dated the 20th July, 1978

RESOLUTION : In pursuance of the recommendations of the Legislature Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribes, Vimukta Jatis and Nomadic Tribes, it has been decided to undertake an evaluation study for assessing the impact of agricultural development programmes on S.C./S.T. population. It is proposed to entrust the study jointly to certain Universities (including Agricultural Universities) in the State and the Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics, Pune. For this purpose it has been decided to convene a meeting of the representatives of these institutes in Mantralaya for considering problems arising out of the proposal. Since this meeting will be in the nature of finding out feasibility of entrusting the study to these institutes, Government is pleased to direct that the expenditure on T.A. and D.A. of one representative of the Institutes concerned, should be borne by Government. The representatives of the institutes should be held eligible to draw T.A./D.A. as per scale I in rule 1(i) (b) in Section I of Appendix XLII-A of B.C.S.Rs., Volume II, in respect of the journeys for attending the meeting. The Deputy Secretary to Government, Planning Department (Div.II), should be Countersigning Authority for signing of T.A. Bills for this purpose.

2. The expenditure on this account should be debited to the budget head "296 Secretariat Economics Services (b)(i) Planning Department-Office expenses" and should be met from the grants sanctioned thereunder.

3. This resolution issues with the concurrence of the Finance Department, vide its unofficial reference No.1151/78/EXP-11, dated the 20th July, 1978.

By order and in the name of Governor of Maharashtra.

Sd/-

(D. S. KULKARNI)
Deputy Secretary to Government
Planning Department,

To

The Accountant General, Maharashtra I,
Bombay.
The Pay & Accounts Officer, Bombay.
The Resident Audit Officer, Bombay.
The Planning Department (ADM-I, ADM-II and Cash Section)
The Finance Department (Desk-EXP 11)
The Representatives of the concerned Institutes
attending the meeting.

चौक २

शेती व्यवसाय

	आज		पाच वर्षापूर्वी	
	अेकर १	गुठे २	अेकर ३	गुठे ४
१ कुटुंबाच्या मालकीची जमीन				
२ कुटुंबाने खंडाने घेतलेली जमीन				
३ कुटुंबाने खंडाने दिलेली जमीन				
४ कुटुंब कसत असलेली जमीन				
५ कुटुंबाची लागवडीखालची कोडवाहू जमीन				
६ कुटुंबाची लागवडीखालची बागाडीत (पाण्याखालची) जमीन				
७ कुटुंबाकडील चालू पडीक जमीन				
	अेकर १	गुठे २		
८ कुळकायदा होण्यापूर्वी तुमच्या कुटुंबाच्या मालकीच्या जमिनीपैकी किती जमीन कुळाकडे कसणुकीसाठी होती?				
९ त्यापैकी किती जमीन कुळकायदा-खाली कुळाकडे मालकी हक्काने गेली				
	केव्हापासून (साल)		किती	
			अेकर १	गुठे २
१० कुळकायदाखाली तुमच्या कुटुंबास मालकी हक्काने मिळालेली जमीन				
११ या जमिनीपैकी किती जमीन आज तुमच्याजवळ आहे?				
१२ कुळाच्या जमिनीचे काय झाले?				
१३ कुळापोटी गहाण पडली आहे				
१४ खंडाने दिली आहे				
१५ कुटुंबाबाहेरील नातेवाजकास दिली आहे				
१६ अन्य कारणांनी ताब्यात नसलेली (कारण सांगा)				

(योग्य त्या विधानासमोर पाहिली मरा.)

चौक २ : पुढे चालू

कुटुंब क्रमांक :

	केव्हा पासून (साल)	क्ती	
		ॐकर १	गुठे २
१६ कमाल मर्यादा कायद्याखाली तुमच्या कुटुंबास मिळालेली जमीन			
१७ या जमिनीपैकी क्वती जमीन आज तुमच्या जवळ वहिवाटीखाली आहे? बाकीच्या जमिनीचे काय झाले?			
१८ कर्जापोटी गहाण पडली आहे			
१९ खंडाने दिली आहे			
२० कुटुंबाबाहेरील नातेवाजीकास दिली आहे			
२१ अन्य कारणानी ताब्यात नसलेली (कारणे सांगा)			
	केव्हा पासून (साल)	क्ती ॐकर १ गुठे २	
२२ तुमच्या कुटुंबास शेतीसाठी मालकी हक्काने मिळालेली जंगल जमीन अथवा अन्य सरकारी जमीन			
२३ या जमिनीपैकी क्वती जमीन लागवडयोग्य आहे?			
२४ या लागवडयोग्य जमिनीपैकी तुम्ही आणि तुमचे कुटुंबीय वसत असलेली जमीन			
२५ कर्जापोटी गहाण पडलेली			
२६ कुटुंबाने खंडाने दिलेली जमीन			
२७ अितर जमीन: कुटुंबाबाहेरील नातेवाजीकास दिलेली			
२८ अन्य कारणानी ताब्यात नसलेली (कारणे सांगून त्यासमोर माहिती भरा.)			
२९ आतापर्यंत वरती अल्लेखिलेल्या जमिनी वगळता गेल्या पाच वर्षात तुमच्या कुटुंबाने खरेदी केलेली अेकूण जमीन			
३० या विकत घेतलेल्या जमिनीपैकी काही जमीन तुम्ही अथवा तुमच्या कुटुंबीयांनी विकली असल्यास, ती क्वती ते सांगा. विकण्याचे कारण -			

चौक २ : पुढे चालू

कुटुंब क्रमांक :

	केव्हापासून (साल)	अेकर १	गुठि २
	३१ लग्नसमारंभ जित्यादीसारख्या बाबींवरील खर्च भागविण्याकरिता		
३२ कर्जाची परतफेड करण्याकरिता			
३३ सर्व जमीन करणे कुटुंबाच्या आवाक्याबाहेरचे होते म्हणून			
३४ अितर कारणे (कोणती ती सांगून प्रत्येका-समेर माहिती भरा.)			

सबसिडी कर्ज
(रुपये) (रुपये)

३५ कुळकायदा, कमाल मर्यादा कायदा याखाली तुमच्या कुटुंबास मिळालेली जमीन तसेच तुमच्या कुटुंबास मिळालेली जंगलजमीन वा अन्य सरकारी जमीन सुधारण्यासाठी, तुम्हास वा तुमच्या कुटुंबियास गेल्यास पाच वर्षांत सरकारकडून मिळालेली सबसिडी अथवा कर्ज

३६ किती कर्ज परत केले?

होय(१) नाही(२)

३७ तुमच्या कुटुंबाकडे खार।खज्जम जमिन आहे का?

असल्यास त्या जमिनीवर सरकारने गेल्या पाच वर्षांत केलेल्या भांडवली खर्चाची माहिती खालील तक्त्यात द्या :

वाच क्रमांक	खर्चाचे प्रकार	सरकारी खर्च (रुपये)		किती जमिनीवरील	
		सबसिडी	कर्ज	अेकर	गुठि
०	१	२	३	४	५
३८	बांधवदिस्ती				
३९	मजगो घालणे				
४०	अितर				

चौक २ : पुढे चालू

बी-ब्रिजाणे, खते आणि कीटकनाशके - चालू

क्र.सं.	पिके	कोड नं.	कोटून मिळाले				सरकारी सहाय्य स्वरूपे	
			सरकार	सहकारी संस्था	बाजारात	कुटुंबाच्या शेतावर	सबसिडी	कर्ज
०	१	२	३	४	५	६	७	८
४९	सुधारित							
५०	रासायनिक खते							
५१	कीटकनाशके							

संक्रित।सुधारित बी-ब्रिजाणे, रासायनिक खते, आणि।अथवा कीटकनाशके मिळविण्यात खालीलपैकी कोणत्या अडचणी येतात ते सांगा-

५२ ती ती वस्तू मिळविण्यासाठी लागणारे कर्ज वेळेवर मिळत नाही (होय।।
नाही२)

५३ वस्तूचा पुरवठा वेळेवर होत नाही (होय-।।नाही-२)

५४ पुरवठा वेळेवर झाला तरी तो आमच्यापर्यंत पोहोचत नाही (होय।।
नाही २)

५५ अितर कारणे (कोणती ती सांगा.) - (असल्यास।। नसल्यास २)

न्या कुटुंबात कोणीही सहकारी पतसंस्थेचा सभासद नसेल त्या कुटुंबाच्या प्रमुखासाठी :
तुमच्या कुटुंबातील कोणीही व्यक्ती सहकारी पतसंस्थेची सभासद झालेली नाही
याचे कारण (कारणे) द्या.

