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7.1 Introduction

The scheduled tribes occupy a significant position in Indian population and contribute to its variety and richness of culture. They inherit a complex social organization and wide spectrum of customs and institutions. Their inhabitation is mainly forests and isolated areas, away from civic life of the country. Basically, they are tillers of land and the collection of forest produce is a subsidiary source of income. However, in the name of conservation of forest the tribals are forced out of their profession. Their fundamental rights to land and forest are disregarded. In reality, the tribes of India are fettered with socio-economic backwardness and illiteracy. Over and above, the inhuman exploitation by the monsters of the society have made the simple tribals landless and underdogs.

This pathetic economic conditions of the tribals has drawn the attention of the Government to their welfare and development. With the independence, the tap-root of tribal development is implanted in the Indian constitution, Article 46, where it stated that prevention and elimination should be ensured and socio-economic development should be accelerated. Therefore, the Government facilitated three important provisions to the scheduled tribes; constitutional concession, development programmes and protectionist policy. The tribal plans also focussed on the improvement of physical, social and educational aspects of tribal life.

Over the years, the Government has implemented a number of tribal developmental programmes in Madhya Pradesh and particularly in Jashpur Project of Raigarh district. Based on earlier studies it is perceived that the benefits accrued to the tribals from the schemes are meagre. The tribal beneficiaries do not even get their allotted share in terms of the schemes and programmes. Those who benefit most are the non-tribals, the immigrant non-tribals, the advanced and progressive tribes and the rich peasants of the blocks by the name of tribal programmes. A portion of scheme resources is diverted to non-developmental activities. It is noticed that a major share of scheme
benefits of economic programmes does not seem to be percolating through the administrative medium and trickling down to the targetted beneficiaries. Some beneficiaries misused the assets for financial needs. All these weaknesses have aggravated the inequality in the distribution of income between tribals and non-tribals. The failure of the scheme is blamed mostly for bureaucratic and ineffective administration machinery and secondly for disregard of socio-economic habitat and non-involvement of beneficiaries. This could be the reason why the tribals are still poverty stricken, illiterate, unemployed and homeless.

Against the above tribal condition, the research study follows the economic approach and probes into the problems of whether or not the implemented programmes have economically benefited the target group of the study area. The main purpose of the schemes is raising of income through asset creation. The impact analysis of research focuses on the basic objective of the scheme, which is income generation. But mere creation of assets does not spontaneously propel the scheme income. It is affected by the social and economic surroundings in which the beneficiary households live. More clearly, the indicators of analysis are: Age, Religion, Family size, Infrastructure, Education level, Dependency ratio, Prior Income, Prior assets, Prior consumption, Subsidy and Savings subject to the given block and tribal community variability. In the above framework, the objectives of the study are:

- To examine the extent to which the intended programmes have reached the target group.

- To assess the scheme-wise variation of income generation across blocks.

- To examine the scheme-wise additional income differentials of targetted and non-targetted beneficiaries across blocks.

- To study the factors influencing the income generation of the tribal beneficiaries.

- To suggest policy implication to the Government to improve the performance of the schemes.

The research study is made on Jashpur Project of Raigarh district, Madhya Pradesh. More specifically, the study is conducted in three selected blocks namely, Bagicha, Pharsabahar and Manora. From each block five schemes are selected
Viz., BPJD, SM, WP & GR. The primary survey is made during April 1992 to October 1992. The present study covers beneficiaries between January 1987 and December 1988. This time bout is taken as a minimum of three years is required for a scheme to generate income after implementation. A multi-staged sampling design is employed for selecting the district, region, project, tahsil, block, village and beneficiary household levels. The total sampling numbered 447 out of 735 beneficiaries of three blocks of Jashpur project. This study is based on the primary and secondary sources of data.

