CHAPTER 0
INTRODUCTION

0.1 The Problem

The question of the changing conditions of rural labour in India has engaged economists recently. Following Vaidyanathan (1986), attempts have been made to explain the steady and significant shift of rural workforce, in proportional terms, from agricultural to non-agricultural activities over the past two decades. A characteristic feature of these mainly empirical studies, however, is their focus on rural employment as an important issue in itself. This raises problems at three levels for analysing the alleged diversification of the rural economy. First, since sectoral redistribution of rural workforce of a significant order cannot occur within a static economy, a general framework of structural change, bringing out the key new relationships, is essential. In particular, as will be argued later, the actual conditions of accumulation of agrarian surpluses must be taken into account. Secondly, although the studies focusing on employment do discuss various correlates such as landholding pattern, level of commercialisation and so on, the aggregative data sets on different characteristics of rural population are not in general mutually


compatible. Analysis based on these might, therefore, suggest questions and hypotheses, but are of little help in identifying the processes at work. Finally, there is now sufficient recognition of the fact that employment of the wage paid kind, which presupposes the existence of well-defined labour markets, is inappropriate as an analytical category for capturing the conditions of labour use and livelihood among rural households in developing economies.

In sharp contrast to the aforesaid attempts through empirical studies to unravel the mechanics of diversification in rural India, is the present theoretical preoccupation with the agrarian economy. The latter is evident in the growing volume of literature on the structure of agrarian markets, contractual arrangements, institutions and the issues of efficiency associated with them. A relatively low level of commercialisation and a slow growth of surplus in agriculture that obtained in the 50's and 60's, among others, permitted the view of agriculture as a sector in itself, and helped closer scrutiny of the production and exchange processes in the agrarian economy. The force of commercialisation, in the train of Green Revolution, was recognised

---

4. The data sets on employment, landholdings, land-lease, debt, housing and so on mainly arise from independent sample surveys using different concepts and methods.


6. The result is an impressive research output including, especially, Krishna Bharadwaj, Production Conditions in Indian Agriculture, Cambridge University Press, 1974; Amit Bhaduri, The Economic Structure of Backward Agriculture, Macmillian-India, 1984; and K.N. Raj, Organisational Issues in Indian Agriculture, Oxford: Delhi, 1990. To these must be added the attempts to apply categories of Marxian Political Economy to Indian Agriculture by Thorner. See Daniel Thorner, The Shaping of Modern India, Allied Publishers, Bombay, 1980, parts two and three. Also, for the subsequent debate, rather inconsequential, on the 'mode of production' in Indian agriculture, see Utsa Patnaik (ed.), Agrarian Relations and Accumulation - The 'Mode of Production' Debate in India, Sameeksha Trust Books, Bombay.
in its effects on exchange systems in agriculture, but was not seen to upset the reproduction of the essential autonomy of the agrarian economy. Thus, the uncertainty and inadequacy of non-farm employment is posited as an important parameter explaining some of the peculiarities of the functioning of agrarian markets. However, once the growth of agrarian surpluses and their accumulation are allowed for, commercialisation will be seen to acquire a new character, transforming the texture of the economy (see below). It may then not be possible to understand the dynamic consequences for the conditions of rural labour in static, sectoral terms. Furthermore, since the expanding arena of choice available to rural households, as well as the new constraints upon it, would be the result of a complex interaction between commercialisation, accumulation, the role of the state and the political process, an observational basis appropriate for the study of rural labour needs to be generated specifically, and cannot be derived simply from published data.