चौक २ : पुढे चालू

कुटुंब क्रमांक:

५६. अनुसूचित जातीपैकी असल्याने (होय-१ । नाही-२)
५७. अनुसूचित जमातीपैकी असल्याने (होय-१ । नाही-२)
५८. आमच्या जवळ जमीन नाही म्हणून (होय-१।नाही-२)
५९. आम्ही लहान शेतकरी असल्यामुळे आमच्यापर्यंत कर्ज पोहोचण्याची शक्यता नाही म्हणून (होय-१।नाही-२)
६०. अितर कारणे (कोणती ती सांगा)(असल्यास-१।नसल्यास-२)

गेल्या पाच वर्षात तुमच्या कुटुंबातील कोणाही व्यक्तीचे पीककर्ज क्वी माफ करण्यात आले आहे का? (खालील तक्त्यात माहिती द्या)

क्र. क्र.	व्यक्तीचे नाव		केव्हा (साल)
	१	२	
६१	१		
६२	२		
६३	३		
६४	४		

टीप : स्तंभ (१) खाली येणारा क्रमांक हा चौक क्रमांक १ मधील स्तंभ (०) खाली दिलेला अनुक्रमांक द्यावा.

जलसिंचन:

खालील तक्त्यात माहिती भरा:

क्र. क्र.	जलसिंचनाचा प्रकार	संबंधित प्रकारच्या सिंचनाखालील निव्वळ क्षेत्र			
		आज		पाच वर्षांपूर्वी	
		एकर	गुठे	एकर	गुठे
०	१	२	३	४	५
६५	विहीर				
६६	कालवा				
६७	अपसा सिंचन				

चौक २ : पुढे चालू

कुटुंब क्रमांक:

६८ तुमच्या कुटुंबाची जमीन कोणत्याही घराच्या लाभक्षेत्रात येते का? होय (१) नाही (२)

----- १ ----- २ -----

नियमितपणे वचक्या घेतले मुळीच घेतले नाही

१ २ ३

६९ गेल्या पाच वर्षात तुमच्या कुटुंबातील कोणीही तेथून पाणी घेतले आहे का?

तुमच्यापैकी कोणीही पाणी घेतले नसल्यास त्याचे कारण (कारणे) सांगा -

७० पाणीपट्टी परवडत नाही (होय- १ । नाही-२)

७१ आमची जमीन घराच्या लाभक्षेत्राच्या परीघावर आहे (होय-१ । नाही-२)

७२ घरात पुरेसा पाणीपुरवठा नसतो (होय-१ । नाही-२)

७३ अितर कारणे (कोणती ते सांगा) (असल्यास १ । नसल्यास २)

होय नाही

१ २

७४ तुमच्या कुटुंबापैकी कोणीही रुपसा सिंचन सोसायटीचे सभासद आहेत का? (होय-१ । नाही-२)

होय नाही

१ २

७५ तेथून पाणी मिळते का? (होय-१ । नाही-२)

७६ तुमच्या कुटुंबाच्या जमिनीस जलानुकूलनावा

(water logging) अपसर्ग पोहोचला आहे का? (होय-१ । नाही-२)

होय नाही

१ २

चौक २ - फटे चालू

कुटुंब क्रमांक :

क्षेत्र
अेकर गुठे
१ २

७७. तसे असल्यास, क्ती जमिनीस ते सांगा

होय नाही
१ २

७८. तुमच्या कुटुंबाचा जमीन समतल करणे (leveling) आणि अथवा तिला आकार देणे (shaping) ही कामे सरकारने करून दिली आहेत का? (होय-१।नाही-२)

क्षेत्र
अेकर गुठे
१ २

७९. दिली असल्यास क्ती जमिनीच्या बाबतीत हे करून दिले आहे ते सांगा.

विहीर खोदण्यासाठी आणि अथवा उपसा सिंचनासाठी तुमच्या कुटुंबास खालीलपैकी कोणते साहाय्य मिळाले आहे का?

क्र. सं.	साहाय्याचा प्रकार	मिळाले?		क्ती (रुपये)	वेळा (वर्ष)
		होय-१ २	नाही-२ ३		
०	१			४	५
८०	सरकारी सबसिडी				
८१	सरकारी कर्ज				
८२	सहकारी संस्थेकडून कर्ज				
८३	बँकेकडून कर्ज				

होय नाही
१ २

८४. विहीरीवर तुम्ही पंप असविला आहे का? (होय-१।नाही-२)

होय नाही
१ २

८५. असविला असल्यास, त्यासाठी सरकारी साहाय्य मिळाले आहे का? (होय-१।नाही-२)

सब्सिडी कर्ज
(रुपये) (रुपये)
१ २

२६. मिळाले असल्यास, सब्सिडी किती आणि कर्ज किती ते सांगा

पिके:

२७. कुटुंबाच्या जमिनीत तुम्ही काढीत असलेल्या पिकाविषयीची माहिती खालील तक्त्यात द्या-

बाब क्र.	पिक		गेल्या वर्षात		पाच वर्षांपूर्वी	
	नाव	कोड नं.	क्षेत्र अ. गुं. ३ ४	उत्पादन (क्विंटल) ५	क्षेत्र अ. गुं. ६ ७	उत्पादन (क्विंटल) ८
०	१	२				

२८. तुमच्या कुटुंबाच्या जमिनीवरील फळबागांविषयीची माहिती खालील तक्त्यात द्या.

बाब क्र.	फळे		फळबागांखालील अेकूण जमीन(क्षेत्र)		फळांच्या झाडांची संख्या	फळे लावण्यासाठी गेल्या पाच वर्षात मिळालेले सरकारी वार्षिक साहाय्य (रुपये)	
	नाव	कोड	अेकर	गुठे		सब्सिडी ६	कर्ज ७
०	१	२	३	४	५		

प्रशिक्षणाची शिबिरे (training camps) आणि प्रयोगनिर्देशक शेते (demonstration farms)

होय नाही
१ २

२९. सरकारतर्फे शेतक-यांसाठी प्रशिक्षणाची शिबिरे चालविली जातात हे तुम्हास व तुमच्या कुटुंबियास माहित आहे का?
(होय-१ | नाही-२)

चौक १ - पुढे चल्

कुटुंब क्रमांक :

१०. अशा अखाद्या शिबिरास तुमच्या कुटुंबापैकी कोणी कधी गेले होते का? (होय-१।नाही-२)

होय नाही
१ २

११. तुमच्या कुटुंबापैकी कोणी कधी प्रयोगनिर्देशक शेत पाहिले आहे का? (होय-१।नाही-२)

होय नाही
१ २

१२. सरकारतर्फे कोणीही ते तुम्हास दाखविण्यास नेले होते का? (होय-१।नाही-२)

होय नाही
१ २

१३. ग्रामसेवक तुमच्याकडे येतो का? (होय-१ । नाही-२)

होय नाही
१ २

१४. त्याच्याकडून तुम्हास कोणती मदत मिळते का? (होय-१।नाही-२)

होय नाही
१ २

शेतीसुत्पन्न:

होय नाही
१ २

१५. गेल्या पाच वर्षांत शेतीपासूनच्या तुमच्या सुत्पन्नात वाढ झाली आहे का? (होय-१।नाही-२)

१६. वाढ झाली असल्यास वा नसल्यास तसे का घडून आले ते सांगा.

