



77548

Working Paper No. 187

An Evaluation Study of Integrated Rural Development
Programmes in Quilon District, Kerala.

Students of the
M.Phil Programmes in Applied Economics
1982-83

Centre for Development Studies
Ulloor, Trivandrum 695 011

January 1984

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This study on the Integrated Rural Development Programmes (IRDP) was conducted at Sasthamcotta Block, Quilon District between 13th and 19th of March 1983, on the request of the Government of Kerala, by the M.Phil students (1982-83) under the supervision of Dr. Chandan Mukherjee. Sri C.K.K. Panicker, IAS, then Development Commissioner evinced keen interest in this study. Sri V. Rajagopalan, IAS, Deputy Secretary, Development Department was very helpful in issuing necessary orders from Government.

Sri G.L. Pillai, IAS, District Collector and Chairman, DRDA Quilon District took personal interest in organising the facilities for the team's stay at Sasthamcotta. He also spent an evening with the team discussing various aspects of the programme.

Sri N.Vemaddevan, Project Officer, DRDA, as the Chief Executive of the IRDP in the district and Sri Nizamuddin, BDO and the extension officers, who were responsible for the implementation of the programmes in the Sasthamcotta Block were very helpful and co-operative in the conduct of the study. They sat with the team on many occasions for detailed discussions. They also organised for the benefit of the team a meeting of the officers of the financial institutions and selected non-officials. This meeting was very useful in understanding the problems of implementation.

We made use of the resources of the Centre for Development Studies; financial, physical and intellectual in finalising the report. Dr F.G.K. Panikar, Director, and Sri C.G. Devarajan, Registrar extended all the necessary support.

To all of them we are extremely grateful, for this survey afforded us a good opportunity of understanding the rural life and the efforts that are being made in improving it through various schemes.

September, 1983
Trivandrum.

M.Phil Students
(1982-83)
Centre for Development Studies

1.2. Objectives of the present survey

- a. to assess the impact of IRDP on the beneficiaries. This was done through detailed analysis of the nature and extent of utilization of the assistance. More specifically we have tried to evaluate to what extent the programme succeeded in its objectives of income and employment generation.
- b. to study the effectiveness and coverage of scheduled castes under IRDP.
- c. to identify the limitations/problems involved in the implementation of the programme and as far as possible suggest improvements.

1.3. Scope of the Survey - Selected for our study are two villages, Shasthara and West Kallada of Shasthamcottah block of Kullion district. Shasthara has been selected for its higher percentage of SC population.

1.4. Selection of sample Households -- The households can be divided into categories those identified for assistance and the rest. Within those identified for assistance, there are two groups eligible and assisted (EA) and eligible but not assisted (ENA). From each of the above i.e., EA and ENA the rest or general category within each village a circular systematic sample was drawn. Table presented below shows the population and sample sizes.

Table 1.1.

	Shasthamcottah				West Kallada			
	EA	ENA	G	Total	EA	ENA	G	Total
Village size	38	262	3319	3619	156	146	2135	2437
Sample size	25	25	14	64	27	22	15	64

2. Selection of Households for Assistance : Eligibility and Other Related Issues

2.1. Introduction -- According to the guidelines issued on IDDP, the families having an annual income of Rs.3500 or below or a per capita annual income of 2,700 or below should be deemed as households below the 'poverty line' and are eligible to receive assistance. Priority should naturally be given to the poorest households belonging to this range.

Tables 2.1 to 2.5 showing distribution of sample households according to total and per capita income and expenditure and operational land holdings can be used to check the appropriateness of the authority's decisions regarding eligibility of households. That is, one can see whether it is really the poorest section of the population that has been officially recorded as eligible and given priority in disbursement of assistance. If that is the case then one should expect a larger incidence of poverty among the 'eligible and assisted' (EA) and 'eligible but not assisted' (EMA) households when compared with the 'general' households, i.e., all of the village as a whole. To enable us to make such a comparison we have computed the income of assisted households excluding the income generated by the asset received under IDDP.

The comparison has been carried out using three criteria of identifying a household's relative economic position: (a) total and per capita (i.e., income per family member) income, (b) total and per capita expenditure on major consumer items, e.g. food, clothing fuel and medicine; and (c) the extent of operational holdings which can be considered as generally the most important asset for a rural household.

2.2. Distribution of Total Income -- Tables 2.1 and 2.2 provide necessary information on income distribution. The following points can be made on the basis of an analysis of these tables.

Concentrating on the combined 'total' (i.e., for both the villages combined) in Table 2.1, we find that it is indeed true that the income distribution of both assisted households (before receipt of assistance) and ENA households is biased towards the lowest income classes when compared with general households. 78.84 per cent of AI and 70.21 per cent of ENA households have an annual income of less than Rs.3500 whereas about 60 per cent of general households have an annual income of below Rs.3500.

We can also say that among the identified households, those who have received assistance are on an average worse off than the ENA.

However this is not to say that the identification has been satisfactory. Table 2.1. & 2.2 show that on the basis of annual total income about 21.20 per cent of the assisted households (24.00 per cent in Shasthamcottah and 18.52 per cent in West Kallada) and on the basis of per capita income about 25.00 per cent of the assisted households (28.00 per cent in Shasthamcottah and 22.00 per cent in West Kallada) are above the stipulated limit. Note that, 7.69 per cent (8.00 per cent in Shasthamcottah and 7.40 per cent in West Kallada) are having an annual income of above Rs.10000. Similarly, about 60% of the general sample have an annual income less than Rs.3500 and an even higher proportion with a per capita income of less than Rs.700. The table on landholdings confirms the presence of obvious and extreme exceptions. This conforms to the impression gathered by many investigators that merely the relatively poorer economic position was not uniformly used as the criterion for selection of households. We will elaborate upon this point later. It is equally possible that no thorough household survey with a view to arrive at reasonably accurate estimates of income had been made previous to the implementation of schemes.

Let us also point out an interesting contrast between the two villages in respect of income distribution. In Shasthamcottah the gap between the EA/ENA and general households is much less than in West Kallada. In the former, 76 per cent of assisted, 72 per cent of ENA and 57 per cent of general households are below Rs.3500 limit. In West Kallada the corresponding figures are 81.48 per cent, 74 per cent and 60 per cent. This may imply either (a) that income distribution is less skewed in Shasthamcottah than in West Kallada, or (b) the selection of households for assistance has been better (i.e., more biased towards the lowest income classes) in West Kallada than in Shasthamcottah. Some corroboration for the latter hypothesis may be found in the table on landholdings (Table 2.5) which shows that the incidence of clearly ineligible and hence exceptional cases receiving assistance is higher in Shasthamcottah.