7.2 Socio-Economic Precinct of Beneficiaries

From the anatomy of socio-economic features of the tribals of the study area, it is observed that the majority of the tribal beneficiaries belong to the Oraons (48%), the Korwas (15%), the Kanwars (10%) and the Nagesias (9.62%). Thus they represent about 83% of the total beneficiaries. The block-wise investigation shows that the Oraons, the Korwas and the Nagesias together form a major tribal beneficiary group in Bagicha (89%) and Manora (88%) blocks whereas the Oraons, the Kanwars and the Buinhars unitedly make another major group in Pharsabahar block (75%). It is comprehended that the Oraons are the most dominant tribal community in the sample blocks as well as in the project area. They alone share 48.32% of the total beneficiaries. It is observed that the percentage of Oraon beneficiaries gradually decreased as the topography of blocks changed from the hilly region (Manora 63%) to the plain area (Pharsabahar 37%). It is also noted that all the Christian beneficiaries are from the Oraon tribe alone. The Christians form 38.26% of the total beneficiaries and 79.17% of the total Oraon beneficiaries.

The demographic analysis indicates that one-third households have the size of family between 5 to 6 members. The percentage of family size with 6 members and below accounts to 56.83 whereas the households lying between 6 to 8 members report to be 57.27%. The majority of households have dependent members ranging to 5, of which most of them are children.

The study of literacy status of beneficiaries reveals that though the literacy level differs from block to block, 54% of the beneficiaries are illiterate. The Bagicha block serves the maximum of 61% of illiterate beneficiaries whereas Manora block 46.67% (lowest).
The analysis of the economic condition of beneficiaries exposes that as high as 80% of the total beneficiaries are agriculturists (owner cultivators) and the others belong to either agricultural labourers or village occupations. Among them 68.68% of the beneficiaries are marginal farmers holding land of five acres and below. It is observed that the vulnerable farmers account to 33.78% of the total beneficiaries. The study also exhibits that about 7% of the beneficiaries are landless.

From the analysis of household assets and annual income, it is found that around 65% of the beneficiary households have per capita income of Rs.1900 and below. The investigation of per capita asset holding shows that the distribution of beneficiary households is almost symmetrical, which means the spread of the percentage of households is uniform. The maximum 18.8% of households form part of the per capita asset holding between Rs.8000 to Rs.12000. The main components of their assets are land and houses.

By analyzing the scheme income it is found that as many as 66.67% of the beneficiary households earn Re.0 to Rs.100 per worker from the scheme. Of them, 37.36% have gained zero scheme income. It is discovered that about 85% of the total beneficiary households (inclusive of zero income households) benefit Rs.200 and below per worker per annum, which is lugubrious contribution from the schemes.

On examining the consumption behaviour of the tribal beneficiary households, it is observed that a lion's share of 90.72% of the annual expenditure is directed to secure their basic needs (food, clothing and education). It is realized that the food items alone share 71.89% of the total expenditure. Of the food expenditure, 53% goes to the purchase of rice alone. Among other expenditures clothing (12%), education (6.7%) and habits (4.49%) are found to be more perceptible.

7.3 Coverage of Beneficiaries and Income Generation

The empirical results on beneficiaries and income generation reveal a doleful impact of the schemes. The schemes cover 68.68% of targetted beneficiaries, of which only 33.78% belong to the weaker section (vulnerable holding land less than 2.5 acres). Still, it is relatively low in the Manora block (mountain). The block-wise comparison of the coverage of beneficiaries reveals that Bagicha and Pharsabahar blocks each
caters to 75% of the targetted beneficiaries whereas Manora block attends to 56.67% only. The scheme-wise across groups (target and non-target) comparison shows that the goat rearing scheme has reached 98% of the targetted beneficiaries whereas the deserving beneficiaries (targetted) of bullock pairs and Jiwandhara schemes account to 83.33% and 71.11% respectively. The other schemes are serving below 60% of the targetted group. The study of reach-out-extent to the beneficiaries of schemes across the blocks exhibit that the bullock pair schemes of Bagicha (93%) and Jiwandhara of Pharsabahar(83%) are more committed to the deserving beneficiaries whereas the other schemes are non-targetted bias.