चौक ३ :

मजुरीचे काम आणि रोजगार हमी योजना :

खालील तक्त्यात माहिती भरा (गेल्या अेका वर्षाची माहिती द्याव्याची आहे) :

कुटुंब क्रमांक :

क्र.	कुटुंबातील मजुरी करणा- या व्यक्तीचे (क्रमांक क्र. चौकःस्तंभ (०) प्रमाणे	शेती		बिगर शेती		रोजगार-हमी योजना					
		सालदार :	रोजंदारी	सालदार :	रोजंदारी	मजुरी दर (रु.)	गेल्या वर्षी किती दिवस काम मिळाले?	गेल्या वर्षी गावापासून किती अंतरावर काम आहात? मिळाले? (मैल)	या योजनेत किती काळ काम करीत (वर्षे/महिने)		
०	१	२	३	४	५	६	७	८	९	१०	११

(पुढे चालू)

अनु. क्र.	या मालकाकडे मजुरीवर काम करता	जाता येत नसल्यास त्याची कारणे
बाव	त्याची नोकरी सोडून कामघरासाठी	मालकाची नोकरी अन्य ठिकाणी काम याच मालकाकडे
क्र.	अन्य ठिकाणी जाता येतील का?	सोडल्यास तो मिळण्याची शक्यता काम करणे परत
	होय-१।नाही-२	नाराज होतील-१ नाही-१।अन्य-२ करतो-१।अन्य-२
	नाही-१। १-२	अन्य-२
	१२	१३ १४ १५ १६

चौक ३ - पुढे चालू

कुटुंब क्रमांक:

२ गेल्या पाच वर्षात तुम्हास व तुमच्या कुटुंबियास दरवर्षी मिळणा-या शेतमजुरीच्या कामाचे दिवस कमीअधिक झाले आहेत का? (दिलेला सकेतांक भरा).

वर्षातून अधिक दिवस काम मिळू लागले आहे - १

वर्षातून कमी दिवस काम मिळू लागले आहे - २

कामाचे दिवस कमीअधिक झालेले नाहीत-३

३ गेल्या पाच वर्षात तुमच्या शेतमजुरीपासूनच्या वार्षिक उत्पन्नात कोणता बदल झाला आहे? (खालीलपैकी योग्य तो सकेतांक भरा.).

उत्पन्न वाढले आहे १

उत्पन्न कमी झाले आहे २

उत्पन्न जवळपास स्थिर राहिले आहे ३

४ रोजगार-हमी योजनेत काम मिळविताना तुम्हास व तुमच्या कुटुंबियांना अडचणी येतात का? (होय १ । नाही २)

होय नाही

१ २

येत असल्यास, खालीलपैकी कोणत्या ते सांगा-

५ चौकशी करूनही सरकारी अधिका-यांकडून माहिती मिळत नाही (होय-१।नाही-२)

६ ही कामे गावाजवळ निघत नाहीत (होय-१।नाही-२)

७ या योजनेत काम स्वीकारल्यास जमीन मालकाची अितराजी पत्करावी लागेल. (होय-१।नाही-२)

८ अितर (कोणती ते सांगा)

(असल्यास-१।नसल्यास-२)

चौक ४
पत्रसंघर्षः

कुटुंब क्रमांक :

कुटुंबाकडील पत्र-पक्ष्यासंबंधीची माहिती खालील तक्त्यात भरा-

वाच क्र. १

वाच क्र. १

तुमच्या कुटुंबाकडे असलेले वेगवेगळे पत्रपक्षी

गेल्या पाच वर्षात विकत घेतलेले : विकत घेण्यासाठी पैसे कोसे असे केले?
(दिलेल्या पयायाखाली योग्य ती रक्कम रजपयात लिहा)

वाच क्र. २

संकरित गाजी असल्यास

किती विकत घेतल्या?
(संख्या)

किती तुमच्या शेतावर निपजल्या?
(संख्या)

प्रकार	आज (संख्या)	पाच वर्षा-पूर्वी (संख्या)	गेल्या पाच वर्षात विकत घेतले (संख्या)	स्वतःचे पैसे	सरकारी सबसिडी	सहकारी संस्थेचे कर्ज	व्यापारी बँकेचे कर्ज	सावकारी-कडून कर्ज	नातेवाजी-काकडून कर्ज	अितर	१	२
१ गाजी												
२ म्हत्ती												
३ शेळ्या												
४ मेंढ्या												
५ डुकर												
६ कोंबड्या												

चौक ४ : पुढे चालू

पत्रसंख्या:

कुटुंब क्रमांक:

बाब क्र. ३		बाब क्र. : ४
सरकारी सबसिडी (गेल्या पाच वर्षात)		गेल्या पाच वर्षात
प्रकार	रक्कम (रुपये)	सरकारकडून किती
१	२	शेळ्या मिळाल्या?
		--(संख्या)--
१	संकरित गाळी विकत घेण्यासाठी	
२	संकरित वासन वाढविण्यासाठी	
३	कौबडीची फिले विकत घेण्यासाठी	

पशुपक्षीजन्य वस्तूंची विक्री:

खालील तक्त्यात माहिती भरा.

बाब क्र. ५

तुम्ही गाळी म्हणजेचे दुध विकत असल्यास-१।नसल्यास-२

विकण्याच्या पयलीची व्यवस्था		तुम्ही कोठे	या प्रत्येक खोदी
संकेतिक	प्रकार	विकता?	दाराकडून
०	१	होय-१।	विक्रीचे पैसे
		नाही-२	तुम्हास वेळेवर
		२	मिळतात का?
			होय-१।नाही-२
१	स्वतः गावातील ग्राहकांना		
२	स्वतः नेमून जवळपासच्या शहरातील ग्राहकांना		
३	खाजगी व्यापारी		
४	सहकारी दुध उत्पादक संघ.		
५	सरकारी दुध केंद्र		

चौक ४ : फुटे चालू

बाब क्र. ६

तुम्ही कोंबडीची अडी विकत असल्यास-१। नसल्यास-२

विकण्याच्या पर्यायी व्यवस्था		तुम्ही कोठे विकता? होय-१। नाही-२	या प्रत्येक खरेदीदाराकडून विक्रीचे पैसे तुम्हास वेळेवर मिळतात का? होय-१। नाही-२
संकेतिक	प्रकार	१	२
०	१		
१	स्वतः गावातील ग्राहकांना		
२	स्वतः नेऊन जवळपासच्या शहरातील ग्राहकांना		
३	बाजणी व्यापारी		
४	सहकारी संघ		
५	सरकारी केंद्र		

पशुवैद्यकीय सोयी

७. तुमच्याकडील पशुंना आजार आल्यास तुम्ही काय करता?
(खालीलपैकी योग्य त्या पर्यायांसमोर संकेतिक द्या.)

पशुवैद्यकीय अिलाज करतो - १

घरगुती अिलाज करतो - २

काहीच करत शकत नाही-३

८. गेल्या वर्षात तुम्ही तुमच्याकडील पशुंना पशुवैद्यकीय अिलाज किती वेळा करत घेतला?

गेल्या पाच वर्षात तुमच्याकडील जनावरांना। कोंबड्यांना सरकारकडून मोफत लस देऊन मिळाली का?

मिळाली मिळाली नाही
(१) (३)

९. जनावर

१०. कोंबड्या

चौक ४ : फुटे चालू

होय (१)	नाही (२)
------------	-------------

११. गेल्या पाच वर्षांत तुम्ही तुमच्याकडील गांजीवर कृत्रिम रेतन (artificial insemination) करून घेतले का?

१२. घेतले असल्यास, किती गांजीवर?

१३. त्यापासून किती वासरे पैदा झाली?