2.3 Distribution of per capita Income -- Table 2.2 showing distribution of the households according to per capita income yields results that do not necessarily correspond to what we have said above. It can be observed that while the proportion of assisted households with a per capita income of less than Rs.700 is higher than the corresponding proportion of general households in both the villages individually and also when combined, the proportion of ENA households below Rs.700 is slightly less than that of general households in at least one village (West Kallada) and also when combined. However, the pattern observed in total income distribution is repeated when we select Rs.525 as the upper limit. This means that in West Kallada, there have been problems of classifying people 'around the poverty line' (Rs.525-700), so to say, and some of them with per capita income just below the poverty line have not been identified as eligible. The actually assisted people are, however, poorer than both ENA and general households in all the cases. Also, our observation that the gap between general and assisted households is less

sharp in Shasthamcottah is valid in the case of per capita income.

2.4 Distribution according to Consumption Expenditure -- Total and per capita consumption expenditure (Table 2.3 and 2.4) apparently do not corroborate the conclusions we have derived from a study of income distribution. It appears that assisted households do not necessarily belong to lower expenditure classes compared to the general households either in villages taken individually or in the combined case. But one need not be too much concerned about this apparent contradiction in our data, for the expenditure figures refer to the current period, that is, after income the IRDP assets have started being realized. Expenditure figures before distribution of IRDP asset have not been collected as they are more likely to be affected by loss of memory.

2.5 Distribution of Operational Holdings -- Table 2.5 on operational holdings shows that three assisted households in Shasthamcottah possess very large amount of both paddy and dry. If these cases are ignored then the rest of the households conform to the patterns observed in income distribution tables, namely, the assisted and ENA households have consistently smaller extent of land than that of the general households.

The interesting thing is, then, the fact that some assisted households in one village at least do seem to possess assets in land of an order well above average. This confirms our observation earlier that a few households in the assisted category are very clearly ineligible in terms of total per capita income.

2.6 Direction of Assistance to SC/OBC households -- An analysis of the table on occupation and caste (Table 2.6) shows that the SC beneficiaries form 26.90 per cent of total number of households assisted (31.00 per cent for Shasthacottah and 29.63 per cent for West Ballada). According to the IRDP instructions the percentage of SC families in the total number of assisted families should not be less than 20 per cent. In view of the fact that the percentage of SC population to the total population in Shasthacottah is higher than the state average, the percentage of assisted SC households should have been more than 30 per cent. However, a very large proportion of assisted households (46.20 per cent) belong to OBC (other backward castes).

2.7 Distribution of Assistance according to Occupation -- The same table also shows that of the 52 families, 3 are marginal farmers (5.77 per cent), 19 agricultural labourers (36.54 per cent), 5 nonagricultural labourers (9.62 per cent), 20 self-employed (38.46 per cent) and 5 engaged in miscellaneous activities (9.62 per cent). 48.08 per cent of the beneficiary families have agriculture as their main source of income and among them 13.64 per cent are cultivators. The SC households are, however, almost entirely agricultural labourers (11 out of 14). 2 are nonagricultural labourers and only one is self-employed, which is a reflection on the general economic condition of the Scheduled Caste families in the area.

2.8 Distribution of Schemes by Caste -- An issue related to this is how the SC households fare in the distribution of schemes. We have tried to find out whether the assisted households are really the poorest section of the population or not. To extend this a little further, assuming that SC households are generally the poorest among all assisted households and given the government's special concern for the welfare of the SC population in

particular, it would be worthwhile to see whether these people do in fact receive higher-valued schemes and larger assistance on an average for the same type of scheme. Table 2.7 summarizes the information relating to this point.

If one observes the information for both the villages combined, SC households on an average seem to receive less amount than CBC households and general households, though the difference is negligible. However, this seems to be because some higher-valued schemes (lime kiln, fishing nets, typewriter, duck rearing, shops) which presuppose some skill or resource on the beneficiary's possession have systematically gone to non-SC households. This is natural given that most SC households do not possess any particular skill and are mostly engaged in various kinds of labour (see Table 2.6).

3 schemes have been given to all types of households: dairy, well and sewing machines. We have commented elsewhere that the variation in the amount of assistance for such schemes like irrigation well and sewing machine seems to depend on such technical matters as soil quality or the type of machine. For dairy, however, SC households do get larger amount on an average than CBC or general households, though the difference once again does not seem to be very significant.

On the whole, it is rather difficult to comment on this issue due to the very small number of observations we have in each category. It is all the more difficult, for the same reason, to comment on the situation in individual villages as such.

2.9 Conclusions -- The main objective of this section has been to check the eligibility of the assisted households. We can conclude by restating our main observations,

Though as a general rule, identification of households and disbursement of assistance seem to have been properly carried out, there exist a few notable exceptions. While the general sample consists of people who are eminently eligible but have not been officially identified, the assisted category includes people who are very clearly ineligible. It is, then, worthwhile to see how much of this can be classified as pure error in the identification process and how much of it is due to some other criteria being implicitly adopted in distribution of assistance. Much of our comments on this point, however, is based on impressions of the investigators.

To those households that are ineligible belong people not only possessing/operating substantial land area, but also persons having a steady and secure alternative source of income (e.g. pensions) or running a fairly well-established medium-scale enterprise in the village. In some of the cases of this third category, the implicit motive behind giving assistance is perhaps not difficult to understand. It may be meant to encourage people who have developed their skill to a high degree and specialized in particular occupations (e.g., poultry, tailoring etc.), no matter what their relative position around the poverty line in. However, not all of the ineligible but assisted households fall into this category and those who do seem to point to some error in the identification process, though their number is not numerically very significant.

Table 2.1

DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO ANNUAL TOTAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Household Income (Rs)	Categories	Shastha cottah						West Kallada						Total					
		Assisted		PNA		General		Assisted		PNA		General		Assisted		PNA		General	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
0 - 1500		4	16.00	5	20.00	5	35.71	11	40.74	11	50.00	4	26.67	15	28.85	16	37.04	9	31.04
1501 - 2500		9	36.00	6	24.00	2	14.29	7	25.93	3	13.64	3	20.00	13	25.00	9	19.15	5	17.24
2501 - 3500		6	24.00	6	24.00	1	7.14	4	14.81	2	9.09	2	13.33	9	17.31	8	17.02	3	10.34
3501 - 5000		2	8.00	1	4.00	1	7.14	0	--	2	9.09	4	26.66	5	9.62	3	6.28	5	17.24
5001 - 10000		2	8.00	7	28.00	4	28.58	3	11.11	2	9.09	1	6.67	6	11.54	9	19.15	5	17.24
10000 +		2	8.00	0	--	1	7.14	2	7.41	2	9.09	1	6.67	4	7.69	2	4.26	2	6.90
Total		25	100.00	25	100.00	14	100.00	27	100.00	22	100.00	15	100.00	52	100.00	47	100.00	29	100.00

Table 2.2
DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO ANNUAL PER CAPITA INCOME