0.2 Objectives

The present study is an attempt to investigate certain patterns of changes emanating from the economic development of East Godavari, an agriculturally advanced district in Coastal Andhra Pradesh, in the 80's, the focus being on the conditions of rural labour. It is premised that persistent processes of change in the rural economy and society cannot be understood by addressing specific issues such as employment or specific institutions such as labour markets, in

---

7. See, for example, Sheila Bhalla, "New Relations of Production in Haryana Agriculture", Economic and Political Weekly, March 1976.

isolation. An integrated view of accumulation is essential, more so when the general economy is wrought with systemic changes. The focus on the conditions of labour, it should be noted, is warranted by substantive analytical considerations, quite apart from the current discussions on rural diversification. It has been suggested that several economic and social processes associated with economic development would be clarified better if labour, rather than capital and commodities, was brought to the centre-stage of analysis. The main objective of the present study is to understand in the context of the regional economy of East Godavari:

(a) The links between the dynamics of commercial agriculture and the growth of surplus;

(b) The pattern and forms of accumulation at the regional and village levels;

(c) The way the process of accumulation impinges on intersectoral and spatial relationships;

(d) The changes in the feasible labour and income opportunities of the rural labour households in the farm and non-farm sectors;

(e) The role of the state and the conditions of demand in the shaping of accumulation process; and

(f) The implications of all the above for the formation of the rural labour market.

0.3 The Framework

As mentioned above, not only must the life and work conditions of rural labour be approached in their totality, but these must be studied in conjunction with the accumulation process. The framework of analysis should, therefore, clarify the twin issues of the nature of the rural labour process and the changing character of commercialisation.

0.3.1 The Nature of the Rural Labour Process

In the conventional neoclassical economic theory, the problem of labour use and income determination is analysed in terms of outcomes of labour 'markets'. Under competitive equilibrium, the supply of and demand for labour services of individuals determine, simultaneously, labour use i.e. level of employment and the price of labour i.e. wages. The offer (supply) of labour is seen as influenced by the individuals preference between work and leisure, while the producer expresses his demand for labour as part of his profit-maximising behaviour, given the feasible options of alternative technologies and prices. The aggregates of labour demand and supply as they appear on the labour market thus emanate from the optimising choices of individuals operating under the premises of free competition. Given the free mobility of capital and labour, all labour processes are interconnected through the market.

The competitive model, when sought to be extended and applied to the conditions of labour use in a developing agrarian economy, certain contradictions become apparent, e.g. the coexistence of positive wages with vast reservoirs of 'surplus' labour and peak season shortages of farm labour in the face of chronic underemployment. The labour use
pattern and the variety of social forms of labour and exchange systems typical of these economies mean that labour 'markets' in this case display structurally very different characteristics. Much of the complexity can be presented in an articulated form once the structure of economic differentiation is recognised and spelt out\textsuperscript{10}. In particular, it has been argued that it is the differential market involvement of different categories of rural households that gives rise to the variety and peculiarities of rural exchange, including the exchange of labour\textsuperscript{11}. Thus the large mass of cultivators operating on tiny holdings are subsistence producers. Among non-cultivators, many may be 'self-employed' in tiny household enterprises. Both these categories of households in reality combine farm and non-farm activities and mix family labour with hired labour in different ways to earn household subsistence. In such situations, it would be misleading to view labour use and returns to labour in terms of wage labour markets. Instead, the concept of labour process has been found useful\textsuperscript{12}. Although used widely in the specific context of capitalism, Marx identified the concept in very general terms: "We shall ... have to consider the labour process independently of the particular form it assumes under given social conditions"\textsuperscript{13}. He defined the labour process as the man-nature relationship in the production process that is continually evolving through history, subject to the social conditions of production of use-values. Thus he notes that "The

\textsuperscript{10} See Bharadwaj (1989), "The Formation of Rural labour Markets...", op.cit.

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid.


general character of the labour process is evidently not changed by the fact that the labourer works for the capitalist instead of for himself..."^14. Under developed capitalism the labour process takes the form of wage labour whereby labour power, itself having been transformed into a commodity, confronts capital in social production. In developing economies where different modes of production coexist, the labour process cannot be uniquely identified; it takes several forms. Hence the title of this study as 'rural labour processes'. In sum, a labour process represents both what people do to earn a living and the social conditions and relations under which they do so.

