

All-India Report On Evaluation Of NREGA  
A Survey Of Twenty Districts



**INSTITUTE OF APPLIED MANPOWER RESEARCH**

**Plot No. 25, Sector A-7, Narela**

**Delhi - 110040**

## CONTENTS

<u>Title</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
Executive Summary	i
Introduction	1
Methodology	3
Section –I : Household Details	4
Section - II : Mechanism of Job Card Registration	5
Section – III: Issue of Job Card	8
Section – IV: Registration and Application for Work	10
Section – V: Impact on Wages, Income and Quality of Life	15
Section – VI: Impact on out-migration	19
Annexure – I: Methodological Note	23
Annexure – II: Tables	25
Annexure – III: Guidelines Issued to Field Staff	73

## **Executive Summary**

The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005 (NREGA) guarantees 100 days of wage employment in a financial year to any rural household whose adult members are willing to participate in unskilled manual work. The Act is an important step towards realization of the right to work and aims at arresting out-migration of rural households in search of employment simultaneously enhancing people's livelihood on a sustained basis, by developing the economic and social infrastructure in rural areas.

The present study on evaluation of the NREG Scheme is intended to assess the impact of this scheme on the overall quality of life of people by gauging different parameters associated with the improvement of overall quality of life of people such as impact on income – earning levels of each household, expenditure on food and non-food items, household and cultivable assets creation by the beneficiaries. This study also captured the impact of the scheme to arrest out-migration, views and feedback of the beneficiaries on various facets of implementation of the scheme at grass root level right from the stage of issue of job cards etc.

With the above set of objectives, the study was carried out in 20 districts spread throughout India by targeting 300 beneficiaries from each district. These beneficiaries are hailing from the diverse geography and social background distributed evenly within the selected districts. The data pertains to the year 2006-07 during which period this scheme was launched in the first phase of 200 districts. By way of open-ended questionnaires, data on several variables were collected from these beneficiaries who are part of the NREGA Scheme. Overall impact of the scheme, views expressed by the beneficiaries etc. is elucidated in a nutshell in the following paras.

Female-headed household participation in the works is very encouraging ranging from 12 to 52 percent. Though the scheme envisages at least one-third of the total person-days to be earmarked for women participants, it is too early to judge on this point since the effective time duration of the scheme in these 20 districts is uneven and in some cases the scheme hardly taken off. Most beneficiaries got their job cards through Gram Sabha (GS) meetings and the rest by steps taken by Gram Panchayat (GP). Majority of the rural households agreed that there is a transparent mechanism followed for issue of job cards. Enrollment and registration under the scheme is an open-ended one, however, fifteen percent of the respondents opined otherwise who experienced several visits to GP office for registration purpose.

Verification of all the registrants is done by GS as expressed by majority of the HHs. Besides, review of applications earlier rejected by the GP were also taken up by GS in many districts. GS meetings took place on quarterly basis rather than on monthly basis according to HHs. Migrant families could not register for job card due to their absence.

Views of beneficiaries were also captured on the modalities followed to issue the job card by the officials. One-tenth of the people revealed that ten percent of the

eligible adult members of the family are not included in the job card. The job card is in the possession of GP officials in most of the districts of eastern region and only during the season of works, the job cards are handed over to the beneficiaries for their signature/thumb impression. Majority of the HHs agreed that the job card was issued within couple of days of registration. Majority of households expressed that they got their job cards without waiting for much time and without unnecessary visits to GP office. Though affixing of photograph of the households is mandatory, it is not followed in many districts, and in some places the beneficiary paid for it. Job card was not designed to have sufficient space for all the entries in detail as was observed from many entries in the job cards.

Eighty percent of the HHs expressed that they did not get the work within the stipulated 15 days time of demand for work in writing, neither were they paid any unemployment allowance. Further enquiry with GP officials on this point revealed that they are struggling with teething problems of this kind of gigantic scheme and it takes some time to comply with such mandatory guidelines. As far as publicity of the scheme and dissemination of information related to the scheme, all locally available communication modes are utilized to spread the awareness and information about the scheme. On the utility of maximum number of days of works, only small fraction of HHs could utilize more than 35 days of work, remaining still lagging behind. The reason for non-utilisation of maximum permissible 100 days is late starting of the scheme. NREG Scheme stipulates at least one-third of the wage allocation i.e., person-days to women beneficiaries. It was found that only in 42 percent households, the women could share the 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the allocated person-days (wage days). However, in 22 percent of the households, the women folk did utilize more than one-third of the utilized person-days in the household. In most of the work sites, excepting crèche all the other facilities like shed, drinking water are provided.

Payment for the wages earned is paid in cash either at the worksite or at GP office at a later date. Fourteen percent of the HHs did not agree that the names of workers, number of days, and the amount is read out at the worksite by the mate of the worksite as stipulated in the guidelines of the Act.

An enquiry is also made to assess the impact of the scheme on the overall quality of life of the beneficiaries. Due to the income generation through this scheme, the number of beneficiaries at the low earning level are reduced to nearly half in size resulting this on the rise of HHs with marginally higher income. It was found that more than half of the beneficiaries are agricultural and unskilled workers. There is also shift in the beneficiaries expenditure pattern on food and non-food items. The survey revealed that the number of families spending less on food has come down drastically where as there is a rise of families who are spending more on food and non-food items.

Only two percent of the HHs opened bank account among the surveyed beneficiaries. More than half of the HHs revealed that they purchased livestock like sheep/goat etc. during the year. Four-fifths of the HHs do not have any outstanding loan. In the western region, nearly 60% of the HHs have an outstanding loan either from bank or local money lender. 3.3% of the beneficiaries bought a bicycle for the first time, 1.5% of the beneficiaries did buy electric fan, or other appliance, 3.2 % of the HHs purchased steel utensils etc. with the income generated from the scheme.

One of the significant objectives of the NREGA is to arrest out-migration of unskilled, landless labour force from the rural areas to urban areas by ensuring up to 100 days of wage employment within their native jurisdiction so that these 100 days guaranteed wage employment can be judiciously and rationally utilized by the landless peasants during lean and distress seasons. One-fourth of the families surveyed opined that there is migration from their respective village to towns/cities in search of job. Almost fifty percent of the HHs in western region expressed that migration is taking place from their villages. In the north eastern region, in the district of North Lakhimpur, everyone agreed that there is migration from their villages. There is migration taking places from districts such as South Garo Hills (Meghalaya), Medak (AP), and Dahod (Maharashtra) in addition to almost all the districts from the eastern region. In some of these districts, the out-migration is to the extent of 40%.

Contrary to the general perception of better wages upon migration, 70 percent of the beneficiaries revealed that the migration is only for just wages and not for any better wages. This implies that there is a distress migration for just minimum wages to eke out the livelihood and for survival rather than for better wages. Notable among the responses is that 82 and 67 percent of the HHs interviewed in the eastern and northern region respectively expressed that the out-migration is in search of work and meager wages rather than for better earnings which can be viewed as a distress migration. They preferred to stay in their native village if there is enough wage employment available locally.

It is disappointing to note that 38 percent of the HHs did not agree with the measures taken by GP to check out-migration. They expressed that the GP did not take any measures to create sustainable assets to generate wage employment within the village. Only 40 percent agreed that GP is taking appropriate steps to create wage employment. Rest of the beneficiaries did not give their opinion at all about the capacity of GP. Most notable fact is that the eastern region beneficiaries to the extent of 46 percent did not express any confidence in their respective village GP about their efforts of checking out-migration.

**All-India Report on Evaluation of NREGA:**  
**Survey of 20 Districts based on primary data collection**

**Introduction :**

The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005 (NREGA) guarantees 100 days of employment in a financial year to any rural household whose adult members are willing to do unskilled manual work. The Act has come into force with effect from February, 2006 in 200 districts initially and later on extended to all the rural districts of India from the financial year 2008-09.

The Act is an important step towards realization of the right to work. It is also expected to enhance people's livelihood on a sustained basis, by developing the economic and social infrastructure in rural areas. The choice of works seeks to address the causes of chronic poverty such as drought, deforestation and soil erosion. Effectively implemented, the employment guaranteed under the Act has the potential of transforming the geography of poverty.

NREGA is the most significant act in the history of Indian polity in many ways like grass-root level participation of every citizen and beneficiary through democratic process, multi-layered social audit and transparency mechanism by involvement of civil society, comprehensive planning at village level towards sustainable and equitable development etc. Important salient feature of the Act is to improve the quality of life of rural households who are vulnerable to out-migration in search of daily wage employment by channelising the wage workforce towards developmental activities at the village level itself.

The scheme was initially in progress in the first phase of 200 districts during its cognitive stage has generated lot of enthusiasm among social scientists, and NGOs and led them to initiate several surveys on their own. The surveys as in the cases of any other scheme are centered around the end results such as targeting all the needy beneficiaries, and implementation of the Act in letter and spirit. The scheme is gigantic in nature and in the process of implementation and achieving the desired

output, there are many issues which are straddling the implementing agencies right from District to Gram Panchayat.

The present study on evaluation of the NREG Scheme is intended to assess the overall scenario i.e., the pros and cons associated with the scheme itself, the operational bottlenecks, the efficacy of social audit, and at last to assess the impact of the scheme on the targeted beneficiaries. Exactly with the above purpose, Institute of Applied Manpower Research (IAMR), has conducted survey in 20 districts of these 200 districts spreading throughout the country.

The National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme, besides, the main features mentioned in the above background note, also involves participatory planning and implementation of the scheme through (i) proactive role of Gram Sabha, (ii) rigorous & continuous monitoring by way of social audit, and (iii) involvement of ordinary people at the grass-roots level. It addresses (i) chronic poverty, (ii) drought, (iii) deforestation, (iv) soil erosion etc. It also aims at (i) generating productive assets, (ii) protecting the environment, (iii) empowering rural women, (iv) arresting rural-urban migration.

The scheme is implemented through collaborative partnership right from Grama Sabha to Central Government Community participation by way of (i) Grama Sabha, (ii) local vigilance & monitoring committees, and (iii) Self Help Groups (SHGs), and ensures active role by Civil Society Organisations. At official level, the scheme was embedded with inbuilt monitoring & evaluation mechanism at every layer of implementation including online monitoring through Monitoring and Information System (MIS).

The scheme is implicitly strengthened by mandatory and active participation of local community, and complete transparency in all operations and record keeping. Nevertheless, due to massive funding, extensive coverage of beneficiaries, there is a necessity to identify and assess the ground realities, channelising labour-intensive activities into sustainable assets at village level, besides, studying the impact of the scheme on migration, quality of life etc.

Since the scheme is going to be in place for an undefined period of time, and is being enlarged in terms of scope and geographical coverage, there are many challenges like non-homogeneity in its effectiveness, region specific disparities and outcomes etc. It is exactly due to this reason, few NGOs have already done some surveys. However, they are very much confined to one or two districts, and more importantly centered around systemic defects, rather than probing the impact on beneficiaries.

Against this background, there is a necessity to carry out an empirical study with two pronged strategy i.e., (i) All India study by capturing signals from all corners of the country, taking into account all the regions, and (ii) comprehensive coverage of all the objectives and clauses enshrined in the NREG Act in a broad manner.

### **Methodology:**

Twenty districts from the first lot of 200 districts were selected for studying the beneficiary level impact and responses. These 20 districts are spreading throughout the country covering 16 states from all the regions. Selection of these districts is done by using the secondary data of districts for the year 2006-07 placed in the NREG website. State averages were calculated based on man-days and job cards issued. Two districts, one above and one below the state average were selected from each state in all the regions except western region where the district data was not available. Wherever the data is available, two districts from each state were selected and more weightage in selection of districts is given to eastern region by selecting 7 districts where there is severe out-migration from this region. List of districts selected for the study is given at Annexure – I.

From each district two blocks were selected in consultation with the district officials concerned and from each block, three gram panchayats were selected for canvassing the schedules. In every GP, 50 beneficiaries were selected on random selection basis from the list of job card holders/beneficiaries available with the GP



office. Thus in every district 300 beneficiaries were targeted covering 6000 beneficiaries spreading throughout the country.