Per-capita Income (Rs.)	Categories	Shasthamcottak						West Kallada						Total					
		Assisted		EWA		General		Assisted		EWA		General		Assisted		EWA		General	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
0 - 175		12	8.00	4	16.00	1	7.14	9	33.33	7	31.82	3	20.00	11	21.15	11	23.40	4	13.79
176 - 350		107	28.00	6	24.00	4	28.59	7	25.93	5	22.73	3	20.00	14	26.93	11	23.40	7	24.15
351 - 525		78	32.00	6	24.00	3	21.42	5	18.52	2	9.09	3	20.00	13	25.00	8	17.02	6	20.69
526 - 700		00	0	1	4.00	1	7.14	1	3.70	2	9.09	3	20.00	1	1.92	3	6.30	4	13.79
701 - 1000		22	8.00	2	8.00	3	21.42	2	7.41	4	18.18	1	6.67	4	7.69	6	12.77	4	13.79
1000 +		56	24.00	6	22.00	2	14.29	3	11.11	2	9.09	2	13.33	9	17.31	8	17.02	4	13.79
Total		25	100.00	25	100.00	14	100.00	27	100.00	22	100.00	15	100.00	52	100.00	47	100.00	29	100.00

Table 2.3

DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO ANNUAL TOTAL CONSUMPTION EXPENDITURE

Household Expendi- ture (Rs.)	Categories		Shasthamcottah						West Kallada						Total					
			Assisted		EMA		General		Assisted		EMA		General		Assisted		EMA		General	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
	0 - 1500	0	-	1	4.00	2	14.29	0	-	2	9.09	2	13.33	0	-	3	6.38	4	13.79	
1501 - 2500	0	-	4	16.00	0	-	3	11.11	4	18.18	0	-	3	5.77	8	17.03	0	-		
2501 - 3500	4	16.00	4	16.00	2	14.29	3	11.11	1	4.55	3	20.00	7	13.46	5	10.64	5	17.25		
3501 - 5000	8	32.00	10	40.00	3	21.42	2	7.41	3	13.64	3	20.00	10	19.23	13	27.67	6	20.69		
5001 - 10000	9	36.00	4	16.00	2	14.29	10	37.04	8	36.35	4	26.67	19	36.54	12	25.54	6	20.69		
1000	2	8.00	0	-	4	28.57	5	18.52	1	4.55	0	-	7	13.46	1	2.13	4	13.79		
No Information	2	8.00	2	8.00	1	7.14	4	14.81	3	13.64	3	20.00	6	11.54	5	10.61	4	13.79		
Total	25	100.00	25	100.00	14	100.00	27	100.00	22	100.00	15	100.00	52	100.00	47	100.00	29	100.00		

Table 2.4

DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO ANNUAL PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION EXPENDITURE (Rs.)

Per Capita Expenditure (Rs.)	Categories		Shasthamscootah						West Kallada						Total							
			Assisted		EMA		General		Assisted		EMA		General		Assisted		EMA		General			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
0 - 175	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	4.55	1	6.67	0	-	1	2.13	1	3.45				
176 - 350	1	4.35	4	16.00	1	7.14	1	3.70	2	9.09	1	6.67	2	3.85	6	12.77	2	6.90				
351 - 525	0	0.00	7	28.00	0	-	4	14.81	1	4.55	2	13.33	6	11.54	8	17.02	2	6.90				
525 - 700	5	24.09	4	16.00	5	35.71	2	7.41	4	18.18	1	6.67	8	15.38	8	17.02	6	18.69				
701 - 1000	7	28.00	5	20.00	2	14.29	5	18.52	9	40.90	5	33.33	12	23.07	14	30.78	7	24.14				
1001 +	7	28.00	2	12.00	5	35.71	11	40.75	2	9.09	2	13.33	18	34.61	5	10.64	7	24.14				
No. Information	2	8.70	1	8.00	1	7.14	4	14.81	3	13.64	3	20.00	6	11.54	5	10.64	4	13.79				
Total	25	100.00	25	100.00	14	100.00	127	100.00	22	100.00	15	100.00	18	100.00	77	100.00	29	100.00				



DISTRIBUTION OF OPERATIONAL HOLDINGS

Categories	Area operated (in cents)	Shasthamcotta				West Lallada					
		10 - 25	26 - 50	51 - 100	100 +	Total	10 - 25	26 - 50	51 - 100	100 +	Total
Assisted:-					2(100.00)						
1. Landless					1(100.00)					1(100.00)	
2. Only Wet land	1(100.00)				1(100.00)						
3. Only Dry Land	8(44.44)	13(55.56)			18(100.00)	19(90.48)		1(4.76)	1(4.76)	21(100.00)	
4. Wet and Dry		1(25.00)		3(75.00)	4(100.00)	1(25.00)	3(75.00)			4(100.00)	
(a) Wet (average cents)		10		71	55.75	10	17.67			15.50	
(b) Dry (average cents)		28		153	121.75	10	12.67			12.00	
EMA:-					1(100.00)						
1. Landless					1(100.00)						
2. Only Wet Land											
3. Only Dry Land	6(30.00)	9(45.00)	4(20.00)	1(5.00)	20(100.00)	12(80.00)	1(6.67)	2(13.33)		15(100.00)	
4. Wet and Dry	1(25.00)		2(50.00)	1(25.00)	4(100.00)		6(75.00)	1(12.50)	1(12.50)	8(100.00)	
(a) Wet (average cents)	10		10	50	20.00		18.83	10	25	22.25	
(b) Dry (average cents)	12		71	55	52.25		13.50	5	100	13.13	
General:-					1(100.00)						
1. Landless					1(100.00)						
2. Only Wet Land				1(100.00)	1(100.00)						
3. Only Dry Land	3(30.00)	2(20.00)	4(40.00)	1(10.00)	10(100.00)	9(81.82)	1(9.09)	1(9.09)		11(100.00)	
4. Wet and Dry		1(50.00)	1(50.00)		2(100.00)		1(25.00)	2(50.00)	1(25.00)	4(100.00)	
(a) Wet (average cents)		18	40		29.00		9	38	50	33.75	
(b) Dry (average cents)		23	50		36.50		20	19	210	67.00	

Note: Number of households in each size-class as a proportion of total of all size-classes is given in brackets.

(Table continued on p 15)

Table 2.5 (Continued)
DISTRIBUTION OF OPERATIONAL HOLDINGS

Categories	Area operated (in cents)	Total				Total
		0 - 25	26 - 50	51 -100	100+	
Assisted:-						
1. Landless		1(100.00)				3(100.00)
2. Only Wet Land		1(100.00)				1(100.00)
3. Only Dry Land		27(69.23)	10(25.64)	1(2.56)	1(2.56)	39(99.99)
4. Wet and Dry		1(12.50)	4(50.00)		3(37.50)	8(100.00)
(a) Wet (average in cents)		10	15.50		71	35.63
(b) Dry (average in cents)		10	16.50		153	66.88
EMA:-						
1. Landless						1(100.00)
2. Only Wet Land						
3. Only Dry Land		18(51.43)	10(28.57)	6(17.14)	1(2.86)	35(100.00)
4. Wet and Dry		1(8.33)	6(50.00)	3(25.00)	2(16.67)	12(100.00)
(a) Wet (average cent)		10	18.33	20	37.50	21.50
(b) Dry (average cents)		12	13.50	40	77.50	26.17
General:-						
1. Landless						1(100.00)
2. Only Wet Land					1(100.00)	1(100.00)
3. Only Dry Land		12(57.14)	3(14.29)	5(23.81)	1(4.76)	21(100.00)
4. Wet and Dry			2(33.33)	3(50.00)	1(16.67)	6(100.00)
(a) Wet (average cents)			39.00	38	50	32.17
(b) Dry (average cents)			36.50	10	210	53.50

Notes: Number of households in each size-class as a proportion of total of all size-classes is given in brackets.



DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO MAIN OCCUPATION AND CASTE

Main Occupation	Caste				West Chhatis			
	SC	ST	Others	Total	SC	ST	Others	Total
Assisted:-								
1. Cultivator			3(100.00)	3(100.00)				
2. AL	5(50.00)	1(10.00)	1(10.00)	7(100.00)	6(66.67)	3(33.33)		9(100.00)
3. NAL	1(100.00)			1(100.00)	1(25.00)	2(50.00)	1(25.00)	4(100.00)
4. Self-employed		2(50.00)	2(50.00)	4(100.00)	1(2.22)	8(66.67)	3(25.00)	12(100.00)
5. Others		1(33.33)	1(33.33)	2(100.00)		1(50.00)	1(50.00)	2(100.00)
All Categories	6(54.55)	4(33.33)	5(36.00)	15(100.00)	8(28.63)	14(51.85)	5(18.52)	27
EMA:-								
1. Cultivator		1(27.78)	7(77.78)	8(100.00)		2(50.00)	2(50.00)	4(100.00)
2. AL	1(50.00)		1(50.00)	2(100.00)	5(62.50)	2(25.00)	1(12.50)	8(100.00)
3. NAL			1(100.00)	1(100.00)	1(33.33)	1(33.33)	1(33.33)	3(100.00)
4. Self-employed	1(16.67)	3(50.00)	2(33.33)	6(100.00)		1(25.00)	2(50.00)	5(100.00)
5. Others	2(28.57)	1(38.89)	3(42.86)	6(100.00)	1(50.00)	1(50.00)		2(100.00)
All Categories	4(16.00)	7(28.00)	12(48.00)	23(100.00)	7(30.43)	7(30.43)	4(17.39)	18(78.18)
General:-								
1. Cultivator	1(20.00)	2(40.00)	2(40.00)	5(100.00)		1(100.00)		1(100.00)
2. AL	2(100.00)	1(50.00)	12(25.00)	15(100.00)	1(25.00)	2(50.00)	1(25.00)	4(100.00)
3. NAL			1(100.00)	1(100.00)	1(50.00)	1(50.00)		2(100.00)
4. Self-employed		1(100.00)		1(100.00)		1(66.67)	1(33.33)	2(100.00)
5. Others	1(33.33)		2(66.67)	3(100.00)		1(20.00)	2(40.00)	3(100.00)
All Categories	4(20.00)	4(20.00)	6(30.00)	14(100.00)	2(14.29)	5(35.71)	4(28.57)	11(100.00)
Grand Total	17(31.82)	21(31.82)	35(52.31)	73(100.00)	17(26.56)	30(41.88)	17(26.56)	64(100.00)

Notes:- (1) AL = Agricultural labourer NAL = Non agricultural labourer

(2) percentage of caste in total is shown in brackets.

Page No.

Table 2.8 (Continuation)

DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO MAIN OCCUPATION AND CASTE

Main Occupation \ Caste	Total			Total
	SC	OBC	Others	
Assisted:-				
1. Cultivation			3(100.00)	3(100.00)
2. AL	11(57.89)	7(36.84)	1(5.26)	19(100.00)
3. NAL	2(40.00)	2(40.00)	1(20.00)	5(100.00)
4. Self-employed	1(5.00)	12(60.00)	7(35.00)	20(100.00)
5. Others		3(60.00)	2(40.00)	5(100.00)
All Categories	14(26.92)	24(46.15)	14(26.92)	52(100.00)
ENA:-				
1. Cultivation		4(30.77)	9(69.23)	13(100.00)
2. AL	6(60.00)	2(20.00)	2(20.00)	10(100.00)
3. NAL	1(25.00)	1(25.00)	2(50.00)	4(100.00)
4. Self-employed	1(9.09)	6(54.55)	4(36.36)	11(100.00)
5. Others	3(33.33)	3(33.33)	3(33.33)	9(100.00)
All Categories	11(23.40)	16(34.04)	20(42.55)	47(100.00)
General:-				
1. Cultivation	1(16.67)	3(50.00)	2(33.33)	6(100.00)
2. AL	3(37.50)	3(37.50)	2(25.00)	8(100.00)
3. NAL	1(33.33)	1(33.33)	1(33.33)	3(100.00)
4. Self-employed		3(75.00)	1(25.00)	4(100.00)
5. Others	1(12.50)	1(12.50)	6(75.00)	8(100.00)
All Categories	6(20.69)	11(37.93)	12(41.38)	29(100.00)
Grand Total	31(24.22)	51(39.84)	46(35.94)	128(100.00)

Notes: 1. AL = Agricultural Labourer, NAL = Nonagricultural wage labourer

2. Percentage of caste in total is shown in brackets.

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHEMES BY CASTE

Scheme \ Category	Chathanacottah			West Mallada			All		
	SC	OBC	General	SC	OBC	General	SC	OBC	General
1. Well	1(1000.00)	1(2000.00)	1(3000.00)		1(2000.00)		1(1000.00)	2(2000.00)	1(3000.00)
2. Work Bullock	1(1000.00)			1(2000.00)			2(1666.67)		
3. Dairy	3(2953.33)	3(2833.33)	1(2000.00)	3(3000.00)	5(2700.00)	1(3000.00)	6(2853.33)	8(2750.00)	2(2500.00)
4. Duck-rearing			1(3000.00)						1(3000.00)
5. Goat-rearing	2(1000.00)						2(1000.00)		
6. Bullock Cart		1(4000.00)	1(5000.00)	1(5000.00)			1(5000.00)	1(4000.00)	1(5000.00)
7. Cycles		2(900.00)	3(1250.00)			1(1200.00)		2(900.00)	5(1230.00)
8. Woodsawing Mach.				2(359.50)			2(359.50)		
9. Typewriter			1(5000.00)						1(5000.00)
10. Shops					1(1500.00)	1(2500.00)		1(1500.00)	1(2500.00)
11. Tailoring	2(937.50)	2(1200.00)	2(1250.00)	1(1157.00)	2(1700.00)	1(900.00)	3(1010.67)	4(1450.00)	3(1133.33)
12. Fishing nets/ Bats					3(3000.00)			3(3000.00)	
13. Coir Matting					2(350.00)			2(350.00)	
14. Lime Kiln		1(4500.00)						1(4500.00)	
All Schemes	9(1630.55)	10(2320.00)	10(2425.00)	8(2234.50)	14(2150.00)	50(1760.00)	17(1894.53)	24(2139.58)	15(2202.00)

Note:- Average amount of assistance is shown in brackets.