From the results of the analysis of income generation of individual scheme, it is perceived that though there is variation of average income of bullock pairs and tailoring in absolute terms, the across blocks comparison indicates no significant difference. Among the recipients of the bullock pairs, 81% of them are using for farming activities. As many as 59% of the beneficiaries expressed satisfaction over the bullock assets in general whereas other complained about high cost, unhealthiness and untimely distribution of the bullocks. The beneficiaries of the hilly plateau prefer local bullocks. Among the beneficiaries of bullock pairs 19% do not gain any benefit at all. It is also realized that the land development scheme is highly appreciated by the tribal beneficiaries. It is felt that the sanctioned amount is very low for the purpose.

Under the minor irrigation schemes (irrigational wells), the significant differentials of scheme income are shown between Bagicha and Pharsabahar blocks (in Jiwandhara and Agri-Wells and Pumpsets separately) and between Bagicha and Manora blocks (in Jiwandhara alone). These differences are mainly attributed to the availability of working capital, means of irrigational facilities, land productivity and the degree of response of beneficiaries to the schemes. It is detected that the users of WP and JD are 62% and 59% respectively. Among the users of wells, most of them are utilized for raising vegetables on a small plot of land and only 9% are growing vegetables as well as crops. About 52% of the recipients show satisfaction regarding disbursement of loan, progress of activities whereas 48% stress discontentment over the callous attitudes of block officials. As high as 16% of total investment in JD is leaked out through the official channels which forced the beneficiaries to use their own money to complete the JD work.
The Goat Rearing Scheme has generated very low income. It has completely failed among the Korwa beneficiaries due to the lack of lean-to goat shed, medical care, unsuitable climate and lack of finance. Most of them died, others are either sold, exchanged or killed for the meat purpose. Goat rearing is not successful with those beneficiaries who are landless and daily wage earners.

The tailoring has neither generated employment nor propelled income of the tribals. The across block accessory income comparison demonstrates that Pharsabahar is relatively little better than other blocks. It is found that out of total beneficiaries, 43% of them are using for domestic purpose occasionally while 47% of the beneficiaries are not using the machines at all. Of the users, only 3% of them are doing business. The failure of the scheme is attributed to the lack of business mind, lack of training and non availability of inputs and market outlets for products.

The analysis of income generation of targetted and non-targetted beneficiaries reveal that the non-targetted group of each block under each scheme (except tailoring) is deriving higher average income than its counter parts. On the other hand, the target beneficiaries get higher percentage of increment of income from the pre-assistance income level. It is observed that the targetted beneficiaries of Pharsabahar block get relatively higher scheme income in absolute term from Bullock Pair, Agris, Wells and Pumpsets and Goat Rearing whereas the beneficiaries of Manora and Bagicha blocks secure higher income from Jiwandhara and Tailoring respectively. However, the income from Wells-Pumpsets and Goat Rearing is significant between the targetted beneficiaries of Bagicha and Pharsabahar, inasmuch as the scheme income of non-target groups of Bullock Pairs between Bagicha and Pharsabahar, Jiwandhara and Wells-Pumpsets between Bagicha and Manora blocks.

The across blocks comparison exposes that the Bullock Pair in Bagicha, Wells-Pumpsets in Pharsabahar and Kirana shop in Manora blocks are yielding relatively higher income. Like targetted beneficiaries, the non-targetted beneficiaries are benefiting relatively better income from Bullock Pairs in all the blocks.
7.4 Contributing Factors of Scheme Income

From the analysis of the effect of income generation, a set of significant determinants is identified for each scheme based on the fitted regressions. They are attributed to:

- the prior assets (PA), subsidies (SB), habit expenditure (HE) and non-food expenditure (NE) for Bullock Pair Scheme;

- family size (SI), non-food expenditure (NE) and food to habit expenditure ratio (FH) for Jiwandhara Scheme;

- infrastructure (IS), prior income (PR) and per capita food expenditure (FEP) for Wells-Pumpsets Scheme;

- infrastructure (IS), per capita land holding (LDP), per capita food expenditure (FEP) and particularly plain regions such as Pharsabahar block (FS) for Tailoring Scheme and