The all-India survey report presents the response received from the beneficiaries of the scheme pertaining to the period 2006-07. The information collected is grouped into the following sections such as

1. Household details
2. Mechanism of job card registration
3. Issue of job card
4. Registration & application for job (work)
5. Impact on Wages, Income and Quality of Life
6. Impact on out-migration

Following sections analyses the responses received from the beneficiaries on various issues ranging from their social background to impact of the scheme on quality of life, out-migration etc. The data collected from all the 20 districts is presented in the tabular form. Compilation of all the district and region wise tables are enclosed at Annexure – II.

### **Section – I: Household Details:**

This section deals with household details such as their social background, size of eligible adult members in each household, beneficiaries of other employment related schemes etc. Out of the 6000 job card holders covered in 20 districts, Table 1.1 gives the break up of different social groups such as SC, ST, OBC, General category beneficiaries. Out of the 1200 beneficiaries in four districts of northern region, one-fourth of them are the female headed households. Female participation at 52% is higher than male counterparts in all the three districts of southern region. Of all the regions, female participation in NREG Scheme is lower at 17.5% in eastern region. Beneficiaries hailing from ST are significant in numbers in the eastern, and north east regions.

Table 1.2 gives the size of the households in terms of number of eligible workers registered under NREGA. 73% of the households (HHs) are having up to three wage earners in a single job card. Nearly 23% of the HHs have enrolled up to six family members as potential wage workers.

Table 1.3 shows the distribution of respondents who are beneficiaries of any schemes other than NREGA. These schemes are related to self-employment, or entrepreneurial /skill upgradation etc. 86% of the HHs expressed that they did not benefit with any such schemes. HHs from southern and eastern region have been benefiting from other such schemes which promote self-employment, skill development etc. From the available secondary data sources at district level, the share of BPL HHs who obtained job cards varies from 26 to 81 percentage among the surveyed 20 districts.

## **Section - II : Mechanism of Job Card Registration:**

This section captures the views of HHs pertaining to the procedures followed by GP in conducting the registration of willing HHs and the efficacy and mechanism of registration process such as survey of HHs, inviting applications, registration for job cards and verification of the same in a transparent manner.

Table 2.1 shows the response of HHs regarding the method of obtaining job card such as (i) approved by Gram Sabha (GS), (ii) oral request, (iii) applied on plain paper, (iv) door to door survey (v) any other method. One-fourth of the HHs got their job cards through GS. Nearly half of the HHs have applied for job card through a plain paper. One-fifth of the beneficiaries got their cards through door-to-door survey conducted by GP. Only seven percent of the surveyed people got the job card by oral request.

Table 2.2 reveals the opinion of respondents regarding approval of all applications prior to registrations by GS. The guidelines dictates that all the eligible HHs who were registered for issue of job card have to be approved by convening of GS meeting and by reading the names of those families in the open meetings of GS.

Eighty five percent of respondents accepted that the names of registered persons were read out in the GS meeting. Remaining fifteen percent respondents expressed that all the registered persons were not read out in the meeting.

The NREGA guidelines also dictates that the registration process has to be an open-ended process to facilitate registration of eligible HHs throughout the year. However, Table 2.3 shows that fifteen percent of the beneficiaries did not experience the same. Very negligible number of people in eastern region revealed that they got the job card by intervention of elected ward members/public servants etc. Collective opinion of individual beneficiaries revealed that the registration process was carried out as a ritual for a period of one week or couple of weeks in their respective villages to report the same to Block / District level officials. During this seasonal period of registration, many families who missed out due to various reasons, one among them, migration to neighboring cities/towns, were making several visits to GP office to register under the scheme.

As per the stipulated guidelines of NREGA, all the eligible registrants have to be verified in an open meeting of GS. Table 2.4 gives the response details of HHs who certified that such norm was followed before issue of job card. Three-fourths of the respondents agreed that proper verification of all applicants was done before issuing of job card.

An attempt was also made to elicit the views of HHs about the review of applications in GS which were rejected earlier due to various reasons. Table 2.5 shows that only 40 percent of the respondents agreed that the applications which were not approved in the earlier occasion were approved in the consequent GS meetings. Majority of respondents hailing from eastern and southern region expressed their views that once the application was rejected in earlier occasion was not taken up for any review in the consequent meetings. In general, the procedure for reviewing of cases is taking place in a satisfactory, democratic and transparent manner through Grama Sabhas and the applicants were given a chance to present their case in front of other inhabitants of village.

Opinion was collected about the frequency of GS meetings convened for the ongoing activities of registration, approval of works, preparation of plan of activities etc. Table 2.6 shows that there were more quarterly meetings than monthly or bi-monthly meetings. Half of the HHs surveyed opined that GS meetings were convened on quarterly basis. Assessment of the overall responses reveal that the activities are being carried out to a satisfactory level within the guidelines stipulated under NREGA.

Opinion was also sought about the genuine HHs who wanted to register for job card but could not register due to any reason. According to Table 2.7, more than 93 percent respondents agreed that every genuine HH who wanted to register was able to do so. Only three percent of the respondents expressed that some HHs could not register as they were absent due to migration or some other reason.

One of the important objectives of the NREGA is to arrest out-migration. As a step towards this direction, opinion was also gathered from HHs about the families of the same village who migrated and who could register for job card. According to Table 2.8, nearly ninety percent of the HHs revealed that none of the migrant families were able to register for job card. Only three percent agreed that migrant families have also registered for job cards under the NREG Scheme. In eastern region, only eight percent of the respondents agreed that migrant families have also come to know about the NREG Scheme and could register under the scheme.

### **Section – III: Issue of Job Card**

Through this section, opinion of all job card holders is collected on issues such as (i) whether all the eligible HH members are included in the job card, (ii) under whose custody, the job card is kept, (iii) waiting period for applying and obtaining the job card, (iv) number of visits by beneficiaries to obtain job card, (v) whether photograph is enclosed on the card, (vi) physical verification and observations on the entries in the job card.

Ten percent of the respondents opined that all the eligible members of the family were not included in the job card. Such responses are widespread from the eastern region where more than 22 percent of the beneficiaries not satisfied with all the willing members of the family not included in the job card followed by southern region with fifteen percent as per Table 3.1. One of the several reasons expressed by the beneficiaries is non-presence of those families during the registration process due to migration for want of wages. Their case could not be taken up later on due to non-persuasion of those affected families. Such cases are rampant in the eastern region.

It has come to light that in the eastern region nearly one-tenth of the beneficiaries' cards are in the possession of either GP official or Mate looking after the worksites contrary to the fact that job card should be in the custody of respective HHs as shown in Table 3.2. On an average, nearly five percentage of the surveyed HHs agreed that the job cards are surrendered to GP officials and only during work allocation they will be handed over to them for getting entries of wages etc.

Another crucial aspect is the time-lag between application and issue of job card. As per the directives of the NREGA, job card has to be issued at the earliest preferably within couple of weeks. Table 3.3 shows that two-thirds of the surveyed beneficiaries revealed that the job cards were issued to them within 15 days of application. Nineteen percent of HHs revealed that job cards were issued to them within one month of application. In case of only fourteen percent of the families.

An attempt was also made to capture the number of visits by the HHs purely for the purpose of obtaining the job card. Out of the total respondents of 5997, 3464 respondents i.e., 58 percent of the respondents obtained the job cards by visiting the GP office only once. Nearly nine percent of the respondents visited GP office more than twice. According to the Table 3.4, there are instances of more than four visits in eastern and southern regions.

Though affixing of photograph is mandatory on the job card, and it is the responsibility of GP office which is issuing the card, there are cases to the extent of 20 percent among the surveyed cards, that no photograph was affixed. More widespread among them were from the eastern and southern region. One-fourth of

the job cards verified in Karauli district in Rajasthan state did not have any photograph on the job card. Nearly 30 percent of the beneficiaries paid for the photographs. Only in half of the cases, GP facilitated the affixing of photograph of HHs on their respective job cards. Data at Table 3.5 reveals that almost all the HHs in the districts of Munger (Bihar) and Davangere (Karnataka) have affixed their own photographs with their own money. In the districts of Sambalpur, Malda (Eastern region), Medak (Southern region) there were no photographs affixed on the job card.

An attempt was also made to check the entries in the job card regarding wage payment, number of days of employment etc. as illustrated in Table 3.6. It was found that in many cases there was no enough space to record wage payment. In two northern districts of Barabanki and Sonbadra, all the job cards did not have enough space for entry of wage payments. As far as recording of quantum of employment provided, Sambalpur (Orissa), Davangere (Karnataka), Palakkad (Kerala) did not made proper entries at all in the respective job cards of HHs. Nearly one-third of the job cards of eastern region did not have proper entries about details of number of days of employment.

#### **Section – IV: Registration and Application for Work:**

This section captured very important aspect of procedures and rules vis-à-vis guidelines of NREGA followed by the officials at GP level by way of views expressed by the beneficiaries. There are several guidelines to be followed by GP officials such as (i) allotment of work on time, (ii) time-lag between application for work and allotment of work, (iii) distance between worksite and residence, (iv) communication and dissemination of information about works and other activities under NREGA, (v) extent of women participation in all the activities carried under NREGA, (vi) facilities at worksite, (vii) redressal of grievances and complaints, (viii) record keeping of attendance, (ix) wage implementation and awareness, (x) procedure to be followed for payment of wages, (xi) delay in providing employment within stipulated time and unemployment allowance etc. This section tries to capture the views of all the beneficiaries in the above aspects.

Table 4.1 captures the data on the extent of fulfillment of obligation by GP to provide employment as a mandatory duty under NREGA for all those applicants who applied for job. Out of 5997 HHs tapped, the 169 HHs expressed that they were not offered employment at the time of investigators interviewed those HHs. Majority among them i.e., 80 HHs out of 1200 HHs hail from western region. The reason could be non-starting of the works in those districts, or those beneficiaries are still under consideration while the work plan is underway.

Table - 4.2 captures whether there is any time lag between application for job and allocation of job. According to the guidelines of the scheme, within a maximum period of 15 days of applying for job in writing, wage employment has to be provided. However, the response of the beneficiaries who got the wage employment speaks the other way. Out of the total beneficiaries, 80 percent of them did not get the employment within the stipulated time. Neither have they got any employment allowance as stipulated in the Act. In the northern and north-eastern region, most of the HHs did not get the job within the stipulated time. All the beneficiaries revealed that they were forced to visit GP office several times to seek employment even after applying for the job in writing. In other regions only few people got within the stipulated time.

The enquiry at official level revealed that since they are straddling with teething problems of the scheme such as lack of human resources, lack of vision, and lack of plan approvals etc. the work allocation got delayed. Officials are confident that this problem will be solved in due course of time.

Table – 4.3 explains the duration of waiting period after seeking for employment through application. Normally, within the framework of the NREGA, the work has to be provided within fifteen days of seeking employment. However, the primary data analysis shows that only 71.5% of the job-seekers were provided wage employment within the stipulated time period of 15 days. Seven percent of the people were provided after 3 weeks of seeking job.

The scheme was implemented in a gigantic scale at village level and it is commendable that though there is some delay, the work was provided up to the satisfaction of all the job seekers as far as the time lag is concerned. It is commendable to record that 28% of the job-seekers were provided wages within one week of demanding for wage employment. Among the 1712 HHs who constitute nearly one-fourth of the total sample, who were delayed employment beyond two weeks, majority are from the northern and eastern region.

Table – 4.4 tries to capture the HH data pertaining to average number of days of work provided to each and every household. There is a maximum limit of 100 days of employment to each household under this scheme. Only 4.5 percent of job card holders did utilize more than 35 days of wages per family. 14 percent of job card beneficiaries get up to 8 days of employment as on the time of this survey. Most of the beneficiaries did not utilize up to 100 days since the scheme is in its initial stages and all of them are yet to get work allocation in near future according to the version of officials. There is non-uniformity of distribution of number of wage-days in each district since the scheme was in its different stages of initiation. In some of the districts surveyed, the scheme was hardly launched. Therefore, most of the eligible families are yet to utilize their share of 100 days of wage employment.