3. Schemewise Distribution of Households

Table 3.1 shows that 52 sample families have been assisted under 56 schemes, 4 families (all of them belonging to Shasthamcotta) enjoying benefits under two schemes each. Agricultural schemes account for 12.5 per cent of the households, animal husbandry 32.14 per cent, services 26.79 per cent and artisans 28.57 per cent. Among individual schemes, dairy units account for 26.80 per cent of the households, followed by sewing machines (17.86 per cent) and cycles (12.50 per cent). The proportion of funds going to different schemes also correspond to the above pattern. Animal husbandry receiving 40.26 per cent of the funds, services 25.89 per cent, artisans 22.69 per cent and agricultural schemes 11.18 per cent.

The overwhelming relative importance of two schemes, namely, milch animal and sewing machine is perhaps explained in terms of their universal usability. Profitable utilization of assistance like these need not depend on technical skill of a very high order. The eligible households consist of a number of cases where no member has a regular round-the-year occupation while many persons technically belonging to the working force are unemployed. The heterogeneity of the occupational structure of these households and the absence of particular skill may be the reasons why milch animal and sewing machine are of such importance.

The column on the range of assistance given to households under each scheme shows that for most of the schemes, the range is either zero or negligible. The variation in the amount of assistance for such schemes as dairy, goat-rearing or tailoring can be explained by actually observed differences in the quality of the asset (e.g.) hybrid cows as against local

DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTED HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO IRDP SCHEMES

Type of Scheme	No. of schemes and Loan Amount	Chasthancootah				West Kallada				Total			
		No. of Respondent		Loan Amount		No. of Respondent		Loan Amount		No. of Respondent		Loan Amount	
		f	%	Range	Average	f	%	Range	Average	f	%	Range	Average
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
Agriculture:													
1. Irrigation-Well		3	10.34	2000	2000	1	3.70		2000	4	7.14		2000
2. Work Bullock		2	6.90	0	1500	1	3.70	-	2000	3	5.36	0	1666.6
Total		5	17.24		1800	2	7.41		2000	7	12.50		1857.1
Animal Husbandry:													
1. Dairy		6	20.69	500	2883.3	9	33.33	500	2833.3	15	26.79	500	2853.3
2. Ducks		1	3.45	-	3000					1	1.79	-	2000
3. Goats		2	6.90	1000	1000					2	3.57	1000	1000
Total		9	31.03		2366.6	9	33.33		2833.3	18	32.14		2600
Services:													
1. Bullock Cart		2	6.90	0	4500	1	3.70	-	5000	3	5.36	0	4666.67
2. Cycles		5	17.24	600	1110	2	7.41	600	1200	7	12.50	600	1207.1
3. Wood sawing						2	7.41	23	359.5	2	3.57	23	359.5
4. Typewriting		1	3.45	-	5000					1	1.79	-	5000
5. Shops						2	7.41	1000	4000	2	3.57	1000	4000
Total		8	27.59		2506.3	7	25.93			15	26.79		

(Continued)

Table 3.1 (Continuation)

DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTED HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO IRDP SCHEMES

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Artisans:												
1. Tailoring	5	20.69	525	879.17	4	14.81	1600	1364.3	10	17.86	1600	
2. Fishing Boats					3	11.11	0	3000	3	5.36	0	3000
3. Coir Machinery					2	7.41	0	350	2	3.57	0	350
4. Lime Kiln	1	3.45	-	4500					1	1.79	-	4500
Total	7	24.14		1603.6	9	33.33		1684.1	16	28.57		2273.9
Grand Total	29	100.00			27	100.00			56	100.00		

varieties, the type of machinery, etc.). Similarly, differences in soil quality may explain variations in the assistance given to dig wells. The relatively higher range in the case of cycles is explained by the fact that a number of established shopkeepers hiring out cycles have been giving 2 cycles at a time.

4. The Average Amount of Assistance:

The average assistance per household works out to Rs.2236 (Rs.2147 for SC families). SC families received 26.79 per cent of all the schemes and 25.85 per cent of the funds.

As we have already seen, the amount of assistance depends on the scheme and not on the person's income. Table 4.1 shows that both very poor and the top income bracket households are given the more expensive schemes. The average amount per household works out to Rs.2567.33 for the poorest class and Rs.2460 for the top income class, both significantly above average. In contrast, the average amount given to the middle income classes, particularly households with income above Rs.3500 but below Rs.10,000 is much less than the overall average. Since it is true of both the villages, this pattern may not be purely due to chance. It may indicate that while the poorest classes naturally receive the more expensive schemes, the top-income class households also can receive the same.

Table 4.1

AVERAGE AMOUNT RECEIVED BY HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO INCOME CLASSES
(Rs)

Villages	Shasthamcottah	West Kallada	Total
Size-class			
0 - 1500	3433.33	2278.67	2567.33
1501 - 2500	1909.38	2606.25	2257.81
2501 - 3500	2757.14	1232.67	2299.80
3501 - 5000	2000.00	1700.00	1850.00
5001 - 10000	2250.00	1633.33	1880.00
10000+	2333.33	2500.00	2400.00
All Sizes	2463.00	2025.04	2235.60

5. Analysis of Benefits from the IRDP Scheme

5.1 Perhaps the most important part of our analysis is an evaluation of the performance of various schemes in respect of additional income and employment generation. The analysis of income generation is carried out in three stages. In section 5.1, a highly aggregative table which shows income distributional changes after disbursement of IRDP assistance has been discussed. The table is aggregative in the sense that it does not either attempt to treat different schemes or the different categories of assisted people in different ways. That is evidently partial and one has to recognize the heterogeneity in both. Hence two more sections are introduced in one of which we distinguish between the major types of assistance recipients according to a few suitable criteria and then compare the experience of different types and in the other, we have analysed the benefits received from IRDP assets schemewise. Finally, in the last section, the question of additional employment has been discussed.

5.2 Changes in Income Distribution : Table 5.1 and 5.2 presents income distribution before and after receipt of assistance. In the case of a total of 30 schemes out of 56 (53.57 per cent), a clearcut positive yield has been reported.

It can be further seen from the tables that about one-third (34.03%) of the households have crossed a total income of Rs.3500 p.a. (the percentage having come down from 80.84% to 46.81%), while 27.66% have crossed Rs.2500 p.a. In terms of per capita income, 17.02% of the households have crossed Rs.700 p.a. while 23.40% have crossed Rs.525 p.a.

The concept of 'poverty line' in estimating the number of poor people may be considered as arbitrary in view of the problem of measuring or even conceptualising the poverty line itself. Besides, if our purpose in using any such index is to estimate the number of people who need institutional help then poverty line can be quite misleading since it tends to suggest that anyone above the line no longer deserves institutional help as much as those below the line do which may be quite far removed from reality.