0.3.2 Labour Processes, Contracts and Survival Strategies

It is important that the concept of labour process be distinguished from contracts and household survival strategies^15. The labour process defines the basic conditions and relations surrounding an activity, while a contract formalises and specifies the terms and conditions of the labour process. Thus participation in the land lease market is an important and widespread rural labour process in India, but whether the lease involves share cropping or fixed rent and the actual share or amount of rent, are matters specified in particular lease contracts which may vary across regions and villages, and even across individual tenants in the same village.^16 Individuals and households can, and often do, combine two or more labour processes in an effort to earn subsistence, which yields a survival strategy. A survival strategy thus does not merely represent a bundle of different

15. The distinction does not appear to be clear always in ILO (1983), op.cit.
16. See Chap. III, Section 3.3. A nine-fold classification of labour processes for non-cultivator households is adopted in the present study. See Chap IV, Section 4.3.
activities, but typically cuts across different social forms of labour. For example, an individual labourer may be engaged as a casual farm labourer during harvest, may migrate temporarily for the lean season, and if on return he seeks a small loan from the village moneylender, he might remain a tied worker for the lender for the next sowing season, and so on. The fact that individual labourers may assume different forms of labour over the annual cycle makes it difficult to view the rural labour market even as a segmented market. The actors in this case do not stay put in any one segment for long, but are continually on tour, as it were, from one segment to another. A household survival strategy represents a vector of individual survival strategies in the household, and is naturally more complicated in so far as special categories of workers such as women and children would be included.

0.3.3 Employment Accounting

The heterogeneity of rural labour processes and the flux associated with them also cause problems for the usual exercises in employment accounting. Simple criteria like time and income are often used to classify the rural 'workforce' by particular industries or economic sectors. The time criterion when used in the decennial censuses of population assumes stable activity patterns over the reference year, and when used in national sample surveys, assumes short period variations in 'labour force' participation. It is easy to see

17. Note that the very concept of a segmented market violates the norms of a competitive labour market, with each segment representing a different set of rules in regard to job access, recruitment, wage-setting etc.

18. The concepts and measures of employment and unemployment have been the subject of some debate in India. See Report of the Expert Committee on Unemployment Estimates, Planning Commission, 1970 (Chairman: M.L. Dantwala); papers read at the Symposium on the Concepts and Measurement of Rural Unemployment, Centre for Development Studies, Trivandrum, 1976.
that these cases conform theoretically to a wage labour/full-employment economy. Not surprisingly, the concepts and measures of employment have had to go through several revisions in attempts to tackle, for example, the case of 'marginal workers', a low overall rate of unemployment, sharp swings in female participation rates, and so on. The preoccupation with quantification and measurement moreover appears to have served only to obscure knowledge of actually existing modes of livelihood.

Not much discussion is evident on the income criterion employed in special surveys called Rural Labour Enquiries. These enquiries have the household as the relevant unit of analysis -- a desirable feature -- and the income criterion is in some ways better than the time criterion, as the former can broadly capture the productive potential of an activity. The rural labour enquiries consider three sources of household income: (i) 'wage-paid manual labour in agricultural and/or non-agricultural occupations'; (ii) 'paid non-manual employment'; and (iii) 'self-employment'. A household recording the first source of income as the largest in the year preceding the survey is classified as a 'rural labour household'. Two problems arise here. First, in the light of discussion above, it is not difficult to see that the three income sources identified in rural labour enquiries are not sufficiently discriminating as labour processes. Activities under each source may be subject to divergent conditions of work. Both casual labour and attached labour, for example, would qualify for 'wage-paid manual labour'. Similarly, an independent commodity producer and one whose enterprise is part of a putting-out network.

---
19. Thus far, four Rural Labour Enquiries (1963-5, 1974-5, 1977-8 and 1983) have been conducted. The last two were integrated with NSS-32nd Round and NSS-38th Round, respectively.
would both be classified as 'self-employed'. There is thus a heterogeneity of incomes within each of the identified income sources.