As per the guidelines of NREGA, the work site should not be more than 4 km away from the GP office/residence of the beneficiaries. However, it was revealed in Table – 4.5 that 5 percent of the beneficiaries did work in those sites which are beyond 4 kms. Notable among them are from northern and eastern regions. More than half of the HHs did work in the worksites which are within the radius of one kilometer from their residence.

Though it is mandatory to provide transport allowance to job card holders in the event of work site falling beyond the distance of 4 km, it was found in the survey as stated in the Table – 4.6 that no such allowance was paid in spite of working in sites falling beyond the stipulated distance. However, in case of Davanagere district of Karnataka, a very minute number of beneficiaries i.e., 13 HHs expressed that transport allowance was paid.



There has to be several modes of dissemination of information detailing the work allocation so as to inform all the HHs falling in the jurisdiction of GP such as (a) notice board, (b) drum beating, (c) public announcement etc. Through the Table – 4.7 an attempt was made to know the most common mode of communicating the information regarding works. It was found that 55 percent of the HHs did come to know about the works and about the scheme itself through public announcements either in GP or in GS. 29 percent of the people came to know about the scheme and other details through notice boards displayed at GP office. Many among them heard through others who read or seen the contents of the notice board. 16 percent of the beneficiaries have come to know the details through drum beating which is the age-old, traditional way of disseminating the information from the GP office.

NREG Scheme stipulates at least one-third of the wage allocation i.e., person-days to women beneficiaries. Table – 4.8 captures the HH data of women participation in the NREG works. An attempt was made to analyse the participation of women in each and every household compared to the total person-days utilized by the respective households. It was found that in 21.5 percent of HHs, women folk of the family did not take part to the extent of 33% of person-days. Only in 42 percent households, the women could share the 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the allocated person-days (wage days). However, in 22 percent of the households, the women folk did utilize more than one-third of the utilized person-days in the household.

The Act under NREGA stipulates to provide basic facilities such as crèche, first aid, drinking water and shade for workers at the work site. An attempt was made as shown in Table – 4.9 to enquire the extent of such facilities provided to the wagers at the work site. Only 80 percent of the HHs did find drinking water facility at the work site. Only one-fourths of the HHs did agree that there is a crèche facility. However, only 83 percent of the HHs who participated in the wage employment did agree that there is a drinking water facility. Though, a shade for resting in between work hours and during lunch recess is mandatory, only 65 percent of the HHs did agree that there is a facility of shade near the work site.

An attempt was also made to enquire with the beneficiaries whether there are any general nature of grievances or complaints regarding works allocation,

registration procedures, and job card allocation etc. These grievances do not contribute to any particular lacunae of officials but the views and opinions of beneficiaries expressed during interaction with the investigators. 4.5 percent of the respondents recorded a complaint about works allocation, though in other cases i.e., registration, and allocation of job card there were only minor complaints as per the Table – 4.10. Among the complainants, majority are from the western region. Relatively, there were more complaints on the issue of work allocation compared to the process of registration and issue of job cards. Significant about this enquiry is that majority of beneficiaries expressed satisfaction with the overall work allocation and not attributed to any complaints in general.

Recording of attendance at the work site is another important step in the overall process of carrying out works under NREG Scheme. Table 4.11 reveals that 53 percent of the participants could not put their signature on the records and recorded their attendance by thumb impression. 58 percent of the HHs in the eastern region are illiterates and put their signature by thumb impression.

Through Table – 4.12 an attempt is made to arrive at an opinion about the awareness of the HHs vis-à-vis minimum wages Vs NREGA wages, maximum hours of work involved per day, prevailing wage rates in the respective places etc. Two-thirds of the participants agreed that there are separate better wages under NREGA Scheme compared to local prevailing wage rates. They also agreed that the prevailing rate for unskilled workers is less than the NREGA stipulated rate.

Table 4.13 shows that the payment of wages is done either at public place, or work site itself, or GP office or through Bank. It is very interesting to note that except in the districts of Medak (A.P.) and Palakkad (Kerala), in no other 20 districts payment is made through bank. One-third of the beneficiaries were paid at the work site itself. 23 percent of the beneficiaries were paid at the GP office while the rest were paid at some other public place.

To make the payment of wage highly transparent, and to make it clear to every beneficiary about the details of payments made, it is mandatory to publicly announce the names, number of days of wages, and total amount to be paid to respective

participant in order to rule out the ambiguity among the beneficiaries. However, Table – 4.14 shows that nearly 15 percent of the HHs are not convinced that there was any public announcement of individual names prior to payment of wages. Most of these respondents hail from eastern region, and to be precise majority of the surveyed HHs in Munger and Kishanganj districts did not agree that there was a public announcement detailing the payment of wages to individual participant at the worksite.

An enquiry was also made about their knowledge of any person who was delayed work allocation beyond stipulated duration and was paid any unemployment allowance. As stated in Table – 4.15 no one has come across any person who was paid any such allowance.

#### **Section – V: Impact on Wages, Income and Quality of Life:**

One of the major objectives of the scheme is to improve the income levels and enhance the quality of life of village folks who are thus far eking out with meager income, constraints of low wages, frequent interruptions in wage earnings etc. by providing 100 days of wage employment at prescribed minimum wages applicable in the region. This section is trying to bring out the impact of the scheme on various important attributes which contribute to the enhancement of quality of life such as (i) income levels before and after the scheme in vogue, (ii) distribution of means of income of beneficiaries e.g., agriculture, daily wage, petty business etc. (iii) shift in expenditure pattern on food items after income generation through the present scheme, (iv) expenditure pattern on non-food items before and after implementation of the scheme, (v) beneficiaries of the scheme having electricity connection, (vi) land holding pattern of the beneficiaries of this scheme, (vii) acquisition of movable and immovable assets by the beneficiaries during the year of implementation of the scheme, (viii) status of loans outstanding against the beneficiaries at the time of enquiry, (ix) status of household assets gathered before and after the scheme in vogue, (x) status of cultivation assets owned by the beneficiaries before and after the scheme's implementation, (xi) details of livestock creation prior to and after utilizing the scheme.

NREGS is the most significant scheme to uplift the overall quality of life of rural households. However, the impact time of the scheme is very less, in most districts of survey it is hardly couple of months and the utility of this scheme is not up to the maximum permissible limit of 100 days at the time of survey. Due to this reason, all the important variables which contribute towards quality of life did not give much output for further analysis since the scheme is not fully and not uniformly implemented in all the districts surveyed. Nevertheless, this little span of impact time has given much of the information to gauge the overall impact in areas such as expenditure pattern on food and non-food, asset creation at household and agricultural level, trends in income shifts etc. Following parts illustrate the impact of each and every variable studied on the beneficiaries of the scheme.

One of the important aspects of impact assessment is rise in income levels of the beneficiaries. Annual income of the beneficiaries is categorized into four groups such as (a) less than Rs. 5,000, (b) between Rs. 5,000 and 10,000, (c) between Rs. 10,000 to 15,000 and (d) above Rs. 15,000 but less than 20,000. This grouping is done based on the feedback from the beneficiaries and after confirming that all the beneficiaries income levels are falling under Rs. 20,000 per annum. Table – 5.1 shows that there is a shift in the first two income bracket of (a) & (b) categories as stated above. Percentage of HHs falling in these categories are reduced from 5.5 and 41.5 to 2.9 and 26.6 percent respectively. On the other hand, beneficiaries earning in the range of Rs. 15,000 and up to Rs. 20,000 increased from 33 and 20 percent to 44 and 26.3 percent respectively as a result of impact of the scheme. The effect is clearly visible in the eastern region where there is a reduction of low income group up to one-third of the original size.

Table – 5.2 captures the income sources of the beneficiaries from various sources such as agricultural yield, unskilled labour, agricultural labour, petty business etc. It was found that 52.3 percent of the HHs are unskilled labourers eking out their livelihood by odd and unskilled jobs. 12 percent of the HHs are agricultural peasants totally depending on seasonal agricultural works. One-fifth of the HHs are generating income from their own agricultural yields/activities. Very small fraction of them are eking out livelihood by petty businesses revolving around rural economy. Most of the HHs depending on purely unskilled labour activities are hailing from eastern region.

An attempt is also made to judge the impact of the scheme on the expenditure pattern of beneficiaries on food items. This information goes a long way in assessing the impact of the scheme on nutritional inputs of the beneficiaries . Here again it is categorized into three groups of beneficiaries i.e., (a) beneficiaries spending less than Rs. 500 on food items per month, (b) spending between Rs. 500-700, and (c) above Rs. 800 per month. The surveyed beneficiaries pattern of the above three categories shifted from 23.5, 27, and 49.5 percent to 15.5, 28 and 56.5 percent. It shows that there is a significant shift of beneficiaries from 49.5 to 56.5 % who are spending Rs. 800 & above on food items. This is the result of reduction of people spending very less i.e., less than Rs. 500 on food items. The region wise impact is shown in Table – 5.3

On the above lines an inference is also drawn to assess the expenditure on non-food items as given in Table – 5.4. It shows that there is an increase of beneficiaries from 6 to 11 percent who are spending more than Rs. 800 on non-food items. In western region there is an increase of three fold among the beneficiaries who are spending Rs. 800 above on non-food items. Non-food items include all eatables, consumables like beverages, alcoholic drinks, non-food supplements to their children etc.

As part of assessment of quality of life, an enquiry is also made to assess the electricity connections in the hutments, dwelling units of the beneficiaries as shown in Table – 5.5. It was revealed that only 31 percent of the beneficiaries are having electricity connection in their residences. 1569 beneficiaries out of 2100 HHs surveyed ( 75%) in the eastern region expressed that they do not have any electricity connection in their dwelling units.

Table – 5.6 gives the land holding status of the beneficiaries. This land holding include all the beneficiaries who claimed to have possessed even one bigha of land in their name or in the name of the head of the family. 53 percent of the beneficiaries are possessing at least a small agricultural land in their name. This data also includes the beneficiaries who are possessing land distributed by state/local government free of cost on various occasions.

An attempt is also made to measure the acquisition of movable and immovable assets by the beneficiaries during the year as stated in Table – 5.7. This asset base also include livestock which is the important asset in rural areas. 68 percent of the HHs revealed that they purchased livestock during the year. This livestock include sheep, goat, poultry etc. Seven percent of the beneficiaries purchased household articles like utensils, pressure cookers, crockery etc. Nearly two percent of the HHs opened bank accounts and deposited some money for the first time. Most of them are from northern and southern region. There was also an interesting revelation that nearly one percent of the beneficiaries and all of them are from southern region purchased some amount of gold during the year.

Table – 5.8 reveals the outstanding loan status of the beneficiaries. Nearly four-fifths of the beneficiaries do not have any outstanding loan. This loan status is from all the sources i.e., banks, local money lenders etc. Only one-fifth i.e., nearly 20% of the HHs have taken loans from the local money lenders. Among them, majority are from southern and western regions. It is interesting to note from the data that out of 300 beneficiaries surveyed in each district in the western region at least 60% of them have declared that they owe money to money lenders.

An attempt is also made to assess the purchasing capacity of the HHs as a result of this scheme by way of measurement of acquisition of household asset base such as bicycle, radio, sewing machine, electrical fittings, fans, steel trunk, etc. as shown in Table – 5.9. This table gives the auditing of household assets base prior to and after the implementation of the scheme. It has come to light that nearly 46 percent of the beneficiaries were already possessing bicycle even before the scheme. With the increase of income due to this scheme, only 3.3 percent of beneficiaries could buy new bicycles. 4.6 percent of people were able to buy radio/transistor. Only 31 out of 5997 HHs did buy sewing machine. 1.5% of the beneficiaries did buy either electric fan or other electrical fittings. 3.2 percent of the beneficiaries purchased steel trunks with the savings out of the income from this scheme.