चौक ५. कर्जाची सोय:

गेल्या वर्षात कुटुंबास मिळालेल्या अेकूण कर्जाविषयीची माहिती

१. संबंधित माहिती खालील तक्त्यात भरा -

संकेतिक	कर्ज देणारी संस्था	गेल्या वर्षात मिळालेले कर्ज	
		रक्कम (रुपये)	धान्य क्विंटल किंमत (रुपये)
०	१	२	३
१	नातेवाजीक आणि मित्र		
२	सावकार		
३	जमीनमालक		
४	सहकारी संस्था		
५	सहकारी बँक		
६	व्यापारी बँक		
७	सावकार		

कर्जाफाी योजना :

१. सरकारच्या अलिकडच्या कर्जाफाी योजनेचा तुमच्या कुटुंबास लाभ मिळाला आहे का? (होय-१; नाही-२)

होय-१ नाही-२

२. नसल्यास, काही (खालीलपैकी योग्य त्या पर्यायासमोर संकेतिक धावा)

चौक ५ : पुढे चालू

कुटुंब क्रमांक :

- (१) ही योजना आम्हास माहित नाही-१
- (२) ज्या प्रकारच्या शेतकऱ्यांसाठी ही योजना तयार केली होती त्या शेतकऱ्यांच्या वर्गात आम्ही मोडत नाही-२
- (३) आम्ही कधी कर्ज घेतलेले नाही-३
- (४) आम्ही आमचे कर्ज सरकारी घोरण जाहीर होण्याआधीच परत केले होते-४
- (५) जितके कर्जणे (कोणती ती सांगा) - ५

चौक ६ सिखण :

१. तुमच्या कुटुंबातील शिक्षणा-या मुलांमुलींना खालील गोष्टी गेल्या वर्षी मोफत मिळाल्या का? (खालील तक्त्यात माहिती भरा)

संकेतिक	प्रकार नाव	मोफत मिळाल्या -१	मोफत मिळाल्या नाहीत-२
०	१	२	३
१	पाठी-पेन्सिली		
२	वह्या		
३	पुस्तके		
४	गणवेप		
५	सकाळच्या अथवा दुपारच्या वेळचे लागे		

सर्व सर्व कुटुंबाचा-१ आंशिक सूट-२ संपूर्णतः मोफत-३

- २ तुमच्या कुटुंबातील मुलेमुली वस्तीगृहात राहात असल्यास त्यांच्या वस्तीगृहाचा खर्च सर्वेच्यासर्व तुम्ही करता की तुम्हास त्यात काही सूट मिळते? (योग्य त्या पर्याया-चा संकेतिक दावा).

चौक ७

कुटुंब क्रमांक:

जागेंची सोय:

१ खालील तक्त्यात माहिती द्या:

घरासाठी कुटुंबास सरकारने जमीन मिळाली का?	मिळाली असल्यास किती मिळाली? (गुठे)	किती काळापूर्वी मिळाली? (वर्षे/महिने)	सरकारने घर बांधून दिले का? होय-१।नाही-२	घरबांधणीसाठी सरकारने दिलेले साहाय्य (रुपये)
होय-१।नाही-२	१	२	३	४

चौक ८ . पिण्याचे पाणी, वीज, सरकारी दवाखाना-अ.:

पिण्याचे पाणी

खाजगी विहीर

सार्वजनिक विहीर

१. तुम्ही पिण्याचे पाणी कोठून आणता? (समोर दिलेल्या पर्यायापैकी योग्य त्या पर्यायासाठी संकेतांक द्यावा.)

तलाव
३नदी
४नाला
५सरकारी नलिकाकूप
६नळाचे पाणी
७

२. तुम्ही पिण्याचे पाणी किती अंतरावरून आणता? (मैल)

होय-१ नाही-२
१ २

३. तुम्हास हे पाणी बाराही महिने मिळते का? (होय-१।नाही-२)

कुटुंब क्रमांक:

चौक ८ : पुढे चालू

होय-१ नाही-२

वीज अित्यादि:

४. तुमच्या घरात वीज आली आहे का?
५. तुमच्या कुटुंबाजवळ गोबर गॅस मट्टी आहे का?
६. ती व्यवस्थित काम देते का?
७. तिच्यासाठी सरकारी सबसिडी

वैधकीय सोय:

होय-१ नाही-२

८. गेल्या बारा महिन्यात तुमच्या कुटुंबात कोणी आजारी पडले होते का?
९. वरील प्रश्नाचे उत्तर होकारार्थी असल्यास, त्यावेळी तुम्ही उपचारासाठी सरकारी दवाखान्यात गेला होता का?
१०. तेथे गेला असल्यास, तुम्हास औषधे मोफत मिळाली का?
११. तुमच्या कुटुंबात किती जणांनी कुटुंब नियोजन शस्त्रक्रिया करून घेतली आहे? (संख्या)

गोखले अर्थशास्त्र संस्था, पुणे
महाराष्ट्र शासन शिक्षण प्रकल्प
ग्रामीण कुटुंबांचे सर्वेक्षण
अन्वेषकांसाठी सूचना

सर्वसाधारण

- १ माहिती योग्य त्या जागी सुवाच्य अक्षरात लिहावी.
- २ जेथे उत्तरादाखल आकडे लिहायचे असतील तेथे सर्व आकडे आंतरराष्ट्रीय पध्दतीने (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) लिहावेत.
- ३ प्रत्येक पानावर सर्वेक्षित कुटुंबाचा क्रमांक लिहिणे आवश्यक आहे.
- ४ कित्येक ठिकाणी उत्तरे 'होय-नाही' पैकी आहेत. या संभाव्य उत्तरांना खालीलप्रमाणे कोड क्रमांक अथवा संकेतांक दिले आहेत: होय (१)।नाही(२), अशा उत्तरांच्या बाबतीत उत्तर शब्दात लिहून त्याशिवाय संकेतांकामध्ये लिहिल्यास सोयीचे होईल. उदा. उत्तर 'होय' असल्यास संबंधित स्तंभात, होय(१) असे लिहावे, आणि 'नाही' असल्यास, नाही(२) असे लिहावे.
- ५ कित्येक ठिकाणी सरकारकडून मिळालेली सबसिडी आणि/अथवा कर्ज, तसेच सहकारी संस्था, व्यापारी बँका इत्यादिकडून मिळालेले कर्ज, यांच्या रकमा विचारल्या आहेत. येथे दोन गोष्टी लक्षात घ्यायच्या आहेत. सबसिडी/कर्ज मुळीच मिळाले नसल्यास संबंधित स्तंभाखाली '०' (शून्य) असे लिहावे. दुसरे असे की जिला सरकारी सबसिडी असे संबोधले जाते त्यात कर्जाचा अंश असतो. हा कर्जाचा अंश कर्ज रकमेत समाविष्ट करून 'कर्ज' या स्तंभाखाली लिहावा. 'सबसिडी' या स्तंभाखाली निव्वळ सबसिडीची रक्कम लिहावी.
- ६ अनेक ठिकाणी जमिनीबाबतची माहिती अकर-गुठ्यात विचारली आहे. अशाकडे कुटुंबाकडे संबंधित प्रकारची जमीन नसेल तर योग्य तेथे 'अकर' आणि 'गुठे' या दोन स्तंभाखाली '० ०' असे लिहावे. उदा. चौक २, बाब क्र. १९ पाहा. कुटुंबाने पाच वर्षात खरेदी केलेल्या जमिनीविषयीची माहिती विचारली आहे. अशाकडे कुटुंबाने जमीन खरेदी केलेली नसेल तर तिच्या प्रश्नाव्तीत अकर आणि गुठे या दोन्ही स्तंभाखाली '० ०' असे लिहावे लागेल.
- ७ प्रश्नाव्तीतील काही प्रश्न विशिष्ट कुटुंबाच्या बाबतीत अुद्भवत नसतील. उदा. चौक ३ मधील पहिल्याच तक्त्यात कुटुंबात मजुरी करणा-या विषयीची माहिती विचारली आहे. कुटुंबात कोणीही मजुरी करणारे नसेल तर त्या कुटुंबाकडे येथे सांगण्यासारखी कोणतीच माहिती नसेल. अशा परिस्थितीत त्या त्या स्तंभाखालील जागा कोरी ठेवावी.

काही प्रश्नांखाली कारणांचे काही संभाव्य पर्याय दिले आहेत. त्यातून उत्तर निवडायचे आहे. त्यामध्ये शेवटचा पर्याय 'अितर कारणे' असा अवशिष्ट (residuary) पर्याय आहे. उत्तर सादरात मोडत असल्यास त्याखाली पोळ्या सोडलेल्या जागेत अितर जी कारणे असतील ती अेका खालोखाल अेक अशी लिहावीत, आणि त्यांच्यासभार योग्य ती माहिती मरावी. उदा. चौक २, बाब १५ पाहा : 'अन्य कारणांनी ताब्यात नसलेली' येथे अशी अन्य कारणे असल्यास ती अेका खालोखाल अेक अशी लिहून त्या प्रत्येक कारणामुळे किती अेकर, गुठे जरीन ताब्यात राहिलेली नाही ते त्यासभारच्या तक्त्यात लिहावे.