- family size (SI), savings (SA), prior assets (PA) and age difference (AG) for Goat Rearing Scheme

It is found that the prior assets, prior income, family size and consumption expenditure are the income conducive factors in agriculture related schemes, viz., Bullock Pairs, Jiwandhara and Wells-Pumpsets. But the income inhibiting factors are identified as subsidy and infrastructure tending to pre-urbanization. The employment oriented schemes [Goat Rearing and Tailoring] also have the prior assets, family size and food expenditure along with savings as the income generating factors. Whereas the per capita land holding and infrastructure inclined to pre-urbanization are income restraining factors in Tailoring Scheme, the age difference alone is in goat Rearing. Thus, the significant determinants have both positive and negative impact on the scheme income.

To conclude, it is necessary that the programmes should be availed only to the target group so that the further income inequalities can be restrained. This needs the grass-root level approach to the selection of beneficiaries. Along with the criteria of land holding and income, in choosing the beneficiaries, the opinions of the surrounding neighbours (grass-root level) should also be included in the process of decision making. For greater authenticity of identification, on the spot verification is essential.
It is a fact that among the target group itself, the schemes have not reached the more vulnerable section of the tribals considerably. Those who have received the scheme assets, its impact on income generation is unexpectedly low. As many as 37% of the total beneficiaries are not able to use the scheme assets for various reasons. The most prominent reason is nothing other than the dearth of working capital. The apex of the financial crisis could be perceived when the beneficiaries sell out their scheme assets to non-tribals and go for wage labour to get daily sustenance. In such a distressing condition, to expect full usage of the scheme assets from the tribal beneficiaries is rather an unjust and unkind demand. It needs a sympathetic approach to tribal development. Therefore, deserving beneficiary households who can not utilize the scheme assets, should be given further support, a maximum for three years depending on the economic condition of beneficiaries and the nature, gestation period and productive capacity of the schemes. The beneficiaries should be availed with required setup in which the scheme assets are to be utilized. For instance, most of the irrigational wells are used for horticulture. The pre-requisites for this are land leveling, land shaping, fencing, seedlings, saplings, implements, fertilizers, pesticides, market-channels, etc. Unless a minimum of these facilities are made available to them, they will not be able to benefit from the schemes. Further, to prevent the beneficiaries from going for wage labour and making them work with their scheme assets, they should be paid the minimum wages from the NREP project, at least in the initial stage. This should be considered as the extension programme of the scheme. Besides, they should also get the produce of the scheme for themselves. This will give impetus to productive work and to earn more.

In order to make this suggestion workable, the administrative personnel should follow the policy of involvement at the village level through personal contact. A knowledgeable person should be appointed at village level for each pocket of beneficiaries spread over different parts of the block. Under his close guidance and instruction, the beneficiaries should function in congenial atmosphere with confidence and hope. He should clarify all the prejudices which have made home in the minds of the tribals against the government officials. The bureaucratic approach of delaying, postponing and protracting the delivery of scheme assets should be substituted by the timely and need based service approach, backed by strong will to bring up the economically down-trodden tribals. The simple tribals should be assisted with sympathy and concern rather than callousness of the officials. Therefore, the village level worker (or extension officer) should involve himself participating in their economic activities, demonstrating and helping them get their requirements timely. He should be able to resolve the problems arising from scheme utilization through proper co-
ordination at the block level. This will inculcate in them more understanding and may improve economic activities.

It is to be noted that so far development is considered as an economic, a social, a political or a technological point of view. In tribal societies all these aspects taken comprehensively and not as separate entities. The varied nature of tribal society demands a holistic approach to development problems. Therefore, the development of tribals is not merely implementation of work programmes but it involves social process to set in motion. The socio-economic conditions of the people may be well noted, while implementing the programmes with the consent of the tribal society as well as in consonance with their culture. It is necessary to introduce new technology with their consent and participation while preserving their native culture forms and environment. Without these, the measure adopted for their betterment may be self-defeating.