Table – 5.10 gives the cultivable asset base of the beneficiaries before and after utilizing the scheme's wage income. This table pertains to those who are holding

some amount of cultivable land and generating income from this land. It was revealed that sizable number of beneficiaries who are possessing cultivable arid/agricultural land are possessing assets even before implementation of the scheme. However, the increase in asset base with the impact of this scheme is negligible as stated in the table. Nearly 10% of the HHs were already possessing bullock carts, and the increase in this assets is only less than one percent after implementation of the scheme. Nearly five percent of the beneficiaries were already having tube wells and the net increase during this year is mere 11 tube wells from among the huge cohort of nearly 6000 beneficiaries. 1.2 % HHs were possessing harvesters and threshers and its number remained same even after implementation of the scheme. It is most significant to note that 53 beneficiaries were possessing tractors even before on-set of this scheme. It is remarkable that two beneficiaries used the income generated from this wage scheme as a supplement to buy tractor.

Table – 5.11 gives the asset status of livestock of the beneficiaries before and after utilizing this scheme. 27% of the people were possessing milk animals and their number increased to 35% due to impact of the scheme. HHs possessing goat/sheep increased from 22% to 32% whereas the HHs possessing poultry/duck increased from 14 to 22% with the income generation from this scheme.

### **Section – VI: Impact on out-migration:**

One of the significant objective of the NREGA is to arrest out-migration of unskilled, landless labour force from the rural areas to urban areas by ensuring up to 100 days of wage employment within their native jurisdiction so that these 100 days guaranteed wage employment can be judiciously and rationally utilized by the landless peasants during lean and distress seasons. This section analyses the impact of this scheme in arresting out-migration by taking the opinion of households who have enrolled under the NREGA scheme and who are in possession of the job cards. This section precisely gathers the collective opinion of HHs on important attributes such as (i) details of families migrating in search of work, (ii) any knowledge of mass migration from the village, (iii) permanent migration of families from the village, (iv) wage parity of migration, i.e., attractiveness of wages upon migration, and (v) measures initiated by GP to check migration. In all the following description and

illustration of tables, it was described only the opinion and experiences of each and every household regarding the information of migration of other families including self to assess the extent of migration prevailing in the village.

In Table 6.1, it was shown that one-fourth of the families surveyed opined that there is migration from their respective village to towns/cities in search of job. Almost fifty percent of the HHs in western region expressed that migration is prevailing from their villages. In the north eastern region, in the district of North Lakhimpur, everyone agreed that there is migration from their villages.

Table 6.2 illustrates the mass migration scenario in all the 20 districts surveyed. In Malda, and South Garo Hills, almost half of the rural folks expressed that there is a mass migration from their places. In Medak (A.P.) which is adjoining the fast growing Hyderabad metropolitan is experiencing mass migration to the extent of 40 percent. In Dahod of western region it is almost one-third of the rural population.

Table 6.3 also reveals the permanent migration of families from their places. According to the opinion collated in the table, 66 households revealed that according to their knowledge there exists permanent migration of families from their villages. Out of those 66 families, the information given by 37 families reside in the eastern region, 23 families reside in the southern region and the rest from other parts of the country. This implies that there is a mass migration reported from eastern and southern region. Among the districts where the opinion is forthcoming are from Malda from West Bengal and Davanagere from Karnataka where the beneficiaries expressed that there is an exodus from their respective villages in search of livelihood.

Through Table – 6.4, an attempt is made to know the reasons for migration purely in terms of whether there exists enhanced wages upon migration in other places compared to the same kind of work in their own native villages. It is surprising to note that contrary to the general perception of better wages upon migration, 70 percent of the beneficiaries revealed that the migration is only for just wages and not for any better wages. This implies that there is a distress migration for just minimum wages to eke out the livelihood and for survival rather than for better wages. This can



be arrested through this NREG Scheme which is intended to address the distress migration of unskilled labour force among other things. Notable among the responses is that 82 and 67 percent of the HHs interviewed in the eastern and northern region respectively expressed that the out-migration is in search of work and meager wages rather than for better earnings which can be viewed as a distress migration.

There is a commendable role to be played by local bodies such as GPs to arrest the out-migration and distress migration. The NREG Scheme has given impetus to these local bodies to generate work within the village framework by sustaining the local resources and creating irrigation, agricultural asset base within the village set up itself. In this context, Table – 6.5 captures the views of beneficiaries vis-à-vis the capacity of GP to initiate measures to arrest the out-migration of the rural folks. It is disappointing to note that 38 percent of the HHs did not agree with the measures taken by GP to check out-migration. They expressed that the GP did not take any measures to create sustainable assets to generate wage employment within the village. Only 40 percent agreed that GP is taking appropriate steps to create wage employment. Rest of the beneficiaries did not give their opinion at all about the capacity of GP. Most notable fact is that the eastern region beneficiaries to the extent of 46 percent did not express any confidence in their respective village GP about their efforts of checking out-migration.

The last two sections which deal with the impact of the scheme on quality of life, asset base and migration were dealt with a limited purpose since the scheme was not uniformly implemented in all the 20 districts which were selected for the study. In some districts, the scheme was hardly launched, and even in few districts where it was under implementation for more than six months, all the beneficiaries could not utilize the maximum 100 days due to teething problems at the GP level to generate work to the full extent. Nevertheless, the study has brought out very important signals within the time frame of the implementation.

Zone	State	District	Person-days generated (Lakhs) (A)	Job cards issued (B)	Ratio (A/B)
North	1. U.P.	1. Barabanki	617.64	3860951	16.01
		2. Sonbadra	41.35	333246	12.4
	2. Haryana	3. Sirsa	48.32	145182	33.28
		4. Karauli	19.66	92365	21.3
	3. Rajasthan	5. Medak	11.7	60910	18.1
		6. Davanagere	912.79	1513739	60.3
South	4. A.P.	7. Palakkad	110.86	192992	57.4
		8. Kishangunj	548.23	5066675	10.82
	5. Karnataka	9. Munger	23.0	250957	9.16
		10. Gumla	182.22	790209	23.06
	6. Kerala	11. Ranchi	57.53	149901	38.38
		12. Sambalpur	10.85	201178	5.39
East	7. Bihar	13. Sundergarh	5.62	133305	4.22
		14. Malda	297.24	3171198	9.4
	8. Jharkand	15. Bandara	0.51	171864	0.3
		16. Dahod	22.48	97140	23.1
	9. Orissa	17. Jabua	308.14	2098713	14.7
		18. Bilaspur	26.86	121809	3.6
10. West Bengal	19. North Lakhimpur	7.92	191326	19.1	
	20. South Garo Hills	626.61	2568529	24.3	
West	11. Maharashtra	21. Saurashtra	34.12	121590	27.96
		22. Kutch	28.46	199962	14.0
	12. Gujarat	23. Daman	345.79	4973481	6.96
		24. Diu	21.5	428076	4.91
	13. M.P.	25. Madhya Pradesh	0	223316	---
		26. Madhya Pradesh	0	171853	---
14. Chattisgarh	27. Madhya Pradesh	84.57	624239	13.55	
	28. Madhya Pradesh	21.58	101676	21.22	
N.E.	15. Assam	29. Madhya Pradesh	1711.77	4442056	38.54
		30. Madhya Pradesh	113.14	276000	40.99
	16. Meghalaya	31. Madhya Pradesh	600.2	1809969	33.19
		32. Madhya Pradesh	96.98	222211	43.64

**Methodological Note:**

During the finalization of study details, it was proposed to take up 50 districts from among the first batch of 200 districts where the NREGA is under implementation. A presentation was made to a committee chaired by Prof. Abhijit Sen on 20-3-2007. The committee asked us to reduce the districts to 20 only.

These 20 districts were selected on the basis of available data of person-days generated and job cards issued. These districts were the blend of above and below state-average figures of the ratio of person-days generated and job cards issued. On the advise of the members present in the meeting (Mr. V.K.Bhatia, Adviser, PEO, and Mr. H. N. Gupta, Sr. Consultant), more weightage is given to four states of eastern region which constitute major chunk of out-migration of labour force. In all, 20 districts covering 16 states including 2 districts in North-East were finalized for the study in a separate meeting held with Mr. V.K. Bhatia, and Mr. H. N. Gupta. In case of Western region, the four districts were irrespective of above or below average figures since the data on other districts is not available at that point of time. Region-wise list of districts is given below:

**List of Districts:**

In every district, 6 gram panchayats (GPs) falling in two revenue blocks @ 3 GPs from each block were chosen in consultation with the district and block officials. In case of selection of beneficiaries i.e., @ 50 beneficiaries from each GP, it was done by random selection as advised by Prof. Abhijit Sen in the meeting held on 20-3-2007.

### Household Details

**Table-1.1: District wise Distribution of Head of the Household by Sex and Social Group**

S.No.	Districts	Social Group								Total	
		SC		ST		OBC		General		Male	Female
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
	<b>Northern Region</b>										
1	Barabanki	169	0	0	0	106	1	23	1	298	2
2	Sonbhadra	60	8	120	50	53	8	1	0	234	66
3	Sirsa	100	74	0	0	77	6	30	13	207	93
4	Karauli	51	46	40	40	51	46	16	7	158	139
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>897</b>	<b>300</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>										
5	Munger	103	5	32	4	121	4	31	0	287	13
6	Kishanganj	34	1	28	2	33	3	188	11	283	17
7	Sambalpur	37	10	129	51	41	8	24	0	231	69
8	Sundergarh	13	10	126	108	15	13	8	7	162	138
9	Gumla	2	0	241	34	9	3	9	2	261	39
10	Ranchi	13	5	211	39	12	14	4	2	240	60
11	Malda	89	4	151	28	22	0	6	0	268	32
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>918</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>1732</b>	<b>368</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>										
12	Dahod	1	9	201	18	0	0	69	2	271	29
13	Jhabua	0	0	158	142	0	0	0	0	158	142
14	Bhandara	40	8	0	6	183	27	31	5	254	46
15	Bilaspur	16	5	223	15	25	3	13	0	277	23
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>582</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>960</b>	<b>240</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>										
16	Devangere	68	29	35	24	28	15	81	20	212	88
17	Medak	79	66	2	0	42	84	20	7	143	157
18	Palakkad	14	66	30	40	22	93	14	21	80	220
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>465</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>										
19	North Lakhimpur	19	2	88	0	91	6	94	0	292	8
20	South Garo Hills	1	1	232	61	0	2	2	1	235	65
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>527</b>	<b>73</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>909</b>	<b>349</b>	<b>2047</b>	<b>662</b>	<b>931</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>664</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>4551</b>	<b>1446</b>

Note: SC - Scheduled Caste

ST - Scheduled Tribe

OBC - Other Backward Class

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007.

**Table1.2: District wise Distribution of Potential NREGS Workers in each Household**

S.No.	Districts	Size of the household (Potential worker)			Total
		1-----3	4-----6	7-----10	
	<b>Northern Region</b>				
1	Barabanki	299	1	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	293	7	0	300
3	Sirsa	260	38	2	300
4	Karauli	261	36	0	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1113</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>				
5	Munger	67	190	43	300
6	Kishenganj	58	171	71	300
7	Sambalpur	188	106	6	300
8	Sundergarh	231	66	3	300
9	Gumla	282	18	0	300
10	Ranchi	270	30	0	300
11	Malda	280	18	2	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1376</b>	<b>599</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>				
12	Dahod	167	121	12	300
13	Jhabua	129	167	4	300
14	Bhandara	90	180	30	300
15	Bilaspur	177	110	13	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>563</b>	<b>578</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>				
16	Devangere	187	109	4	300
17	Medak	270	15	15	300
18	Palakkad	285	14	1	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>742</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>				
19	North Lakhimpur	296	4	0	300
20	South Garo Hills	270	30	0	300
	<b>SubTotal</b>	<b>566</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>4360</b>	<b>1431</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

## 2. Mechanism of Job Card Registration

**Table 2.1 : District wise Distribution of Beneficiaries response regarding the Procedure followed for issue of Job Card**