चौक १ (तक्ता)

१. कुटुंबाची माहिती : कुटुंबातल्या व्यक्तींची नावे लिहिताना 'कुटुंब' म्हणजे काय ते ठरवावे लागेल. प्रत्येक कुटुंबप्रमुख त्याचे कुटुंबीय कोण ते जाणत असतो. परंतु प्रस्तुत सर्वेक्षणासाठी त्यापैकी जे गावातच स्थायिक असून ज्यांची स्वयंपाकाची व्यवस्था अेकत्रित आहे ते आणि गावाबाहेर शाळाकॉलेजात शिकत असलेली कुटुंबातील मुलेमुली, यांचाच 'कुटुंब' या सदरात समावेश करावा. कर्मधंद्यासाठी अथवा अन्य कारणांसाठी गावाबाहेर जाऊन स्थायिक झालेल्या जवळच्या नातेवाजीकांना वगळावे. सर्व प्रश्नांखाली जेथेथे 'कुटुंब' हा शब्द असेल तेथेथे हाच अर्थ घेऊन उत्तरे मागवावीत.
२. कुटुंबातील प्रत्येक व्यक्तीसाठी प्रत्येक स्तंभात वेगळी माहिती लिहा.
३. स्तंभ १ : वय, क्षेत्र पूर्ण वर्षे लिहावीत.
४. स्तंभ ४ आणि ५ : शिक्षण. स्तंभ क्र. ४ मध्ये पूर्ण झालेले वा चालू असलेले शिक्षण या विषयीची माहिती घेतील. स्तंभ क्र. ५ - कोड क्रमांक - हा कोरा ठेवावा. ज्याचे शिक्षण मुळीच झालेले नसेल त्यांच्यापुढे स्तंभ ४ मध्ये 'शिक्षण नाही' असे लिहावे. शिक्षण ज्यांच्यापर्यंत पोहोचले आहे त्यांचे दोन वर्ग संभक्तात: (१) शिक्षण पूर्ण झालेले आणि (२) शिक्षण चालू असलेले. शिक्षण पूर्ण झालेल्यांच्या बाबतीत ज्या टप्प्यापर्यंत शिक्षण पूर्ण झाले असेल तो टप्पा सांगावा. उदा. अियता ९ वीत असताना शिक्षण सोडून दिले असल्यास 'अियता ८' असे लिहावे. ज्याचे शिक्षण चालू असेल त्यांच्या नावासभार शिक्षणाचा टप्पा लिहून क्सात '(चालू)' असे लिहावे. उदा. प्रथम वर्ष वाणिज्य वर्गात मुलगा शिकत असेल तर त्याच्या नावासभार स्तंभ ४ मध्ये 'प्रथम वर्ष वाणिज्य (चालू)' असे लिहावे.
५. स्तंभ ६ आणि ७. प्रमुख व्यवसाय. प्रमुख व्यवसाय म्हणजे व्यक्तीस निम्म्या-हून अधिक उत्पन्न मिळून देणारा व्यवसाय असे समजावे. हा व्यवसाय

कोणता ते स्तंभ ६ खाली लिहावे. स्तंभ ७ कोरा ठेवावा. स्तंभ ६ मध्ये माहिती लिहिताना काही गोष्टी घ्यानात घ्याव्यास हव्यात. शिक्षण चालू असणा-या विद्यार्थी-विद्यार्थिनींच्या बाबतीत 'शिक्षित आहे' असे लिहावे. नोकरी व्यवसाय न करता घरगुती कामे करणा-या गृहिणींच्या नावासमोर स्तंभ ६ मध्ये 'घरगुती कामे' असे लिहावे लागेल. सेवानिवृत्तीच्या बाबतीत 'सेवानिवृत्त', सध्या बेरोजगार असून कामाच्या शोधात असलेल्यांच्या नावासमोर 'कामाच्या शोधात', सध्या काही करित नाही परंतु नोकरी मिळत असल्यास ती करण्यास तयारी असलेल्या व्यक्तींच्या बाबतीत 'नोकरी करण्यास तयार', सध्या काही करित नाही आणि नोकरी करायची अिच्छा नाही अशांच्या बाबतीत 'काही करित नाही', अशा नोंदी कराव्यात. शेती करणारा आणि मजुरीपासून (शेती आणि अथवा जिरा शेती) उत्पन्न मिळविणारा, यांच्या नावासमोर अनुक्रमे 'शेती' आणि 'मजुरी' असे लिहावे. याशिवाय खेडेगावात अितर अनेक व्यवसाय संभवतात. उदा. लोहारकाम, सुतारकाम, कुंभाराचे काम, टोपल्या तयार करणे अित्यादी. या व्यवसायांपासून निम्म्याहून अधिक उत्पन्न मिळविणा-यांच्या बाबतीत त्या त्या निश्चित व्यवसायाची नोंद करावी.

६ स्तंभ ८ आणि ९. स्तंभ ८ मध्ये अतराचा संकेतांक लिहावा. उदा. संबंधित व्यक्ती 'नववौघट' असेल तर तिच्या नावासमोर या स्तंभात '३' असे लिहावे. तसेच स्तंभ ८ मधील अतर '३' अथवा '४' असल्यास स्तंभ ९ कोरा ठेवावा.

७ स्तंभ ११ आणि १२. संबंधित व्यक्ती सहकारी संस्थेचा सदस्य नसली (स्तंभ १० मधील अतर 'नाही (२)' असे असेल) तर ११ आणि १२ हे दोन्ही स्तंभ कोरे राहतील. तसेच सदस्य असलेल्या व्यक्तीने पाच वर्षात पीक कर्ज घेतले नसल्यास, स्तंभ ११ मधील अतर '०' (शून्य) असे लिहावे आणि स्तंभ १२ कोरा ठेवावा.

८ स्तंभ १३ आणि १४. व्यापारी बँकेकडून पाच वर्षात पीक कर्ज घेतले नसल्यास स्तंभ १३ मधील अतर '०' (शून्य) असे लिहून स्तंभ १४ कोरा ठेवावा.

९ स्तंभ १२ आणि १४. नियमितपणे परत केले जाणा अर्थ घेतलेले पृत्येक कर्ज नेमून दिलेल्या मुदतीत परत केले.

चौक ३. (शेती व्यवसाय)

१ कुटुंबाची व्याख्या वरती दिली आहे. कुटुंबीय अंदाज गावात स्थायिक असले तरी त्याची जमीन त्या खेड्याबाहेरही असेल. कुटुंबातील सर्व

व्यक्तींची मिळून अकूण जमीन - खेड्यातील व खेड्याबाहेरील - रसात घेतली पाहिजे.

३ बाबी १ ते ७. जमीन मालकी आणि जमिनीची कसणूक यांबाबतीत गावातील प्रत्येक कुटुंबाची सध्या काय परिस्थिती आहे हे माहीत करून घेण्याचा प्रयत्न येथे केला आहे. या संदर्भात एक समीकरण नजरेसमोर ठेवावे: कुटुंबाच्या मालकीची जमीन (बाब १) - कुटुंबाने खंडाने दिलेली जमीन (बाब ३) + कुटुंबाने खंडाने घेतलेली जमीन (बाब २) = कुटुंब कसत असलेली जमीन (बाब ४). अकाद्या बाबीखाली अल्लेखिलेली जमीन नसल्यास तेथे अकरा या स्तंभाखाली '०' आणि गुंठे या स्तंभाखाली देखील '०' असे लिहावे.

३ बाबी ५ आणि ६. कोरडवाहू आणि बागाजोत (पाण्याखालची) जमीन. येथे संदर्भ कुटुंब कसत असलेल्या जमिनीचा आहे, तिच्या मालकीच्या जमिनीचा नाही. तेव्हा कुटुंब कसत असलेल्या जमिनीपैकी कोरडवाहू किती आणि बागाजोत किती ते लिहावे.