This objection to the use of poverty line is not meant to deny the fact that there has taken place a distinct improvement in income distribution among sample households. While it does suggest some degree of success for the programme, even this result does not offer much valuable insights, for, the households vary significantly in their capacity to utilize the asset. Fortunately we have the necessary qualitative information to make a disaggregative analysis possible where different types of households can be compared.

5.3 Analysis of Benefits from the scheme by Types of Households

One thing which struck the investigators is the fact that the assisted households form an extremely heterogeneous category in respect of their capacity to use the asset. This fact must be taken into account in any analysis of their experience. The sources of heterogeneity are as follows:- (a) the time elapsed after receipt of assistance. In the case of many schemes (e.g. sewing machine) the yield picks up after a time lag (i.e. after the people of the village know about the machine). Therefore, households under the same scheme but with different dates of receipt of assistance should be treated separately.

(b) The nature of the scheme itself. In the case of certain schemes, e.g., coir matting and lime kiln, there exist special problems such as a glut in the market or the need for exceptionally large amount of working capital. These schemes cannot be treated in the same way as the others.

(c) The correspondence between occupation of the beneficiary and the nature of the scheme. It is possible that when a scheme is given with a view to enable a person to expand his main occupation, it can be more successful in the income-generation sense, than otherwise. Thus sewing machine given to an already well-established tailor who is known in the area is likely to be more successful in the above sense than when it is given to the member of an agricultural labourer family. There is, then, the need to distinguish between someone who can use the assistance to expand his main business, and one for whom the question does not arise, meaning an unemployed/retired person or a casual worker with no fixed occupation.

Accordingly, in the discussion that follows we have tried to analyse the incidence of successful utilization by incorporating all these various distinctions. The major distinction is between (a) persons with clearcut occupation-scheme correspondence, (b) persons for whom no such correspondence can be observed between previous occupation and the scheme (these include persons with irregular occupations), and (c) persons who were totally unemployed (or retired) at the time of receiving assistance.

For each of these groups we have classified the responses into five situations:

(i) too early to say. There is no fixed time period for all the schemes that is considered as sufficient to produce results; the decision as to whether it is too early to say or not depends largely on the perception of the investigators and the beneficiaries.

(ii) satisfactory: The actual or potential income generated by the scheme seems to be satisfactory to the beneficiary.

(iii) nil: No or negligible income is being generated or loss being incurred even after a relatively long period of use.

(iv) cannot be ascertained: In particular cases the exact contribution of the scheme itself cannot be measured (e.g. work-bullock given for self-cultivation).

(v) special problems exist. Utilization of the scheme suffers from such exogenous problems (e.g. glut in the market) on which the beneficiary can have little control.

Table 5.3 summarises the classification of various schemes under all these different categories.

First of all, let us point out that the maximum number of respondents belong to the categories of people for whom the assistance is meant for expanding their main business and of those who are engaged in irregular occupations, i.e., for whom the assistance is meant to provide an additional supplementary source of income or an alternative. The number of respondents belonging to all other categories is much smaller and we can easily restrict ourselves to a comparison between these two major categories only.

The conclusion that comes out from a comparison of the experience of these two categories in both the villages is that the incidence of the

assistance not being used properly or not being of much help is much larger in the case of those households for which the main occupation and the scheme do not correspond. One can say that the chance of successful utilization of the scheme is higher if there is some kind of correspondence between the scheme and the main occupation.

Two kinds of policy suggestions can follow from this. First, such a correspondence should be established while distributing schemes as far as possible. A word of caution is necessary here. It is likely that the incidence of poverty is higher for people without any regular occupation. If schemes are always given to people who are already well-established in some kind of occupation and want to use it to expand their wealth, the whole purpose of the programme will be lost. Eligibility should be based on income alone. All that is meant here is that the choice of the scheme should depend upon a more careful consideration of a person's ability to utilize the scheme. A correspondence should be established wherever the scope of it exists. For example, it is useful to consider whether giving a work-bullock to an agricultural labourer family can be more profitable than giving a milch animal or a sewing machine. We have both kinds of households in our sample. We have seen that while work bullock means a decided jump in the labourer's wage rate, the benefits from other kinds of schemes is of an uncertain nature and may not always be realized. This is, however, just a general observation, the ultimate decision must depend on the conditions and preferences of the particular case.

The second kind of policy suggestions would consist of making suitable arrangements to remove some of the typical impediments in the way of successful utilization of a scheme which does not correspond to a beneficiary's existing occupation. Some of these impediments will be discussed

at length in section 6 where we take up the reasons for poor utilization.

5.4 Analysis of Benefits by Types of Schemes

We have already described the relative importance of different schemes. In the present section we will analyse the pattern of utilization and problems involved in it by types of schemes.

(i) Dairy Units:- 40 per cent of the dairy units have gone to agricultural labourers, 27 per cent to shopkeepers (mainly tea shop owners who can use the assistance in their own business) and another 27 per cent to self-employed people of various types. 40 per cent of all recipients are SC families. 73 per cent have an operational holdings of less than 20 cents.

10 out of 15 households (67 per cent) receiving dairy units have reported positive yield ranging from Rs.292 to Rs.3791 per year. 2 are incurring losses and 3 have sold off the assistance. Those who have sold off have done so mostly due to sudden and unforeseen need for money and not necessarily because the assistance itself was unprofitable. Those who are incurring losses have mentioned the relatively low price of milk offered by the cooperative societies and the irregularities in collection of sale proceeds. All but one of the tea shop owners have been successful in using the asset profitably.

(ii) Sewing Machine - 10 households have received sewing machine, 2 of them have been given it as a second scheme. In 6 cases (60 per cent) positive yield has been reported ranging from Rs.300 to Rs.3600 per annum. The incidence of success is higher for already established tailors receiving machine (2 such cases we have in our sample, both are highly

successful). Those who faced problems belong to agricultural labourer or nonagricultural labourer families and except for one isolated case where the beneficiary was married off immediately after the asset was acquired, the reason for poor utilization seems to be a lack of enough market. This is expressed in such typical statements as 'every house has its own sewing machine' in the area already. These beneficiaries do not find enough work to occupy themselves fully and earn satisfactory income.

(iii) Cycles - 7 households have been given cycles. Out of them, in 3 cases, calculation of net income generated by the scheme is impossible since either the assistance has been received too recently or it is used by the beneficiary himself as a means of conveyance in his own business. In 3 other cases, the cycles are hired out on rent and the beneficiaries are earning handsome returns from it. In only 1 case, the cycle has not been used for any commercial purpose as all and the beneficiary is using it for personal purposes.

(iv) Irrigation Well - 4 households who have some land for cultivation of paddy have been given assistance for digging irrigation-wells. But in all the cases the wells are being used for getting drinking-water only. Not only that, the wells have been dug in the homestead lands, sometimes quite far from their cultivated area. It seems that an acute shortage of drinking water is the reason behind this misutilization of funds.