S.No	Districts	Procedure followed for getting Job Card					Total
		Gram Sabha	Oral request	Applied on paper	Door to door survey	Any other	
	<b>Northern Region</b>						
1	Barabanki	100	0	200	0	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	0	0	50	250	0	300
3	Sirsa	276	20	0	4	0	300
4	Karauli	71	13	84	129	0	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>447</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>334</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>						
5	Munger	1	4	295	0	0	300
6	Kishenganj	35	21	227	6	11	300
7	Sambalpur	5	2	241	52	0	300
8	Sundergarh	0	12	285	3	0	300
9	Gumla	170	117	7	3	3	300
10	Ranchi	103	132	63	2	0	300
11	Malda	72	18	14	196	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>386</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>1132</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>						
12	Dahod	0	0	300	0	0	300
13	Jhabua	0	8	0	292	0	300
14	Bhandara	0	0	300	0	0	300
15	Bilaspur	10	73	202	15	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>802</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>						
16	Devangere	22	8	20	250	0	300
17	Medak	90	0	210	0	0	300
18	Palakkad	300	0	0	0	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>412</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>						
19	North Lakhimpur	0	0	250	50	0	300
20	South Garo Hills	225	0	75	0	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>300</b>
	<b>Grand-Total</b>	<b>1480</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>2823</b>	<b>1252</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 2.2 : District wise Distribution of Procedure followed for Verification of Registered Persons for Job Card**

S. No	Districts	List of Registered Persons read out in Gram Sabha for Verification of Job Card			
		Yes	No	No response	Total
	<b>Northern Region</b>				
1	Barabanki	300	0	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	300	0	0	300
3	Sirsa	298	0	2	300
4	Karauli	273	24	0	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1171</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>				
5	Munger	233	67	0	300
6	Kishanganj	282	18	0	300
7	Sambalpur	150	150	0	300
8	Sundergarh	288	12	0	300
9	Gumla	215	85	0	300
10	Ranchi	237	63	0	300
11	Malda	264	36	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1669</b>	<b>431</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>				
12	Dahod	271	19	10	300
13	Jhabua	261	39	0	300
14	Bhandara	269	31	0	300
15	Bilaspur	196	104	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>997</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern-Region</b>				
16	Devangere	300	0	0	300
17	Medak	90	210	0	300
18	Palakkad	300	0	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>				
19	North Lakhimpur	250	50	0	300
20	South Garo Hills	300	0	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>5077</b>	<b>908</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey

**Table 2.3 : District wise showing the response of Beneficiary regarding the availability of Registration in Gram Panchayat**

S.No	Districts	Registration open throughout the year in GP			
		Yes	No	No response	Total
	<b>Northern Region</b>				
1	Barabanki	300	0	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	300	0	0	300
3	Sirsa	298	0	2	300
4	Karauli	191	106	0	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1089</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>				
5	Munger	253	47	0	300
6	Kishenganj	270	30	0	300
7	Sambalpur	201	99	0	300
8	Sundergarh	88	212	0	300
9	Gumla	240	60	0	300
10	Ranchi	268	32	0	300
11	Malda	263	37	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1583</b>	<b>517</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>				
12	Dahod	253	33	14	300
13	Jhabua	277	23	0	300
14	Bhandara	255	45	0	300
15	Bilaspur	300	0	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1085</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>				
16	Devangere	102	192	6	300
17	Medak	300	0	0	300
18	Palakkad	300	0	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>702</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>				
19	North Lakhimpur	300	0	0	300
20	South Garo Hills	300	0	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>5059</b>	<b>916</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>5997</b>

**Note** : GP - Gram Panchayat

**Source** : IAMR Survey, 2007



**Table 2.4 : District wise Distribution of response of Beneficiaries regarding convening of Gram Sabha for Verification after Registration**

S.No	Districts	Convening of Gram Sabha for Verification			
		Yes	No	No Response	Total
	<b>Nothern Region</b>				
1	Barabanki	300	0	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	300	0	0	300
3	Sirsa	298	0	2	300
4	Karauli	275	22	0	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1173</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>				
5	Munger	152	148	0	300
6	Kishenganj	158	142	0	300
7	Sambalpur	77	223	0	300
8	Sundergarh	47	253	0	300
9	Gumla	236	64	0	300
10	Ranchi	268	32	0	300
11	Malda	265	35	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1203</b>	<b>897</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>				
12	Dahod	237	35	28	300
13	Jhabua	266	27	7	300
14	Bhandara	180	75	45	300
15	Bilaspur	219	81	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>902</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>				
16	Devangere	205	88	7	300
17	Medak	90	210	0	300
18	Palakkad	300	0	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>595</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>				
19	North Lakhimpur	250	50	0	300
20	South Garo Hills	300	0	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>4423</b>	<b>1485</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 2.5 : District wise distribution of response of Beneficiary regarding the discussion in Gram Sabha about the request of Application which were Rejected earlier**

S.No	Districts	Application which were Rejected earlier			
		Yes	No	No Response	Total
	<b>Northern Region</b>				
1	Barabanki	55	245	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	300	0	0	300
3	Sirsa	298	0	2	300
4	Karauli	0	297	0	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>653</b>	<b>542</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>				
5	Munger	25	275	0	300
6	Kishenganj	8	292	0	300
7	Sambalpur	100	200	0	300
8	Sundergarh	0	300	0	300
9	Gumla	232	68	0	300
10	Ranchi	204	96	0	300
11	Malda	47	253	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>616</b>	<b>1484</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>				
12	Dahod	252	36	12	300
13	Jhabua	237	48	15	300
14	Bhandara	248	43	9	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>737</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>				
15	Bilaspur	0	300	0	300
16	Devangere	80	208	12	300
17	Medak	140	160	0	300
18	Palakkad	26	274	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>942</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>				
19	North Lakhimpur	0	300	0	300
20	South Garo Hills	197	103	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>403</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2449</b>	<b>3498</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 2.6 : District wise Distribution of response of Beneficiaries regarding the Frequency in which the Gram Sabha Meetings are Conducted**

S.No	Districts	Frequency of Grama Sabha Meeting				
		Monthly	Bimonthly	Quarterly	Others*	Total
<b>Northern Region</b>						
1	Barabanki	110	0	190	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	104	144	52	0	300
3	Sirsa	0	0	300	0	300
4	Karauli	41	77	116	63	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>658</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>1197</b>
<b>Eastern Region</b>						
5	Munger	11	0	289	0	300
6	Kishenganj	20	0	280	0	300
7	Sambalpur	57	67	83	93	300
8	Sundergarh	25	35	240	0	300
9	Gumla	131	0	109	60	300
10	Ranchi	197	80	23	0	300
11	Malda	73	13	214	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>514</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>1238</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>2100</b>
<b>Western Region</b>						
12	Dahod	140	160	0	0	300
13	Jhabua	281	17	2	0	300
14	Bhandara	300	0	0	0	300
15	Bilaspur	0	0	300	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>721</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>
<b>Southern Region</b>						
16	Devangere	103	21	85	91	300
17	Medak	8	5	3	284	300
18	Palakkad	0	0	250	50	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>425</b>	<b>900</b>
<b>North-East Region</b>						
19	North Lakhimpur	33	0	222	45	300
20	South Garo Hills	250	0	50	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1884</b>	<b>619</b>	<b>2808</b>	<b>686</b>	<b>5997</b>

**Note :** \*Half yearly or yearly  
**Source :** IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 2.7 : District wise Distribution about the respondents knowledge of Persons who wanted to register for Job Card, but could not register**

S.No	Districts	Knowledge about Persons who wanted to register but could not			Total
		Yes	No	No Response	
	<b>Northern Region</b>				
1	Barabanki	0	300	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	0	300	0	300
3	Sirsa	0	300	0	300
4	Karauli	0	292	5	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1192</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>				
5	Munger	0	300	0	300
6	Kishanganj	35	265	0	300
7	Sambalpur	17	243	40	300
8	Sundergarh	0	258	42	300
9	Gumla	13	287	0	300
10	Ranchi	22	278	0	300
11	Malda	4	296	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>1927</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>				
12	Dahod	0	300	0	300
13	Jhabua	0	300	0	300
14	Bhandara	0	300	0	300
15	Bilaspur	0	300	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>				
16	Devangere	32	262	6	300
17	Medak	48	159	93	300
18	Palakkad	10	284	6	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>705</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>				
19	North Lakhimpur	1	299	0	300
20	South Garo Hills	0	300	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>599</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>5623</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 2.8 : District wise details of respondents knowledge about Migrant Families who could register for Job Card**

S.No	Districts	Migrant families who could register for Job Card			
		Yes	No	No Response	Total
	<b>Northern Region</b>				
1	Barabanki	0	300	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	0	300	0	300
3	Sirsa	0	300	0	300
4	Karauli	45	0	252	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>900</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>				
5	Munger	0	300	0	300
6	Kishenganj	14	286	0	300
7	Sambalpur	0	300	0	300
8	Sundergarh	0	300	0	300
9	Gumla	43	257	0	300
10	Ranchi	19	281	0	300
11	Malda	76	224	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>1948</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>				
12	Dahod	0	300	0	300
13	Jhabua	0	300	0	300
14	Bhandara	0	300	0	300
15	Bilaspur	0	300	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>				
16	Devangere	65	225	10	300
17	Medak	52	217	31	300
18	Palakkad	3	296	1	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>738</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>				
19	North Lakhimpur	0	300	0	300
20	South Garo Hills	22	278	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>578</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>5364</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

### 3. Issue of Job Card

**Table 3.1 : District wise Distribution of response regarding Workers in the family who are eligible to Work and who are willing to Work and included in the Job Card**

S. No	Districts	All ther eligible workers of the family who willing the work and included in the Job card		
		Yes	No	Total
<b>Northern Region</b>				
1	Barabanki	266	34	300
2	Sonbhadra	300	0	300
3	Sirsa	300	0	300
4	Karauli	297	0	297
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>1163</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>1197</b>
<b>Eastern Region</b>				
5	Munger	187	113	300
6	Kishenganj	21	279	300
7	Sambalpur	300	0	300
8	Sundergarh	285	15	300
9	Gumla	299	1	300
10	Ranchi	286	14	300
11	Malda	259	41	300
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>1637</b>	<b>463</b>	<b>2100</b>
<b>Western Region</b>				
12	Dahod	300	0	300
13	Jhabua	300	0	300
14	Bhandara	300	0	300
15	Bilaspur	299	1	300
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>1199</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1200</b>
<b>Southern Region</b>				
16	Devangere	268	32	300
17	Medak	230	70	300
18	Palakkad	271	29	300
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>769</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>900</b>
<b>North-East Region</b>				
19	North Lakhimpur	300	0	300
20	South Garo Hills	300	0	300
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>600</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>5368</b>	<b>629</b>	<b>5997</b>

**Source :** IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 3.2 : District wise Distribution of response of the Beneficiaries regarding the Custody of Job Card**

S.No	Districts	Custody of Job Card		
		In the custody of	Custody of	Total
		the Member of the Household	GP/Mate	
	<b>Northern Region</b>			
1	Barabanki	300	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	300	0	300
3	Sirsa	300	0	300
4	Karauli	297	0	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1197</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>			
5	Munger	256	44	300
6	Kishanganj	299	1	300
7	Sambalpur	283	17	300
8	Sundergarh	205	95	300
9	Gumla	300	0	300
10	Ranchi	287	13	300
11	Malda	271	29	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1901</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>			
12	Dahod	300	0	300
13	Jhabua	300	0	300
14	Bhandara	300	0	300
15	Bilaspur	300	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1200</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>			
16	Devangere	216	84	300
17	Medak	300	0	300
18	Palakkad	297	3	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>813</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>			
19	North Lakhimpur	300	0	300
20	South Garo Hills	300	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>5711</b>	<b>286</b>	<b>5997</b>

**Note :** GP - Gram Panchayat

**Source :** IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 3.3 : District wise Distribution of the Waiting Period between registration and receiving of Job Card**

S. No.	Districts	Waiting Period between registration and receiving of Job Card			Total
		Upto 15 days	15-30 days	More than 30 days	
	<b>Northern Region</b>				
1	Barabanki	300	0	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	300	0	0	300
3	Sirsa	90	210	0	300
4	Karauli	234	22	41	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>924</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>				
5	Munger	76	52	172	300
6	Kishenganj	84	24	192	300
7	Sambalpur	108	161	31	300
8	Sundergarh	64	41	195	300
9	Gumla	251	19	30	300
10	Ranchi	187	79	34	300
11	Malda	232	52	16	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1002</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>670</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>				
12	Dahod	271	29	0	300
13	Jhabua	242	58	0	300
14	Bhandara	273	27	0	300
15	Bilaspur	291	6	3	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1077</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>				
16	Devangere	175	54	71	300
17	Medak	248	45	7	300
18	Palakkad	202	46	52	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>625</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>				
19	North Lakhimpur	170	130	0	300
20	South Garo Hills	228	72	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>398</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>4026</b>	<b>1127</b>	<b>844</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007