The other problem concerns the relationship between the three sources of income. Suppose that a household records 'self-employment' as the largest income source and is, therefore, not a rural labour household. Now it is conceivable that 'wage-paid manual labour' in agriculture may yet be a critical income source in that, without it, subsistence is threatened. Thus in either case, the solution appears to lie in a complete account of the labour processes involved.

Having explored the nature of rural labour processes and some analytical consequences thereof, the focus is now turned to the other major element of the framework viz. the changing character of commercialisation.

0.3.4 Accumulation and Commercialisation

Accumulation is an element that is missing conspicuously in the current analyses of commercialisation of Indian agriculture. Commercialisation has been interpreted in terms of growth of output markets and cash nexus in the agrarian economy, including monetization of wages and consumption. These are doubtless historically very important developments\(^\text{20}\). But the *differentia specifica* of commercialisation in post Green Revolution agriculture is the growth of agrarian surpluses and their accumulation. It is evident that surpluses have accrued continuously to (at least) the middle and big farmers in many parts of the country for a quarter century now under a regime of yield-raising technology, subsidised inputs, incentive

---

prices, buffer-stock policy and untaxed farm incomes. Secondly, it
would be reasonable to expect that a major portion of these surpluses
have gone into capital formation in agriculture and/or accumulation (or
'centralisation') of land by surplus farmers. However, real gross
fixed capital formation in the aggregate shows only a declining trend
in the 80's\(^{21}\). Nor is there clear-cut evidence of a growing inequality
in land ownership or 'dispossession of peasantry'\(^{22}\).

In the absence of centralisation of land and growth of fixed
capital in agriculture, the actual modes of utilisation of agrarian
surpluses cannot be specified \textit{a priori} and must be sought in concrete
conditions. Partly, this is due to the strong regional patterns that
are likely to obtain in the forms and pattern of accumulation,
depending on historical factors such as level of commercialisation and
the evolution of a local entrepreneurial class. This study shows that
farmers in East Godavari villages have a diversified portfolio of
investments ranging from rural industry and moneylending to contracting
and urban business; the purchase of land does not generally figure high
on the scale.\(^{23}\) In fact, most farmers (save the very small) have some
involvement in non-farm enterprises. A cultivator owning two acres of
land may simultaneously own or operate a rice mill or a tractor or a
shop or buildings in the town.

The fact that the same class of rural entrepreneurs holds control
over agriculture, local industry and trade has two consequences for

\(^{21}\) C.H. Hanumantha Rao, "Technological Change in Indian Agriculture: Emerging Trends and
Perspectives", \textit{Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics}, 44(4), 1989. To the extent that
capital formation depends on basic infrastructural development, a disaggregated (state-
wise) analysis is in order. Secondly, certain commercial crops may take more \textit{working}
capital, than fixed investments.

\(^{22}\) N. Krishnaji, "Land Market and Dispossession of Peasantry," \textit{Indian Journal of Agricultural

\(^{23}\) See Chap. II, Section 2.5.
analysis. First, rural class formation is complicated; in particular rural 'classes' cannot be identified with reference to any single criterion such as the size (or scale) of landholding. Secondly, the interpenetration of economic sectors means that the power of the rural oligarchy is enhanced much beyond the possibilities offered by the rather static phenomenon of 'interlinked contracts' in agriculture. In the study region, the interlinkages between output, lease and credit markets have formally disappeared although credit-tying of farm labour for peak operations persists (Chapter III). But the rural oligarchy is able to exercise, through political and other institutions such as caste, sufficient control over the labour process in general i.e. inside and outside agriculture (Chapter IV).

Accumulation characterised by the transference of surplus from agriculture to industry and services also serves to intensify the commercialisation process through the interactive growth of the economic sectors. As Baldwin\(^24\) observes:

"The notion that the interaction and feedbacks resulting from the creation of exchange relationships between economic sectors are a major source of growth is one that development economists have rediscovered [from classical economists] only comparatively recently. Most neoclassical economists assumed these relations to be in existence already, except in the international sector and they consequently concentrated on other growth factors".