४ बाबी ८ ते ११. १९६० साली महाराष्ट्र राज्याची स्थापना झाली. त्या आधी विदर्भ आदि महाराष्ट्राच्या वेगवेगळ्या भागात कुळकायदे संमत करण्यात आले होते. 'कसेल त्याची जमीन' या तत्वानुसार जमिनीची मालकी कुळाकडे यावी यासाठी हे कायदे करण्यात आले. तसेच महाराष्ट्रात कमालमर्यादा कायदेही करण्यात आले आहेत. कुटुंबाच्या मालकीच्या जमिनीवर कमालमर्यादा घालून त्यापेक्षा अधिक जमीन असलेल्या कुटुंबाकडून जमीन काढून घ्यायची आणि ती भूमिहीन आणि अथवा मर्यादेपेक्षा कमी जमीन असलेल्या कुटुंबांना मालकी हक्काने द्यायची, ही या कायदांभागीची भूमिका होती. या दोन प्रकारच्या कायदांमुळे जमीन मालकी वस्तुतः किती प्रमाणात बदलली आहे, हे माहीत करून घेण्यासाठी हे प्रश्न विचारले आहेत.

५ बाबी ८ आणि ९. अकाद्या कुटुंबाकडे कुळकायदा होण्यापूर्वी जमीनच नव्हती असे असेल तर या बाबीसमोरचे स्तंभ कोरे ठेवावेत. मात्र जमीन असूनही कुळाकडे कसणूकीसाठी दिली नव्हती असे असेल तर बाब ८ च्या समोर अकरा ०, गुंठे ०, असे लिहावे आणि बाब ९ समोरील स्तंभ कोरे ठेवावेत.

६ बाबी १० आणि ११. बाब १० ते अकरा अकरा, ० आणि गुंठे ०. असे असल्यास 'केव्हापासून' हा स्तंभ कोरा ठेवावा आणि तसेच बाबी ११ ते १५ समोरील 'अकरा' व 'गुंठे' या स्तंभाखालची जागा कोरी ठेवावी.

- ७ बाब १५, अन्य कारणे असल्यास, वरती 'सर्वसाधारण' या विभागातील क. ८ ची सूचना पहावी.
- ८ बाब १६, अशी जमीन मिळाली नसल्यास बाबी क्र. १६ ते २१ यांच्या बाबतीत वरील सूचना क्र. ६ लक्षात घेऊन त्यानुसार माहिती भरावी.
- ९ बाब क्र. २१, अन्य कारणे असल्यास, पाहा : 'सर्वसाधारण' विभाग, सूचना क्र. ८.
- १० बाबी क्र. २२ ते २८, महाराष्ट्र शासनाने परीक्षेप्रमाणे प्राचीण कुटुंबांना काही जंगल जमीन आणि अन्य सरकारी जमीन मालकी हक्काने देण्यासंबंधीचे निर्णय घेतले आहेत. या निर्णयांची कार्यवाही किती प्रमाणात झाली आहे हे जाणून घेण्यासाठी हे प्रश्न विचारले आहेत.
- ११ बाबी क्र. २२ ते २८, अशी जमीन मिळाली नसल्यास बाबी क्र. २२ ते २८ यांच्या बाबतीत वरील सूचना क्र. ६ लक्षात घ्यावी.
- १२ बाब क्र. २८, अन्य कारणे असल्यास, पाहा : 'सर्वसाधारण' विभाग सूचना क्र. ८.
- १३ बाब क्र. ३०, 'विक्रत घेतलेल्या जमिनीपैकी' या अंकाची 'तुमच्या कुटुंबियांच्या मालकीच्या 'अेकूण जमिनीपैकी' असे सुधारन घ्या.
- १४ बाबी क्र. २९ ते ३४, बाब क्र. २९ चे अंतर अेकर ०, आणि गुठे ०, असे असल्यास, बाबी ३० ते ३४ यांच्याबाबतीत वरील सूचना क्र. ६ लक्षात घ्यावी. बाब ३० चे अंतर अेकर ०, आणि गुठे ० असे असल्यास बाबी ३१ ते ३४ यांच्या बाबतीत तेच करावे.
- १५ बाब ३४, अितर कारणे असल्यास, पाहा : 'सर्वसाधारण' विभाग, सूचना क्र. ८.
- १६ बाब ३५, माहिती संबंध कुटुंबासाठी अेकत्रित धावी. सबसिडीबाबत पाहा : 'सर्वसाधारण' विभाग, सूचना क्र. ५, सबसिडी आणि कर्ज मिळाले नसल्यास दोन्ही स्तंभासाठी '०' (शून्य) असे लिहा. तथा परिस्थितीत बाब ३६ समोरील स्तंभ कोरे राहतील, मात्र कर्ज मिळाले असल्यास आणि त्यातील काही भाग परत केला असल्यास योग्य ती रक्कम बाब ३६ समोरील 'कर्ज' या स्तंभात लिहावी, परंतु बाब ३६ समोरील 'सबसिडी' हा स्तंभ कोराच राहिल.
- १७ बाबी ३७ ते ४४, खाराकज्जम जमीन अथवा अन्य प्रकारची जमीन मावरील मांडवली खर्चासाठी शेतक-यांना सबसिडी आणि अथवा कर्ज या स्वरुपात आर्थिक साहाय्य देण्याच्या महाराष्ट्र शासनाच्या योजना आहेत. त्यांचा लाभ शेतक-यांना प्रत्यक्षात किती झाला आहे हे जाणून घेण्याचा र्थे प्रस्न केला आहे.

- १८ बाब ३७. अंतर होयानाही पैकी आहे. पाहा : 'सर्वसाधारण' विभाग, सूचना क्र. ४.
- १९ बाबी ३८ ते ४०. वार।खज्ज नपौन नसल्यास या तक्त्यातील सारे स्तंभ कोरे राहतील. जमोन अस्नही सरकारने कोणत्याही प्रकारचा भांडवली खर्च केला नसल्यास सर्व स्तंभातून '०' (शून्य) असे अंतर लिहावे.
- २० बाबी ४१ ते ४४. वरील क्र. १९ ची सूचना पाहा.
- २१ बाब ४५. 'बंदारे' या शब्दाजैवजी 'बांध' हा शब्द घालावा. बांध बांधून दिले नसतील तर स्तंभ कोरे ठेवावेत. बांध बांधून दिले असल्यास जे अंतर असेल त्याचा सर्किट (कोड नंबर) योग्य त्या स्तंभात लिहावा. उदा. 'सर्व ठिकले आहेत' असे अंतर असल्यास त्या स्तंभात '२' असे लिहून अंतर दोन स्तंभ कोरे ठेवावेत.
- २२ बाबी ४६ आणि ४७. बँक, अवजारे विकत घेण्यासाठी शेतकऱ्यांना साहाय्य देण्याच्या शासकीय योजना आहेत. तसेच खरेदीसाठी शेतकरी अन्य मार्गाने पैसा उभा करू शकतात. याविक्रयींची प्रत्यक्ष परिस्थिती जाणून घेण्यासाठी हे प्रश्न विचारले आहेत.
- २३ बाब ४६. कुटुंबाकडे आज बँक नाहीत आणि पाच वर्षांपूर्वीही नव्हते, असे असेल तर स्तंभ १ आणि 'या खाली' '०' (शून्य) असे लिहावे. अंतर स्तंभ कोरे राहतील. समजा आज बँक आहेत परंतु ते विकत घेण्यासाठी कुटुंबास कोणतेही आर्थिक साहाय्य लाभले नसेल तर स्तंभ ३ ते ७ याखाली '०' (शून्य) असे लिहावे.
- २४ बाब क्र. ४७. माहिती भरताना वरील क्र. २३ ची सूचना लक्षात घ्यावी.
- २५ बाबी क्र. ४८ ते ५१. जमीन वस्तू नसलेल्या कुटुंबाच्या बाबतीत सारे स्तंभ कोरे राहतील. शेती करीत असणा-या कुटुंबाविक्रयींची माहिती भरताना खालील गोष्टी लक्षात ठेवाव्यात : (अ) स्तंभ १ मध्ये ज्या पीकांसाठी संकरित बी-वियाणे अित्यादि गोष्टी वापरल्या जातात त्या पीकांची नावे लिहायची आहेत. (आ) स्तंभ २ पोळ्या ठेवावा. (अि) स्तंभ ३ ते ६. अेकाहून अधिक अेजन्सीकडून संबंधित वस्तु मिळत असल्यास त्या त्या स्तंभात माहिती लिहावी. उदा. समजा ज्वारीसाठी संकरित बी-वियाणे काही प्रमाणात सहकारी संस्थेकडून मिळविले आणि काही बाजारात विकत घेतले असे कुटुंबाने सांगितले तर त्या पिकासमोरील स्तंभ ४ मध्ये 'सहकारी संस्था' आणि स्तंभ ५ मध्ये 'बाजारात' असे लिहावे. (अि) स्तंभ ७ आणि ८. वेगवेगळ्या वस्तूसाठी (बी-वियाणे अित्यादि) जे सरकारी साहाय्य पीकवार मिळते त्याच्या रकमा रकमात या स्तंभातून लिहाव्यात.