Table 3.4 District wise Distribution Frequency of visit by the Beneficiary to GP to get Job Card

S. No	Districts	Frequency of visit by the beneficiary to GP to get job card						Total
		Only Once	Twice	Thrice	Four Times	Five & above	No Response	
	<b>Northern Region</b>							
1	Barabanki	181	102	16	1	0	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	1	178	121	0	0	0	300
3	Sirsa	196	104	0	0	0	0	300
4	Karauli	228	51	15	2	1	0	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>							
5	Munger	139	80	39	16	26	0	300
6	Kishenganj	135	120	22	15	8	0	300
7	Sambalpur	188	53	59	0	0	0	300
8	Sundergarh	174	98	22	4	2	0	300
9	Gumla	219	33	17	6	6	19	300
10	Ranchi	202	62	19	7	10	0	300
11	Malda	216	52	10	11	11	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1273</b>	<b>498</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>							
12	Dahod	167	121	12	0	0	0	300
13	Jhabua	245	53	2	0	0	0	300
14	Bhandara	180	120	0	0	0	0	300
15	Bilaspur	288	9	3	0	0	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>880</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>							
16	Devangere	85	100	43	33	39	0	300
17	Medak	158	67	72	3	0	0	300
18	Palakkad	151	94	39	10	6	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>							
19	North Lakhimpur	18	219	48	1	0	14	300
20	South Garo Hills	293	7	0	0	0	19	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>3464</b>	<b>1723</b>	<b>559</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 3.5 : District wise Distribution regarding Facilitation of Photographs on Job Card**

S. No.	Districts	Photographs on Job Card is Facilitated by GP			
		Beneficiary	GP	No Photograph	Total
	<b>Northern Region</b>				
1	Barabanki	40	260	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	35	265	0	300
3	Sirsa	0	300	0	300
4	Karauli	149	66	82	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>891</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>				
5	Munger	283	16	1	300
6	Kishanganj	172	109	19	300
7	Sambalpur	0	0	300	300
8	Sundergarh	25	255	20	300
9	Gumla	132	119	49	300
10	Ranchi	1	182	117	300
11	Malda	23	21	251	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>641</b>	<b>702</b>	<b>757</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>				
12	Dahod	0	300	0	300
13	Jhabua	34	266	0	300
14	Bhandara	0	300	0	300
15	Bilaspur	18	210	72	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>1076</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>				
16	Devangere	268	13	19	300
17	Medak	0	0	300	300
18	Palakkad	300		0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>568</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>				
19	North Lakhimpur	300	-	0	300
20	South Garo Hills	7	293	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1792</b>	<b>2975</b>	<b>1230</b>	<b>5997</b>

**Note :** GP - Gram Panchayat

**Source :** IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 3.6 : District wise Distribution of Investigators Observation on Physical Verification of Job Card**

S.No	Districts	Observation on Physical Verification of Job Card					
		Enough space		Column of Wage Payment		No. of days Empl. Records	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
	<b>Northern Region</b>						
1	Barabanki	300	0	0	300	300	0
2	Sonbhadra	300	0	0	300	300	0
3	Sirsa	300	0	300	0	283	17
4	Karauli	297	0	297	0	297	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1197</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>597</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>1180</b>	<b>17</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>						
5	Munger	300	0	230	70	144	156
6	Kishenganj	299	1	293	7	265	35
7	Sambalpur	300	0	0	300	0	300
8	Sundergarh	250	50	265	35	300	0
9	Gumla	300	0	218	82	206	94
10	Ranchi	289	11	277	23	277	23
11	Malda	300	0	300	0	300	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>2038</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>1583</b>	<b>517</b>	<b>1492</b>	<b>608</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>						
12	Dahod	86	214	300	0	300	0
13	Jhabua	300	0	300	0	300	0
14	Bhandara	300	0	300	0	300	0
15	Bilaspur	300	0	300	0	300	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>986</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>1200</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>						
16	Devangere	300	0	0	300	0	300
17	Medak	283	17	300	0	299	1
18	Palakkad	300	0	0	300	300	301
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>883</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>599</b>	<b>301</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>						
19	North Lakhimpur	136	164	0	300	300	0
20	South Garo Hills	300	0	300	0	300	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>436</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>5540</b>	<b>457</b>	<b>3383</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>5071</b>	<b>926</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

#### 4. Registration & Application for Job (Work)

**Table 4.1 : District wise Distribution of response Pertaining to Work after getting Job Card**

S. No	Districts	Pertaining to Work			
		Applied for Job		Offerd Employment	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
	<b>Northern Region</b>				
1	Barabanki	300	0	298	2
2	Sonbhadra	300	0	300	0
3	Sirsa	300	0	300	0
4	Karauli	297	0	297	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1197</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1195</b>	<b>2</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>				
5	Munger	300	0	300	0
6	Kishenganj	300	0	300	0
7	Sambalpur	300	0	300	0
8	Sundergarh	300	0	300	0
9	Gumla	283	17	286	14
10	Ranchi	285	15	273	27
11	Malda	259	41	259	41
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>2027</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>82</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>				
12	Dahod	300	0	300	0
13	Jhabua	256	44	300	0
14	Bhandara	300	0	300	0
15	Bilaspur	105	195	220	80
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>961</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>1120</b>	<b>80</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>				
16	Devangere	300	0	300	0
17	Medak	143	157	295	5
18	Palakkad	300	0	300	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>743</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>895</b>	<b>5</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>				
19	North Lakhimpur	300	0	300	0
20	South Garo Hills	300	0	300	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>5528</b>	<b>469</b>	<b>5828</b>	<b>169</b>

**Source :** IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 4.2 : District wise Distribution of Delay in Providing Employment and Payment of Unemployment Allowances**

S.No	Districts	Work Allotment		Payment of Unemployment Allowance	
		Delayed			
		Yes	No	Yes	No
	<b>Northern Region</b>				
1	Barabanki	0	300	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	0	300	0	300
3	Sirsa	0	300	0	300
4	Karauli	0	297	0	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1197</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>				
5	Munger	300	0	0	300
6	Kishenganj	300	0	0	300
7	Sambalpur	0	300	0	300
8	Sundergarh	226	74	0	300
9	Gumla	119	181	0	300
10	Ranchi	0	300	0	300
11	Malda	0	300	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>945</b>	<b>1155</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>				
12	Dahod	0	300	0	300
13	Jhabua	0	300	0	300
14	Bhandara	0	300	0	300
15	Bilaspur	17	283	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>1183</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>				
16	Devangere	253	47	0	300
17	Medak	0	300	0	300
18	Palakkad	0	300	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>647</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>				
19	North Lakhimpur	0	300	0	300
20	South Garo Hills	0	300	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1215</b>	<b>4782</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

Table 4.3 : District wise Distribution of Waiting Period after Application for Employment

S. No	Districts	Waiting Period for Employment						Total
		0-5 days	6-10 days	11-15 days	16-20 days	21-25 days	> 25 days	
	<b>Northern Region</b>							
1	Barabanki	76	159	64	1	0	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	104	160	26	10	0	0	300
3	Sirsa	0	0	249	28	23	0	300
4	Karauli	112	76	12	45	15	37	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>							
5	Munger	2	11	12	24	47	204	300
6	Kishanganj	0	0	0	1	34	265	300
7	Sambalpur	25	52	74	27	122	0	300
8	Sundergarh	25	26	23	28	38	160	300
9	Gumla	119	12	22	14	0	133	300
10	Ranchi	249	31	12	1	1	6	300
11	Malda	64	22	80	21	21	92	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>484</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>860</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>							
12	Dahod	27	33	240	0	0	0	300
13	Jhabua	143	94	63	0	0	0	300
14	Bhandara	15	30	255	0	0	0	300
15	Bilaspur	267	33	0	0	0	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>452</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>558</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>							
16	Devangere	41	46	63	7	4	139	300
17	Medak	83	159	58	0	0	0	300
18	Palakkad	150	100	13	4	3	30	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>							
19	North Lakhimpur	124	92	84	0	0	0	300
20	South Garo Hills	33	108	32	2	122	3	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand-Total</b>	<b>1659</b>	<b>1244</b>	<b>1382</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>430</b>	<b>1069</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

Table 4.4 District wise Distribution of the Average Number of Days Work Provided to each Household

S. No	Districts	Average Number of Days of Work Provided to Households						Total
		1-8 days	9-17 days	18-25days	26-34 days	35 & above	No Response	
	<b>Northern Region</b>							
1	Barabanki	30	46	110	114	0	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	48	54	48	150	0	0	300
3	Sirsa	0	0	0	300	0	0	300
4	Karauli	10	10	11	266	0	0	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>830</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>							
5	Munger	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	300	300
6	Kishanganj	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	300	300
7	Sambalpur	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	300	300
8	Sundergarh	27	67	46	160	0	0	300
9	Gumla	72	82	93	42	11	0	300
10	Ranchi	68	63	91	78	0	0	300
11	Malda	139	86	36	39	0	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>900</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>							
12	Dahod	7	29	77	187	0	0	300
13	Jhabua	30	39	94	137	0	0	300
14	Bhandara	180	75	45	0	0	0	300
15	Bilaspur	43	65	73	119	0	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>443</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>							
16	Devangere	64	90	66	37	43	0	300
17	Medak	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	300	300
18	Palakkad	77	94	52	28	49	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>							
19	North Lakhimpur	18	23	31	59	169	0	300
20	South Garo Hills	30	66	31	173	0	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand-Total</b>	<b>843</b>	<b>889</b>	<b>904</b>	<b>1889</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>1200</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 4.5 : District wise Distribution of Distance of Work site from Residence**

S. No.	Districts	Distance in Km. of Work site from Residence					Total
		0-1	2--3	4--5	6--7	8 & above	
	<b>Northern Region</b>						
1	Barabanki	190	110	0	0	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	177	123	0	0	0	300
3	Sirsa	60	210	30	0	0	300
4	Karauli	142	112	36	6	1	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>569</b>	<b>555</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>						
5	Munger	131	159	10	0	0	300
6	Kishenganj	129	116	41	14	0	300
7	Sambalpur	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	300*
8	Sundergarh	205	85	9	1	0	300
9	Gumla	288	12	0	0	0	300
10	Ranchi	282	18	0	0	0	300
11	Malda	253	47	0	0	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1288</b>	<b>437</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>						
12	Dahod	143	138	19	0	0	300
13	Jhabua	137	152	11	0	0	300
14	Bhandara	105	180	15	0	0	300
15	Bilaspur	197	97	6	0	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>582</b>	<b>567</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>						
16	Devangere	51	159	77	9	4	300
17	Medak	180	120	0	0	0	300
18	Palakkad	224	64	12	0	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>343</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>						
19	North Lakhimpur	298	2	0	0	0	300
20	South Garo Hills	152	148	0	0	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>450</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>3344</b>	<b>2052</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5997</b>

**Note** : \* Break up is not available

**Source** : IAMR Survey,  
2007



**Table 4.6 : District wise Distribution by Transport Allowance being paid in the case of far off Work-site from Beneficiaries Residence**

S. No	Districts	Allowance being paid in the Case of far off Work-site			
		Transport Allowance		Living allowance	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
	<b>Northern Region</b>				
1	Barabanki	0	300	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	0	300	0	300
3	Sirsa	0	300	0	300
4	Karauli	0	297	0	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1197</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>				
5	Munger	0	300	0	300
6	Kishanganj	0	300	0	300
7	Sambalpur	0	300	0	300
8	Sundergarh	0	0	0	0
9	Gumla	0	300	0	300
10	Ranchi	0	300	0	300
11	Malda	0	300	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1800</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1800</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>				
12	Dahod	0	300	0	300
13	Jhabua	0	300	0	300
14	Bhandara	0	300	0	300
15	Bilaspur	0	300	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>				
16	Devangere	13*	287	0	300
17	Medak	0	300	0	300
18	Palakkad	0	300	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>587</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>				
19	North Lakhimpur	0	300	0	300
20	South Garo Hills	0	300	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>5684</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5697</b>