(v) Other Schemes - The number of responses in all other schemes is too small to make any generalized statements. It is useful to record that in the case of schemes like coir matting implements the reasons for

nonutilization are somewhat unique in comparison with other schemes: a general glut in the coir market. Work bullock given to cultivators or agricultural labourer, loans given to shopkeepers to expand their business, fishing boats seem to have been on the whole successfully used.

(vi) Main Findings of Schemewise Analysis - it is useful to sum up the main findings of this section. (a) Certain schemes, e.g., irrigation well or coir-matting seems not to have been properly utilized at all. In the case of coir matting at least, the reason seems to be quite beyond the control of the beneficiaries. (b) The three major schemes, namely, milch animal, sewing machine and cycles have been moderately successful, the proportion of beneficiaries reporting positive yield being 67 per cent, 60 per cent and 42.85 per cent respectively. The net contribution of cycles when used in transport business is, however, difficult to measure and accordingly the concrete estimates available are slightly suspect.

But as we have seen in section 5.2, it would be quite misleading to judge the effectiveness of these schemes merely from the above figures, for, a larger proportion of the successful cases represent occupation - scheme correspondence, namely, they use the assistance to expand the business in which they are already more or less well-established.

5.5 Employment Generation - There is not much concrete data on additional employment created. It is possible to say, however, that certain schemes, e.g., road-transport operation, and fishing boat, there is evidence of hiring in of labour as a result of the scheme. In the case of some other schemes like dairy units, tailoring, goat-rearing poultry, etc., some increase in the hours of work has been reported in the successful cases at least.

5.6. Conclusions - There is evidence that the programme has been to a large measure successful in terms of income generation. Overall distribution of income seems to have been improved and approximately in 60 to 70 per cent cases of the major schemes (namely, dairy and sewing machine) the asset has produced some yield. But it is also to be noted that the successful people and the less successful ones actually belong to two different categories varying in their capacity to utilize the asset. The successful people are generally the ones who are already established in some kind of occupation and use the assistance only to expand their operation. It is, therefore, a major task before the implementing authority to remove some of the typical problems faced by people with irregular occupation (who are also generally poorer) in utilising the assets. In section 6, where we generally discuss some of the limitations of the programme, we will explain a few of these problems as well.

6. Reasons behind Poor Utilization

6.1 Inadequacy of the Amount of Assistance - Nearly in all cases the respondents inform that the amount provided is not enough. In many of these cases, the beneficiaries can overcome this deficiency out of their own resources. But in a number of other cases, paucity of funds has posed a genuine problem. Some of the necessary expenses which have to be incurred but which is not being provided for by the scheme can be mentioned. In the case of dairy units, the animals being of hybrid variety, good care and maintenance is needed. They are to be housed in a clean shed and provided with good feed. But there is no provision for these expenses in the scheme. The incidence of sickness in

Table 5.1

DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTED HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO TOTAL INCOME BEFORE AND AFTER RECEIPT OF IRDP ASSISTANCE

Village	Shasthamcottah				West Kallada				Total			
	Before IRDP		After IRDP		Before IRDP		After IRDP		Before IRDP		After IRDP	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
0 - 1500	4	19.05	2	9.52	11	42.32	7	26.92	15	31.91	9	19.15
1501 - 2500	8	38.06	3	14.29	7	26.92	5	19.23	15	31.91	8	17.02
2501 - 3500	4	19.05	2	9.52	4	15.38	3	11.54	8	17.02	5	10.64
3501 - 5000	2	9.52	7	33.33	0		5	19.23	2	4.26	12	25.53
5000 +	3	14.29	7	33.33	4	15.38	6	23.08	7	14.89	13	26.66
Total*	21	99.97	21	99.99	26	100.00	26	100.00	47	99.99	47	100.00

* Excluding those households for which no information was available on additional income.



Table 5.2

DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTED HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO PER CAPITA INCOME BEFORE AND AFTER RECEIPT OF IRDP ASSISTANCE

Village	Shasthancottah				west Kallada				Total			
	Before IRDP		After IRDP		Before IRDP		After IRDP		Before IRDP		After IRDP	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
0 - 175	1	4.76	0		9	34.62	5	19.23	10	21.28	5	10.64
176 - 350	9	42.86	3	14.29	7	26.92	4	15.38	16	34.04	7	14.89
351 - 525	5	23.81	7	33.33	5	19.23	6	23.08	10	21.28	13	26.66
526 - 700	0	-	2	9.52	1	3.85	2	7.69	1	2.13	4	8.51
700 +	6	28.57	9	42.86	4	15.38	9	34.62	10	21.28	18	38.30
Total *	21	100.00	21	100.00	26	100.00	26	100.00	47	100.00	47	100.00

* Excluding those households for which no information was available on additional income.

Table 5.3

OCCUPATION - SCHEME CORRESPONDENCE AND PERFORMANCE OF IRDP ASSET

Types of Responses Types of Beneficiaries	Too Early to say		Nil		Yielding		Special Problems		Difficult to Ascertain		All categories	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Correspondence between Main Occupation and Scheme	1	4.17	1	4.17	14	58.33	6	25.00	2	8.33	24	100.00
Noncorrespondence between Main Occupation and Scheme	1	4.55	9	40.91	11	50.00			1	4.55	22	100.01
Retired/Unemployed			3	37.50	5	62.50					8	100.00
Occupation Unknown									2	100.00	2	100.00

animals is not negligible. And once the animal is sick, productivity can be affected with little chance of being restored (there are two such instances in the sample). This may work as a vicious circle of yield and income. Similarly, those receiving assistance for irrigation-wells report that no arrangement can be made out of the funds for lifting or carrying the water to the field. The lime kiln is also remaining idle possibly for want of enough working capital.

While it is difficult to meet all such subsidiary expenses out of the programme, it should be recognized that some of these are quite essential. In this connection, let us mention the fact of poor availability of veterinary facilities in both the villages though conditions differ from area to area. The general impression of the investigators is that the facilities are inadequate considering the rapidly increasing needs.

It is also necessary to repeat that the amount of funds given to a person is determined entirely by the scheme itself and not by the economic conditions of the person receiving it. Different people have different capacity to afford the maintenance expenses involved with an asset and those who cannot are generally the poorer people. There should be some provision for special consideration for the more deserving cases.

6.2 The Problem of Market: In a number of cases, nonutilization is attributed to local competition. For some schemes (e.g. wood sawing, bullock cart transport) the competition comes from more mechanized units of service available locally. For others, e.g. a number of sewing machines the problem is one of there being too many established tailors in the area.

Competition being an inevitable factor and since most often the beneficiaries operate at a disadvantage, it is useful to explore methods of institutionally guaranteeing sale/service of the households.

6.3 Choice of Scheme -- Some households seem to have gone in for a scheme without much consideration as to its suitability. They seem to feel that they are getting some asset at least to fall back upon and with a subsidy. Perhaps a more careful selection of the asset would have increased the chances of better utilization.

6.4. Accidental and Unforeseen Reasons-- In quite a few cases, assets have not been properly utilized or even disposed off due to some accidental reasons (e.g., to finance a court cases, sickness in the family, etc). In such cases, however, the programme can do little to prevent nonutilization.