- साहाय्य मिळत नसल्यास '०' (शून्य) असे लिहावे.
२६. बाबी ५२ ते ५५. जमीन कसत नसलेल्या कुटुंबांच्या बाबतीत सारे स्तंभ कोरे राहतील. शेतकरी कुटुंबाने यापैकी प्रत्येक बाबीच्या बाबतीत दिलेले अतिर पेटिकेट लिहिताना पाहा : 'सर्वसाधारण' विभाग, सूचना क्र. ४ आणि ८.
२७. बाबी ५६ ते ६०. ज्या कुटुंबातील व्यक्ती सहकारी फर्मास्थेच्या सभासद असतील त्या कुटुंबाच्या बाबतीत ही जागा कोरी ठेवावी. माहिती भरावी लागणार असल्यास पाहा : 'सर्वसाधारण' विभाग सूचना क्र. ४ आणि ८.
२८. बाबी ६१ ते ६४. शेतकऱ्यांची पीककर्जे नाफ करण्याच्या सरकारी योजनांचा लाभ कोणकोणत्या कुटुंबाना किती प्रमाणात झाला आहे हे जाणून घ्यायचे आहे. स्तंभ १ मधील क्रमांकासंबंधीची टीप काळजीपूर्वक वाचावी. स्तंभ १अे मध्ये व्यक्तीचे नाव लिहावे. कुटुंबातील कोणाही व्यक्तीचे पीककर्जे नाफ करण्यात आले नसल्यास सारा तक्ता कोरा ठेवावा, नाफ करण्यात आले असल्यास केवळ साल सांगावे.
२९. बाबी ६५ ते ८६ (जलसिंचन). जमीन कसत नसलेल्यांच्या बाबतीत हा संपूर्ण भाग कोरा राहिल. पाहा : 'सर्वसाधारण' विभाग, सूचना क्र. ७. जे शेतकरी करीत असतील त्यांची अतिर लिहून घेताना घ्यानात घ्यायच्या गोष्टी खाली दिल्या आहेत.
३०. बाबी ६५ ते ६७. जलसिंचनाचा विशिष्ट प्रकार वापरला जात नसेल तर योग्य त्या अकर-गुठे स्तंभात '० ०' (शून्य) असे लिहावे. अदा. समजा उपसा-सिंचनाखाली पाच वर्षांपूर्वी जमीन नव्हती परंतु आज आहे. बाब ६७ समोर स्तंभ २ आणि स्तंभ ३ मध्ये अकर-गुठे लिहून स्तंभ ४ आणि ५ मध्ये '० ०' (शून्य) असे लिहावे.
३१. बाब ६८. पाहा : 'सर्वसाधारण' विभाग, सूचना क्र. ४.
३२. बाब ६९. योग्य तो सर्किल (कोड नंबर) लिहावा. (१, २ अथवा ३). अदा. 'मुळीच घेतले नाही' असे अतिर असल्यास स्तंभ ३ मध्ये ३ असे लिहावे.
३३. बाबी क्र. ७० ते ७३. पाहा : 'सर्वसाधारण' विभाग, सूचना क्र. ४ आणि ८.
३४. बाब क्र. ७१. 'परीघावर' या शब्दाऐवजी 'बाहेर' हा शब्द घालावा.
३५. बाबी क्र. ७४ ते ७६. पाहा : 'सर्वसाधारण' विभाग, सूचना क्र. ४.
३६. बाब ७६. जलानुबंधन (water logging) म्हणजे पाणी साठत राहिल्याने जमीन शेतीसाठी निरुपयोगी ठरणे.
३७. बाब क्र. ७७. तसे नसल्यास, जागा कोरी ठेवावी.
३८. बाब क्र. ७८. पाहा : 'सर्वसाधारण' विभाग, सूचना क्र. ४.

- ३९ वाव क्र. ७, दिली नसल्यास, जागा केरी ठेवावी.
- ४० वावी क्र. ८० ते ८३, अतर 'मिळाले नाही' (म्हणजे तिस-या स्तंभातील 'नाही-२') असे असल्यास, स्तंभ ४ आणि ५ त्या त्या वावीपुरते केरे राहतील.
- ४१ वावी क्र. ८४ आणि ८५ : पाहा : 'सर्वसाधारण' विभाग सूचना क्र.४.
- ४२ वाव क्र. ८६, मिळाले नसल्यास, जागा केरी ठेवावी.
- ४३ वावी क्र. ८७ ते ९६ (पिके), गेल्या पाच वर्षात शेती - यात फळवागाही धरायच्या-करत नसलेल्या कुटुंबाच्यावातीत हा संपूर्ण भाग केरा राहिल. अितरांची अतरे लिहून घेताना घ्यानात घ्यायच्या गोष्टी खाली दिल्या आहेत.
- ४४ वाव ८७, पहिल्या स्तंभात पीकांची नावे घायची, दुसरा स्तंभ केरा ठेवावा.
- ४५ वाव ८८, पहिल्या स्तंभात फळांची नावे आणि दुसरा स्तंभ केरा. सरकारी आर्थिक साहाय्य मिळाले नसल्यास स्तंभ ६ आणि ७ यापैकी योग्य त्या अथवा दोन्ही स्तंभात '०' (शून्य) असे लिहावे.
- ४६ वाव ८९, शेतक-यांना मार्गदर्शन करण्यासाठी अशी शिबिरे भरविली जातात.
- ४७ वाव ९१, प्रयोगनिदर्शक शेतीवर उत्पादनाची लाभदायक अशी नवीन तंत्रे वापरली जातात ती पाहिल्यावर त्यांचे महत्त्व पटल्याने शेतकरी ही तंत्रे अवगत करून घेतील अशी अपेक्षा असते.
- ४८ वावी क्र. ९९ ते १५९, अतरे लिहिताना पाहा : 'सर्वसाधारण' विभाग, सूचना क्र. ४.

चौक ३ मजुरीचे भ्रम आणि रोजगार हमी योजना

- १ वाव क्र. १ ते ४, (अ) मजुरी न करणा-या कुटुंबाच्या आबतीत हा संपूर्ण भाग केरा राहिल. मजुरी करणा-या कुटुंबाची अतरे लिहून घेताना घ्यानात घ्यायच्या गोष्टी खाली दिल्या आहेत. (आ) सालदार: वर्षाच्या कराराने काम करणारा मजूर. रोजगार-हमी योजना : महाराष्ट्र शासनाची अभिन्न योजना. जे रोजगार असतात अशांना कामे देण्या-साठी शासनातर्फे रस्तेवांधणी, पाझर तलाव अित्यादि प्रकारची कामे सुरू केली जातात. शासनाने रोजगारीचे दिलेली ही हमी होय.
- २ वाव क्र. १ (तक्ता). (अ) कुटुंबातील मजुरी करणा-या व्यक्तीचा स्तंभ १ मधील क्रमांक, चौक १ मधील तक्त्यातील स्तंभ (०) प्रमाणे घायचा आहे. चौक १ मधील तक्त्यात कुटुंबातील सर्व व्यक्तींची नावे आली आहेत. (आ) स्तंभ २ ते ४, ५ ते ७, ८ ते ११, १२, आणि १३ ते १६ असे तक्त्याचे भाग पाडले आहेत. तक्त्यातील जो भाग अज्ञात मजुरी

करणा-या व्यक्तीच्या बाबतीत प्रस्तुत नसेल तो भाग त्या व्यक्तीच्या बाबतीत कोरा ठेवावा. उदा. रोजगार हमी योजनेत काम न केलेल्या व्यक्तीच्या बाबतीत स्तंभ ८ ते ११ कोरे राहतील. (अ) सर्व संबंधित स्तंभातून मजुरी दर म्हणजे दैनिक दर घरावा आणि त्याप्रमाणे माहिती मरावी. (आ) स्तंभ १२ : पाहा : 'सर्वसाधारण' विभाग, सूचना क्र. ४. (अ) स्तंभ १३ ते १६. नोकरी सोडून जाता येत असल्यास हे स्तंभ कोरे राहतील. नोकरी सोडून जाता येत नसल्यास प्रत्येक स्तंभात योग्य तो सक्तीक लिहावा. उदा. 'मालकाची नोकरी सोडल्यास तो नाराज होतील' अेवढेच अेक कारण दिले असल्यास स्तंभ १४ मध्ये १ हा आकडा लिहावा आणि अितर सर्व स्तंभात २ हा आकडा लिहावा.