Note: \* Transport allowance has made by two ways:

- i) By large GP has made transport arrangement for long distance work sites  
Only few occasions and to few beneficiaries a cash allowance Rs.10% has provided.
- ii)

**Table 4.7 : District wise Distribution of regarding Communication Method of Work Allocation**

S. No	Districts	Communication Method of Work Allocation			
		Notice Board	Drum Beating	Public Announcement	Total
	<b>Northern Region</b>				
1	Barabanki	6	105	189	300
2	Sonbhadra	0	0	300	300
3	Sirsa	0	0	300	300
4	Karauli	296	0	1	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>790</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>				
5	Munger	93	14	193	300
6	Kishenganj	130	0	170	300
7	Sambalpur	300	0	0	300
8	Sundergarh	134	80	86	300
9	Gumla	53	89	158	300
10	Ranchi	1	138	161	300
11	Malda	97	24	179	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>808</b>	<b>345</b>	<b>947</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>				
12	Dahod	78	59	163	300
13	Jhabua	0	60	240	300
14	Bhandara	51	75	174	300
15	Bilaspur	0	8	292	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>869</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>				
16	Devangere	39	87	174	300
17	Medak	57	238	5	300
18	Palakkad	300	0	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>				
19	North Lakhimpur	23	0	277	300
20	South Garo Hills	86	0	214	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>491</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1744</b>	<b>977</b>	<b>3276</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 4.8 : District wise Distribution Pertaining to Implementation of Women Quota in Work Allotment**

S.No	Districts	Share of Women in the Work Allocation				
		<33%	33%	33%	No Response	Total
<b>Northern Region</b>						
1	Barabanki	300	0	0	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	23	277	0	0	300
3	Sirsa	0	300	0	0	300
4	Karauli	16	33	248	271	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>610</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1197</b>
<b>Eastern Region</b>						
5	Munger	0	29	0	271	300
6	Kishanganj	0	36	0	264	300
7	Sambalpur	0		0	0	300
8	Sundergarh	60	158	82	0	300
9	Gumla	32	263	5	13	300
10	Ranchi	55	232	0	13	300
11	Malda	72	93	135		300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>811</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>548</b>	<b>2100</b>
<b>Western Region</b>						
12	Dahod	300	0	0	0	300
13	Jhabua	0	300	0	0	300
14	Bhandara	0	300	0	0	300
15	Bilaspur	0	300	0	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>900</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>
<b>Southern Region</b>						
16	Devangere	78	99	123	0	300
17	Medak	57	97	146	0	300
18	Palakkad	0	0	300	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>569</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>900</b>
<b>North-East Region</b>						
19	North Lakhimpur	300	0	0	0	300
20	South Garo Hills	0	0	300	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>1293</b>	<b>2517</b>	<b>1339</b>	<b>548</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 4.9 : District wise Distribution of Facilities Available at Work site**

S.No	Districts	Faciliteis Available at Work Site			
		Creche	First Aid	Drinking Water	Shade for Workers
<b>Northern Region</b>					
1	Barabanki	200	300	300	200
2	Sonbhadra	300	300	300	300
3	Sirsa	-	189	300	300
4	Karauli	59	191	288	154
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>559</b>	<b>980</b>	<b>1188</b>	<b>954</b>
<b>Eastern Region</b>					
5	Munger	0	43	257	0
6	Kishenganj	0	0	300	0
7	Sambalpur	100	75	105	110
8	Sundergarh	2	3	109	203
9	Gumla	0	300	300	300
10	Ranchi	32	255	255	250
11	Malda	0	300	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>976</b>	<b>1326</b>	<b>1163</b>
<b>Western Region</b>					
12	Dahod	9	184	257	143
13	Jhabua	284	291	298	281
14	Bhandara	0	39	174	87
15	Bilaspur	249	297	297	263
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>542</b>	<b>811</b>	<b>1026</b>	<b>774</b>
<b>Southern Region</b>					
16	Devangere	0	86	245	21
17	Medak	195	86	300	211
18	Palakkad	0	210	300	202
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>382</b>	<b>845</b>	<b>434</b>
<b>North-East Region</b>					
19	North Lakhimpur	7	300	300	300
20	South Garo Hills	50	300	Mar-00	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1487</b>	<b>3749</b>	<b>4985</b>	<b>3925</b>

**Source :** IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 4.10 : District wise Distribution of respondents Grievances related to Allocation of Work Registration/Job Card**

S. No	Districts	Grievances Related to						Total	
		Allocation of Work		Registration		Job Card			No Complaints
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No		
<b>Northern Region</b>									
1	Barabanki	0	300	0	300	0	300	300	
2	Sonbhadra	0	300	0	300	0	300	300	
3	Sirsa	0	300	0	300	0	300	300	
4	Karauli	0	297	0	297	0	297	297	
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1197</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1197</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1197</b>	<b>1197</b>	
<b>Eastern Region</b>									
5	Munger	0	0	0	0	0	0	300	
6	Kishenganj	0	0	0	0	0	0	300	
7	Sambalpur	0	0	0	0	0	0	300	
8	Sundergarh	10	290	2	298	0	298	288	
9	Gumla	0	300	0	300	12	288	288	
10	Ranchi	28	0	25	0	27	0	220	
11	Malda	2	298	0	300	0	300	298	
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>888</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>898</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>886</b>	<b>1994</b>	
<b>Western Region</b>									
12	Dahod	78	222	0	300	0	300	222	
13	Jhabua	12	288	0	300	0	300	288	
14	Bhandara	15	285	0	300	0	300	285	
15	Bilaspur	1	299	0	300	1	299	298	
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>1094</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1199</b>	<b>1093</b>	
<b>Southern Region</b>									
16	Devangere	54	246	0	300	1	37	245	
17	Medak	4	296	0	0	24	276	272	
18	Palakkad	6	294	0	0	0	0	294	
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>836</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>811</b>	
<b>North-East Region</b>									
19	North Lakhimpur	0	0	0	0	0	0	300	
20	South Garo Hills	0	300	0	300	0	300	300	
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>600</b>	
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>4315</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>3895</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>3895</b>	<b>5695</b>	

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 4.11 : Statement Showing the District wise Distribution of Method Adopted for recording of Attendance at the Work Site**

S.No	Districts	Methods for Recording of Attendance at the Work Site		
		By Signature	By Thumb Impression	Total
	<b>Northern Region</b>			
1	Barabanki	144	156	300
2	Sonbhadra	136	164	300
3	Sirsa	138	162	300
4	Karauli	102	195	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>520</b>	<b>677</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>			
5	Munger	120	180	300
6	Kishanganj	72	228	300
7	Sambalpur	236	64	300
8	Sundergarh	182	112	300
9	Gumla	74	226	300
10	Ranchi	159	141	300
11	Malda	42	300	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>885</b>	<b>1215</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>			
12	Dahod	83	217	300
13	Jhabua	22	278	300
14	Bhandara	89	211	300
15	Bilaspur	29	271	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>977</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>			
16	Devangere	214	86	300
17	Medak	217	83	300
18	Palakkad	253	47	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>684</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>			
19	North Lakhimpur	261	27	300
20	South Garo Hills	230	70	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>491</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2803</b>	<b>3194</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 4.12 : District wise Distribution of Awareness about the Wages**

S. No	Districts	Separate Wages being		Min. wages decided by Govt. per day(Rs.)	Wages Actually paid after 7-8 hours of work (Rs.)	Prevailing Wage Rate for Unskilled workers(Rs.)	No Response
		Applied to NREGS					
		Yes	No				
<b>Northern Region</b>							
1	Barabanki	0	300	58	58	50-60	0
2	Sonbhadra	0	300	58	58	40-50	0
3	Sirsa	300	0	95.55	96	100	0
4	Karauli	297	0	55	55	50-55	0
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>597</b>	<b>600</b>				
<b>Eastern Region</b>							
5	Munger	300	0	68	50	50-60	0
6	Kishanganj	300	0	68	50	50-60	0
7	Sambalpur	0	300	NA	NA	NA	300
8	Sundergarh	300	0	50	50	40-50	0
9	Gumla	214	86	76.68	77	40-60	0
10	Ranchi	0	300	NA	NA	NA	300
11	Malda	300	0	68	70	60-70	0
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>1414</b>	<b>686</b>				<b>600</b>
<b>Western Region</b>							
12	Dahod	300	0	NA	NA	NA	300
13	Jhabua	182	128	63	63	50-60	0
14	Bhandara	300	0	95	95	68	0
15	Bilaspur	300	0	66.7	67	40-50	300
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>1082</b>	<b>128</b>				
<b>Southern</b>							
16	Devangere	254	46	69	69	40-60	0
17	Medak	300	0	80	80	80	0
18	Palakkad	294	6	80	80	50-80	0
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>848</b>	<b>52</b>				
<b>North-East Region</b>							
19	North Lakhimpur	300	0	66	66	100	0
20	South Garo Hills	300	0	70	70	100	0
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>600</b>	<b>0</b>				
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>3941</b>	<b>1552</b>				<b>900</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 4.13 : District wise Distribution regarding the Place where the Payment of Wages was made to Workers**

S. No	Districts	Places where the Payment of Wages made				
		Public Place	Work site	G.P.Office	Bank	Total
	<b>Northern Region</b>					
1	Barabanki	119	110	71	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	277	8	15	0	300
3	Sirsa	60	0	240	0	300
4	Karauli	297	0	0	0	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>753</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>					
5	Munger	116	175	9	0	300
6	Kishenganj	48	249	3	0	300
7	Sambalpur	0	0	300	0	300
8	Sundergarh	295	5	0	0	300
9	Gumla	290	10	0	0	300
10	Ranchi	242	58	0	0	300
11	Malda	125	52	123	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1116</b>	<b>549</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>					
12	Dahod	0	259	41	0	300
13	Jhabua	0	267	33	0	300
14	Bhandara	0	264	36	0	300
15	Bilaspur	105	155	40	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>945</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>					
16	Devangere	0	60	240	0	300
17	Medak	98	120	82	0	300
18	Palakkad	0	0	0	300	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>322</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>					
19	North Lakhimpur	218	82	0	0	300
20	South Garo Hills	0	150	150	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2290</b>	<b>2024</b>	<b>1383</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007



**Table 4.14 : District wise Distribution of the Response of Beneficiaries regarding the procedure followed while making Payment of Wages**

S.No	Districts	Individual Names and Amount are			
		Announced Publicly			Total
		Yes	No	No Response	
	<b>Northern Region</b>				
1	Barabanki	300	0	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	300	0	0	300
3	Sirsa	300	0	0	300
4	Karauli	297	0	0	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1197</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>				
5	Munger	53	247	0	300
6	Kishanganj	9	291	0	300
7	Sambalpur	0	0	300	300
8	Sundergarh	220	80	0	300
9	Gumla	194	106	0	300
10	Ranchi	282	18	0	300
11	Malda	266	34	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1024</b>	<b>776</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>				
12	Dahod	300	0	0	300
13	Jhabua	300	0	0	300
14	Bhandara	300	0	0	300
15	Bilaspur	205	95	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1105</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>				
16	Devangere	270	30	0	300
17	Medak	280	20	0	300
18	Palakkad	300	0	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>850</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>				
19	North Lakhimpur	281	19	0	300
20	South Garo Hills	300	0	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>581</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>4757</b>	<b>904</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 4.15 : District wise Distribution of Respondents knowledge about Persons who received Unemployment Allowance**