In the study region, the dynamic interrelationships between the farm and non-farm sectors are quite evident especially when the role of the state in infrastructural development is taken into account. The growth

of industry in East Godavari was helped substantially by local agriculture and resource pattern, while transport development helped the integration of the region with national markets for agricultural commodities (chap. II). Similarly, growth of the vast services sector in villages and town has been linked to consumption patterns (Appendix), monetization of agricultural wages (chap. III) and programmes for rural development (chap. V).

Yet another dimension of intensive commercialization induced by accumulation concerns spatial relationships, especially the spatial mobility of capital, labour and enterprise. For example, the dynamic interrelation between the delta and upland plains of East Godavari is evident from the delta farmers converting their pasture lands in the upland plains into orchards (chap. II), as also in the flows of seasonal migrant labour between the two sub-regions. The fact that delta farmers have been acquiring agricultural lands and regular business interests in distant places and towns means that the dichotomies between 'rural' and 'urban' and between 'prosperous' and 'peripheral' regions cannot be held strongly.

Thus accumulation in its intersectoral and spatial aspects serves to intensify commercialization and renders it a strong circular and cumulative character. It is against the space thus created in the spheres of production and exchange, together with the active role of the state, that the dynamics of rural labour processes must be mainly analysed and evaluated.

0.4 Methodology and Data

As noted above in section 0.1, processes of change affecting the life and work conditions of rural labour cannot be traced though
exclusive reliance on published data. The study methodology was therefore dictated, among others, by the need to generate village - and household - level observational basis. The village and the household became the proper units of observation and analysis. In order that sample villages be studied comprehensively as durable entities of socio-economic organisation - despite dramatic changes affecting the cohesion of the village 'order' -- the number of sample villages was restricted to two.

0.4.1 Selection of Study Villages

The study villages were selected in three stages. First, the district of East Godavari in Coastal Andhra Pradesh was selected purposively as the broad study region, keeping in view the following:

(i) East Godavari is the most populous district in the state according to 1981 and 1991 censuses;
(ii) It accounted for the largest concentration of rural non-farm enterprises according to the Economic Census 1980;
(iii) In terms of agricultural production and productivity the district's dynamism became particularly evident in the 70's and 80's;
(iv) The proportion of weaker sections (i.e. Scheduled Castes and Tribes) in the district's population is high; and
(v) The relative paucity of research on the district's agrarian economy.

25. In particular, there was no attempt at prior selection of particular categories of households, like tenant households or labour households, for intensive study.


27. Unlike in the case of the neighbouring West Godavari district which was a 'full package' district in the early phase of Green Revolution.
In the second stage, two sub-regions within the study district - the Eastern Godavari Delta and the Upland plains - were identified on the basis of agro-economic criteria and one mandal (revenue-cum-development unit) each from the two sub-regions was purposively selected as representing the 'advanced' delta tract and the 'dry, backward' upland tract. The two sample mandals are Rayavaram in the delta and Rangampeta in the uplands. In the final stage two villages - Machavaram and Singampalli - were selected purposively from out of two sample mandals of Rayavaram and Rangampeta respectively (see Figure 1 in Chap. I).

Machavaram, the sample village from the delta, is big, with 1326 households living in it as in 1990. About 44 per cent of the households operate land, owned or leased, while the remaining 56 per cent of the households are landless (Table 0.4.1). Total agricultural lands owned by the residents in and outside the village work out at 1220 acres. The average area per owner is 2.57 acres (see Chap. III, Section 3.3). As in much of the delta, the village has rich alluvial-black cotton soils. Except for a few acres of sugarcane, HYV rice is the major crop. It is grown in two consecutive seasons followed by a minor pulse-fodder crop under the Godavari irrigation system. Machavaram is equidistant (about 6 kms) from Mandapeta and Ramachandrapuram; an important road connecting these towns passes through the neighbouring village of Someswaram. The dominant caste of Machavaram is Reddys, who are known for their enterprise and involvement in a range of non-farm activities.