३ वाव २. अताराचे तीन पर्याय दिले आहेत. प्रत्येक पर्यायासमोर पेटिका आहे. जो पर्याय कुटुंब सांगेल त्या पर्यायासमोरील पेटिकेत त्या पर्यायाचा सक्तीक (कोड नंबर) लिहा. अितर दोन पेटिका रिक्त म्या राहतील.

४ वाव ३. येथेही तीन पर्याय दिले आहेत. तेव्हा क्र. ३ च्या सूचनेनुसार अतारे लिहा.

५ वाव क्र. ४. पाहा : 'सर्वसाधारण' विभाग सूचना क्र. ४.

६ वाव क्र. ५ ते ८. (अ) वाव क्र. ४ चे अतर 'नाही-२' असे असल्यास, हा सर्व भाग कोरा राहिल. (आ) अतर 'होय-१' असे असल्यास, या बाबींवरील अतारे लिहिताना पाहा : 'सर्वसाधारण' विभाग सूचना क्र. ४ आणि ८.

चौक ४ (पशुसंवर्धन)

१ वाव १. स्तंभ १ ते ४. अेकाद्या प्रकारचा पशुपक्षी नसल्यास योग्य त्या स्तंभात त्या पशुपक्ष्यासमोर '०' (शून्य) असे लिहावे.

२ वाव १. स्तंभ ५ ते ११. गेल्या पाच वर्षांत पशु-पक्षी विकत घेतले नसल्यास हा संपूर्ण भाग कोरा राहिल.

३ वाव २. स्तंभ १ आणि २. संकरित गाऊ नसल्यास, संपूर्ण भाग कोरा.

४ वाव ३. स्तंभ १ आणि २. गेल्या पाच वर्षांत सरकारी सबसिडी मिळाली नसल्यास, रक्कम : ० (शून्य) रनये.

५ वाव ४. शेळ्या पिळाल्या नसल्यास, अतर '०' (शून्य).

६ वाव ५. गाऊ म्हशीचे दूध विकत नसल्यास, संपूर्ण भाग कोरा. विकत असल्यास, स्तंभ २ आणि ३ मधील अतारे लिहिण्यासाठी, पाहा : 'सर्वसाधारण' विभाग, सूचना क्र. ४.

- ७ वाव ६. कोंबडीचो अंडी विक्त नसल्यास संपूर्ण भाग कोरा. विक्त असल्यास, स्तंभ २ आणि ३ मधील उतारे लिहिण्यासाठी पाहा : 'सर्वसाधारण' विभाग, सूचना क्र. ४.
- ८ वावी ७ ते ११. पशुपक्षी नसल्यास हा संपूर्ण भाग कोरा राहिल.
- ९ वाव ७. तीन पर्यायी उतारे आहेत आणि प्रत्येकासभोर पेटिका आहे. उतर एक वा अधिक असू शकतील. समजा दोन उतारे असली तर त्यांच्या पेटिकांमध्ये योग्य ते सैत्तिक लिहावेत. अगलेली पेटिका रिक्त राहिल.
- १० वावी क्र. ९, १०, आणि ११. पशुपक्षी असल्यास योग्य तो सैत्तिक आवश्यक त्या ठिकाणी लिहा. समजा कोंबड्यांना मोफत लस ठोकून मिळाली नाही असे उतर असेल तर वाव क्र. १० (कोंबड्या) सभोरील स्तंभ २ मध्ये 'मिळाली नाही-२' असे लिहावे.
- ११ वाव ११. कृत्रिम रेतन (artificial insemination) : वासरांची पैदास सुधारणी म्हणून कृत्रिम उपार योजून गांभी गाभण राहतील अशी व्यवस्था करणे.
- १२ वावी क्र. १२ आणि १३. वाव ११ चे उतर 'नाही-२' असे असल्यास वावी क्र. १२ आणि १३ यांभोरील पेटिका रिक्त राहिल्या राहतील.

चौक ५ (कर्जाची सोय)

- १ वाव क्र. २, उतर लिहिताना पाहा : 'सर्वसाधारण' विभाग, सूचना क्र. ४.
- २ वाव क्र. १. लाभ मिळाला असल्यास, हा भाग कोरा ठेवावा लागेल. लाभ मिळाला नसल्यास, जे कारण । जे कारणे असतील त्याप्रमाणे पेटिकेत। पेटिकांत योग्य तो । ते सैत्तिक लिहा.
- ३ वाव क्र. ३. 'अितर कारणे' : पाहा, 'सर्वसाधारण' विभाग, सूचना क्र. ८.

चौक ६ (शिक्षण)

- १ वाव १ (वक्ता). प्रत्येक प्रकारासभोर योग्य तो सैत्तिक लिहा. समजा व्हया मोफत मिळाल्या नसतील तर 'व्हया' या नोंदीसभोरील स्तंभ १ कोरा ठेवावा आणि स्तंभ २ मध्ये 'मोफत मिळाल्या नाहीत-२' असे लिहावे. कुटुंबात शिक्षणारी मुले मुली नसल्यास अर्थातच हा संपूर्ण भाग कोरा राहिल.
- २ वाव २. कुटुंबात शिक्षणारी मुलेमुली नसली अथवा अशी मुलेमुली असूनही ती नसतीगृहात राहात नसतील तर हा भाग कोरा ठेवावा. परंतु जर कुटुंबातील मुलेमुली नसतीगृहात राहात असतील तर दिलेले उतर योग्य त्या स्तंभात वेदनेद्वारा लिहावे. उदा. 'संपूर्णतः मोफत' असे उतर असल्यास स्तंभ ३ मध्ये ३ आकडा लिहून अगलेले दोन स्तंभ कोरे ठेवावेत.

चौक ७ (जागेची सोय)

- १ वाव १ (तक्ता). स्तंभ १, अतर लिहिताना पाहा : 'सर्वसाधारण' विभाग, सूचना क्रमांक ४. अतर 'नाही-२' असे असल्यास, स्तंभ २ आणि ३ कोरे राहतील. स्तंभ ४ : अतर लिहिताना पाहा : 'सर्वसाधारण' विभाग, सूचना क्र. ४.

चौक ८ (पिण्याचे पाणी, वीज, सरकारी दुवाखाना अड्ड्यादी)

- १ वाव १ - अकूण ७ पर्याय आहेत. प्रत्येक पर्यायाखाली कसात संकेतांक दिला आहे. जो पर्याय बरोबर असेल त्याच्या खालील पेटिकेत त्या पर्यायाचा संकेतांक लिहा. अरलेल्या पेटिका रिकाम्या राहतील.
- २ वाव क्र. ३ ते ८. पाहा : 'सर्वसाधारण' विभाग सूचना क्र. ४.
- ३ वाव ९ आणि १०. वाव ८ चे अतर होकारार्थी नसल्यास वाव ९ आणि १०, यांसमोरील जागा कोरी ठेवावी. वाव ८ चे अतर होकारार्थी आणि वाव ९ चे नकारार्थी असल्यास वाव १० समोरील जागा कोरी ठेवावी.