7. Problems of Repayment -- Repayment seems to be quite regular in approximately 50 per cent of the cases. They are generally the more successful users of the asset. However in the rest of the cases, repayment is either irregular or just nil. Not only that, several investigators feel that there exists a general notion that the loans are not necessary to repay (though no complaints were heard about the terms of repayment) because sooner or later the government has to write them off. Many people are not even aware of the repayment terms.

This leads to a problem of larger implications. It is quite unlikely that the actual loan-distributing agencies, namely, the banks find this situation entirely agreeable. With or without such programmes like IRDP, one of the yardsticks of a bank's performance is the extent of loans

recovered in time. In the case of IRDP loans, not only is the risk of default relatively higher, frequently loans do not carry any security. The bank officials themselves admit that the papers carrying a claim to the beneficiary's land will not stand in the court. There is reason to believe that under ordinary circumstances, banks may not be willing to distribute these loans without stricter guarantees. Here, therefore, there is a possibility of conflict between the banks and the administration, which, in its urge to push through the scheme may disregard the banks' problems and may even force the latter to fulfill the targets. Some statements made by both government and bank officials in the course of interviews, point to the presence of such a conflict in a mild form.

A better atmosphere for implementation of a programme of this nature would be where all the different agencies directly in charge of implementation can cooperate and agree on the main issues rather than coerce each other. For this, some degree of guarantee must be there as far as recovery of the loans is concerned. It is beyond the scope of the present report to suggest means of achieving this. We only draw attention to the fact that the situation needs to be improved as far as it is feasible.

g. Other Problems

g.1 Promotion of 'Family Plans' -- IRDP is supposed to be a package programme in which a family can be helped under more than one scheme so that more than one member in a family can be employed. Also, the idea is to give adequate consideration to employment of women members of the family. In our sample, however, only 4 out of 52 families have been

assisted under more than one scheme. The number of women assisted also is quite small.

8.2 Time Taken between Application for Loan and Disbursement - Table 2, presents a distribution of assisted households according to the length of this period.

The interesting thing about this table is that the large majority of households are divided almost in the same proportion between two categories, those who receive assistance in less than 6 months and those who receive in more than 10 months. This is true of both the villages, though in West Kallada the incidence of the period being 10 months or more is slightly less.

This pattern may be due to the fact that the length of the period depends on the scheme. In so far as the bulk of the households receive only two or three types of schemes (dairy, sewing machine or cycle), the frequencies can be concentrated in one or two specific time-periods instead of being spread over all the classes in any uniform pattern. However, this explanation is not perhaps valid. Though we have not attempted to make a detailed examination of the scheme-time period correspondence, a casual look at the schedules has convinced us that the principal schemes cannot be sharply distinguished in terms of the time taken. There is no definite correspondence between the two variables.

The explanation can be sought in the extent of influence the beneficiary can exert on the official process of disbursement. That things like the beneficiary's acquaintance with the officials, etc., matter in this regard have been mentioned by the beneficiaries themselves from time to time. It is possible that while there is a certain 'normal' time long

resulting in this process (10 months or more), such factors as above can reduce the period potentially to less than 6 months. This is, however, more or less an conjecture.

8.3. Cases of Bribery, Tips, etc. -- Not a negligible proportion of the households recognized bribery in some form as a feature of the programme. The assisted but not assisted households often pointed out their unwillingness to pay bribe as the reason for delay in receiving assistance. It is the official who has to arrange for transportation of the officials to his residence when receiving the assistance (particularly in the case of assisted land) and quite often the transportation costs are substantial and demand a tip. However, it did not appear that the beneficiaries considered the amount of bribe paid to be excessive.

8.4. Security Against Loans -- Though it is notified by the Reserve Bank of India that no security other than personal security is required for loans up to Rs. 1000, the bank officials insist on the security of government employees. In some cases they want to keep the house/land patta with them. It is understood that this act has delayed the disbursement of the loan in some cases, and in some, led to the denial of the loan itself.

Table 8.1

TIME BETWEEN APPLICATION AND DISBURSEMENT OF ASSISTANCE			
(months)			
Village	Shasthamcottah	West Kallada	Total
Time			
0 - 3	3(12.00)	8(29.63)	11(21.15)
4 - 6	5(20.00)	7(25.93)	12(23.08)
7 - 9	2(8.00)	1(3.70)	3(5.77)
10 -12	6(24.00)	10(37.04)	16(30.77)
13+	9(36.00)	1(3.70)	10(19.23)
Total	25(100.00)	27(100.00)	52(100.00)

9. Summary and Suggestions

9.1 Summary of Main Findings -- A summary of our main findings have already been presented at the end of each section. For the sake of convenience of the readers, they are restated in this section.

(a) We have seen that though, on the whole, identification of eligible households has been properly carried out, there exist a few notable exceptions. While the general sample consists of people who are, by the income-criterion, definitely eligible to receive assistance but have not been officially identified as such, the assisted category consists of people who are clearly ineligible. Some beneficiaries belonging to the latter (i.e., assisted but ineligible) class had, at the time of receiving assistance, already developed their skill and specialized in particular occupations. Perhaps the assistance was meant to encourage them to consolidate their business. However, there are several other cases where the reasons behind giving loans is unclear and they appear to be pure error in the selection process.

(b) It has been noticed that the amount of assistance does not depend on the person's economic conditions, but on the scheme given.

(c) The programme has been moderately successful in ^{improving} ~~improvement-~~ ^{?!} ing the income distribution in the village. Also, in nearly 60-70 per cent of the cases of the two major schemes (dairy and sewing machines, accounting for about 45 per cent of all the schemes), the asset has produced yields. However, we also found that the bulk of the more successful cases are actually people who have a regular occupation and use the assistance to expand their scale of operation. This is particularly true of sewing machines, cycles, fishing boats, work bullocks etc.

(d) Among the various other problems/limitations of the implementation process we have discussed in the report, absence of any provision for giving assistance towards subsidiary or maintenance expenses is notable. As for repayment of IRDI loans is concerned, a certain lack of awareness for the need to repay has been observed in a number of cases.

9.2 Suggestions -- (a) To improve the process of identification, more thorough household surveys should be conducted in all villages

(b) Choice of scheme should be done more carefully trying to match it as far as possible with any skill the person may already possess in any particular occupation.

(c) Household plans should be drawn up in consultation with the members of the family.

(d) The representatives of weaker sections and other social and political organisations may be involved in the selection of beneficiaries and the list of beneficiaries selected may be notified in a prominent place in every village.

(e) Amount of assistance should depend on the beneficiary's economic conditions and not only on the scheme selected.

(f) Subsidiary expenses should be borne by the programme itself at least for certain kinds of schemes and for the poorest section of the beneficiaries.

(g) Follow-up actions (including, as far as possible institutionally guaranteeing the sale or service from the asset) are specially necessary for those beneficiaries who do not have any particular skill in handling the asset.

(h) Certain schemes related to rural industries should be given greater importance.