Singampalli, the sample village from the upland plains, is small, with 466 households as in 1990. Unlike in the delta village,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number and Composition of Households</th>
<th>Machavaram</th>
<th>Singampalli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total No. of households [(A)+(B)]</strong></td>
<td>1326</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(A) Cultivator households</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) owner-operators</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) owner-tenants</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) pure tenants</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) non-cultivating owners</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) households excluded from analysis due to ambiguous land data</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(B) Non-cultivator households</strong></td>
<td>737</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey.
cultivator households here account for a relatively larger proportion at 60 per cent. Total agricultural lands owned by the residents in and around the village are around 585 acres and the average area per owner works out at 2.58 acres, the same as that in the delta village. The soils are red clay and sandy. Rainfed conditions dominate crop cultivation, although a few bigholders have gone in for tubewells. Orchards, tapioca, groundnut, pulses, and coarse cereals are the major crops; paddy is grown on fields receiving tank irrigation. A *pucca* road connecting the delta town of Bicciavolu with Jaggampeta in the uplands passes through the village. The *Kapus* are the dominant caste in the village, while delta *Reddys* own much of the orchards in the village.

0.4.2 Household Census Survey

A Census of households in the two study villages was conducted to collect basic information on the number and size of households, caste status, landholding status, household enterprises and so on. A simple 'Census Schedule' was canvassed among all households for this purpose. The information thus collected was also to serve as a frame for selecting sample households for the intensive survey.

0.4.3 Household Sample Survey

To collect in depth information on activities, assets, income generation and involvement in agrarian markets of households, besides the perceptions of respondents on a range of issues connected with diversification, an intensive survey among a sample of households was conducted with the help of an exhaustive schedule-cum-questionnaire.
The selection of sample households consisted of preparing two lists of households from the census frame referred to above. List-1 consisted of cultivator households (i.e. all households operating some land, owned or leased, at the time of survey), while List-2 consisted of all households not cultivating any land at all. From the List-1 (of cultivator households), the list of owner-operators, who account for over 60 per cent of all cultivator households in both the villages, was separated and a sample of owner-operator households was selected by the method of stratified Random Sampling without Replacement, the strata being (i) size of operational holding and (ii) Caste. From List-2 (non-cultivator households) a sample of households was selected again by the method of Stratified Random Sampling without Replacement, but the sole stratum being caste in this case. The details of samples are given in Tables 0.4.2 and 0.4.3.

0.4.4 Period of Survey

The entire field work comprising household censuses and sample surveys in the study villages, field observation and collection of secondary data at the district and lower levels -- was completed over 11 months, from December 1989 to December 1990. Data collection and interviews were done entirely by the author who commuted to the villages on a two-wheeler from Ramachandrapuram where he had hired accommodation.

0.5 Chapter Outline

The thesis is organised into six chapters, excluding Introduction. The six chapters are further divided into two parts. Part A, consisting of Chapter I and II, is concerned with analyses of
Table 0.4.2

Number of Sample Households (Owner Cultivators) in Study Villages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste Group -</th>
<th>Upper Castes</th>
<th>Backward Castes</th>
<th>Scheduled Castes/Tribes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of HHS</td>
<td>No. of HHS</td>
<td>No. of HHS</td>
<td>No. of HHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of landholding (acres)</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Machavaram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1.00</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 - 2.50</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50 - 5.00</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00 ≥</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Singampalli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 - 2.50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50 - 5.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00 ≥</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 0.4.3

Number of Sample Households (Non-Cultivator Households) in Study Villages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Upper Castes</th>
<th>Backward Castes</th>
<th>Scheduled Castes/Tribes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Machavaram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of HHS</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Singampalli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of HHS</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
commercialisation and accumulation in East Godavari, while the next three chapters dealing with rural labour processes are grouped under Part B. In Chapter VI, the main findings and propositions are summarised. The subject matter of the individual chapters is evident from the chapter titles.