S.No	Districts	Aware of Persons who Received		
		Unemployment Allowance		
		Yes	No	Total
	<b>Northern Region</b>			
1	Barabanki	0	300	300
2	Sonbhadra	0	300	300
3	Sirsa	0	300	300
4	Karauli	0	297	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1197</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>			
5	Munger	0	300	300
6	Kishenganj	0	300	300
7	Sambalpur	0	300	300
8	Sundergarh	0	300	300
9	Gumla	3	297	300
10	Ranchi	0	300	300
11	Malda	0	300	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2097</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>			
12	Dahod	0	300	300
13	Jhabua	0	300	300
14	Bhandara	0	300	300
15	Bilaspur	0	300	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>			
16	Devangere	0	300	300
17	Medak	0	300	300
18	Palakkad	0	300	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>900</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>			
19	North Lakhimpur	3	297	300
20	South Garo Hills	0	300	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>597</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5997</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

## 5. Quality of Life

**Table 5.1 : District wise Distribution of Income Before Applying for the Job Card and After getting the Employment in NREGS**

S. No	Districts	Before					After				
		<5,000	5,000-10,000	10,000-15,000	<20,000	No Response	5,000	5,000-10,000	10,000-15,000	<20,000	No Response
	<b>Nothern Region</b>										
1	Barabanki	12	136	45	107	0	5	116	62	117	0
2	Sonbhadra	30	149	112	9	0	21	79	144	56	0
3	Sirsa	0	290	10	0	0	0	0	290	10	0
4	Karauli	26	57	186	28	0	24	58	182	33	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>632</b>	<b>353</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>678</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>										
5	Munger	0	101	163	36	0	0	96	165	39	0
6	Kishenganj	0	23	172	105	0	0	21	173	106	0
7	Sambalpur	0	0	0	0	300	0	0	0	0	300
8	Sundergarh	20	127	137	16	0	8	85	183	24	0
9	Gumla	5	112	153	30	0	0	57	193	50	0
10	Ranchi	0	0	0	0	300	0	0	0	0	300
11	Malda	36	235	28	1	0	17	198	69	16	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>598</b>	<b>653</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>457</b>	<b>783</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>										
12	Dahod	0	142	131	27	0	0	55	192	53	0
13	Jhabua	0	0	183	117	0	0	0	164	136	0
14	Bhandara	30	160	73	37	0	20	134	109	37	0
15	Bilaspur	0	2	16	282	0	0	0	12	288	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>403</b>	<b>463</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>477</b>	<b>514</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>										
16	Devangere	31	151	93	25	0	17	129	104	50	0
17	Medak	13	135	39	113	0	0	111	64	125	0
18	Palakkad	15	90	81	114	0	1	45	83	171	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>346</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>										
19	North Lakhimpur	71	227	2	0	0	47	212	40	0	0
20	South Garo Hills	7	115	126	52	0	0	41	149	110	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>2252</b>	<b>1750</b>	<b>1099</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>1437</b>	<b>2378</b>	<b>1422</b>	<b>600</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 5.2 : District wise Distribution of Means of Income**

S. No	Districts	Means of Income					Total
		Agriculture	Labour	Agri./Labour	Petty Business	Others*	
	<b>Northern Region</b>						
1	Barabanki	132	102	61	5	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	80	111	109	0	0	300
3	Sirsa	0	300	0	0	0	300
4	Karauli	0	0	0	0	297	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>513</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>						
5	Munger	0	297	3	0	0	300
6	Kishenganj	0	300	0	0	0	300
7	Sambalpur	76	112	112	0	0	300
8	Sundergarh	0	0	0	0	300	300
9	Gumla	8	273	12	7	0	300
10	Ranchi	0	133	162	5	0	300
11	Malda	20	253	27	0	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>1368</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>						
12	Dahod	85	183	0	32	0	300
13	Jhabua	18	210	63	9	0	300
14	Bhandara	0	300	0	0	0	300
15	Bilaspur	18	263	19	0	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>956</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>						
16	Devangere	149	52	98	1	0	300
17	Medak	135	98	0	67	0	300
18	Palakkad	91	48	18	122	21	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>375</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>						
19	North Lakhimpur	288	0	12	0		300
20	South Garo Hills	178	106	6	10	0	300
	<b>Total</b>	<b>466</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1278</b>	<b>3141</b>	<b>702</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>618</b>	<b>5997</b>

**Note** : \* Detail not available

**Source** : IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 5.3 : District wise Distribution of Expenditure Pattern of the Beneficiaries on Food Items Before & After Joining the Scheme**

S. No	District	Before			After			Total
		<500	500-700	>800	<500	500-700	800>	
	<b>Northern Region</b>							
1	Barabanki	87	126	87	54	86	160	300
2	Sonbhadra	91	95	114	49	81	170	300
3	Sirsa	60	240	0	50	235	15	300
4	Karauli	64	93	140	49	100	148	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>554</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>502</b>	<b>493</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>							
5	Munger	0	42	258	0	34	266	300
6	Kishanganj	0	42	258	0	30	270	300
7	Sambalpur	70	81	149	34	80	186	300
8	Sundergarh	61	84	155	55	78	167	300
9	Gumla	111	80	109	83	78	139	300
10	Ranchi	196	60	44	147	91	62	300
11	Malda	140	133	27	102	155	43	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>578</b>	<b>522</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>546</b>	<b>1133</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>							
12	Dahod	164	109	27	127	134	39	300
13	Jhabua	0	0	300	0	0	300	300
14	Bhandara	0	0	300	0	0	300	300
15	Bilaspur	0	2	298	0	0	300	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>925</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>939</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>							
16	Devangere	70	81	149	34	100	166	300
17	Medak	86	120	94	54	90	158	300
18	Palakkad	75	117	108	36	135	129	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>453</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>							
19	North Lakhimpur	131	98	71	53	161	86	300
20	South Garo Hills	2	9	289	1	3	296	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>360</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>382</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1408</b>	<b>1612</b>	<b>2977</b>	<b>926</b>	<b>1671</b>	<b>3400</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 5.4 : District wise Distribution of Expenditure Pattern of the Beneficiaries on Non food Items  
Before & After Joining the Scheme**

S. No	Districts	Before			After			Total
		<500	500-700	>800	<500	500-700	>800	
	<b>Northern Region</b>							
1	Barabanki	268	24	8	256	28	16	300
2	Sonbhadra	285	15	0	258	28	14	300
3	Sirsa	292	8	0	272	20	8	300
4	Karauli	144	112	41	191	50	56	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>989</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>977</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>							
5	Munger	264	36	0	257	43	0	300
6	Kishenganj	273	27	0	265	15	20	300
7	Sambalpur	143	131	26	137	101	62	300
8	Sundergarh	283	10	7	269	23	8	300
9	Gumla	246	34	20	231	45	24	300
10	Ranchi	242	58	0	274	24	2	300
11	Malda	280	15	5	265	11	24	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1731</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>1698</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>							
12	Dahod	181	87	32	154	105	41	300
13	Jhabua	269	22	9	246	12	42	300
14	Bhandara	0	300	0	0	300	0	300
15	Bilaspur	285	14	1	271	1	28	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>735</b>	<b>423</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>671</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>							
16	Devangere	143	131	26	137	101	62	300
17	Medak	202	53	45	172	75	53	300
18	Palakkad	186	60	54	149	94	57	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>458</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>							
19	North Lakhimpur	284	16	0	233	62	5	300
20	South Garo Hills	120	90	90	55	110	135	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>404</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>4390</b>	<b>1243</b>	<b>364</b>	<b>4092</b>	<b>1248</b>	<b>657</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 5.5 : District wise Distribution of Household having Electricity Connection**

S. No	Districts	Household having Electricity Connection			
		Yes	No	No Response	Total
	<b>Northern Region</b>				
1	Barabanki	5	295	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	13	287	0	300
3	Sirsa	240	60	0	300
4	Karauli	18	208	71	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>850</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>				
5	Munger	11	289	0	300
6	Kishenganj	4	296	0	300
7	Sambalpur	0	0	300	300
8	Sundergarh	8	247	45	300
9	Gumla	11	289	0	300
10	Ranchi	137	163	0	300
11	Malda	15	285	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>1569</b>	<b>345</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>				
12	Dahod	86	197	17	300
13	Jhabua	108	192	0	300
14	Bhandara	73	182	45	300
15	Bilaspur	225	75	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>492</b>	<b>646</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>				
16	Devangere	260	40	0	300
17	Medak	203	97	0	300
18	Palakkad	260	40	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>723</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>				
19	North Lakhimpur	18	280	2	300
20	South Garo Hills	155	145	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>425</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1850</b>	<b>3667</b>	<b>480</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 5.6 : District wise Distribution of Possessing of Land**

S. No	Districts	Possessing of Land		
		Yes	No	Total
	<b>Northern Region</b>			
1	Barabanki	246	54	300
2	Sonbhadra	278	22	300
3	Sirsa	32	268	300
4	Karauli	96	201	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>652</b>	<b>545</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>			
5	Munger	52	248	300
6	Kishanganj	49	251	300
7	Sambalpur	94	206	300
8	Sundergarh	112	188	300
9	Gumla	226	74	300
10	Ranchi	238	62	300
11	Malda	81	219	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>852</b>	<b>1248</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>			
12	Dahod	178	122	300
13	Jhabua	212	88	300
14	Bhandara	168	132	300
15	Bilaspur	232	68	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>790</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>			
16	Devangere	132	168	300
17	Medak	174	126	300
18	Palakkad	88	212	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>506</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>			
19	North Lakhimpur	288	12	300
20	South Garo Hills	212	88	300
	<b>Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>3188</b>	<b>2809</b>	<b>5997</b>

**Source :** IAMR Survey, 2007



**Table 5.7 District Wise Distribution of Respondents Acquisition of Movable and Immovable Assests during the year**

S. No	Districts	Distribution of Acquisitions during the Year				
		Live stock	Gold	Bank Deposit	Household articles	Others
	<b>Northern Region</b>					
1	Barabanki	179	7	51	63	0
2	Sonbhadra	245	0	4	6	5
3	Sirsa	270	0	0	30	0
4	Karauli	197	0	0	0	10
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>891</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>15</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>					
5	Munger	224	0	0	76	0
6	Kishenganj	300	0	0	0	0
7	Sambalpur	56	0	1	7	29
8	Sundergarh	274	0	0	0	0
9	Gumla	277	2	9	12	0
10	Ranchi	156	0	0	0	0
11	Malda	261	4	4	31	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1548</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>29</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>					
12	Dahod	118	0	0	29	0
13	Jhabua	293	0	0	7	0
14	Bhandara	164	0	0	36	0
15	Bilaspur	182	1	1	5	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>757</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>					
16	Devangere	135	2	1	7	5
17	Medak	161	29	0	27	89
18	Palakkad	167	13	43	46	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>463</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>94</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>					
19	North Lakhimpur	290	0	0	10	0
20	South Garo Hills	153	0	0	47	0
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>443</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>94</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>4102</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>439</b>	<b>138</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 5.8 : District wise Distribution of Loan Position of the Beneficiary**

S. No	Districts	Outstanding Loan		
		Yes	No	Total
	<b>Northern Region</b>			
1	Barabanki	7	293	300
2	Sonbhadra		300	300
3	Sirsa	-	300	300
4	Karauli	18	279	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>1172</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>			
5	Munger	2	298	300
6	Kishenganj	25	275	300
7	Sambalpur	0	300	300
8	Sundergarh	23	277	300
9	Gumla	19	281	300
10	Ranchi	5	295	300
11	Malda	20	280	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>			
12	Dahod	192	108	300
13	Jhabua	212	88	300
14	Bhandara	189	111	300
15	Bilaspur	198	102	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>791</b>	<b>409</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>			
16	Devangere	93	207	300
17	Medak	176	124	300
18	Palakkad	86	214	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>545</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>			
19	North Lakhimpur	13	287	300
20	South Garo Hills	3	297	300
	<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>584</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1281</b>	<b>4716</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

Table 5.9 : District wise Distribution of Assets Created by the Respondents Before & After Joining the Scheme

S. No	District	Before							After						
		Bicycle	Radio	Sewing Machine	Electric Fitting	Fan	Steel Trunk	Others	Bicycle	Radio	Sewing Machine	Electric Fitting	Fan	Steel Trunk	Others
	<b>Northern Region</b>														
1	Barabanki	249	126	0	2	3	103	0	19	64	0	0	2	40	29
2	Sonbhadra	185	78	6	0	0	254	0	2	7	0	0	0	5	0
3	Sirsa	60	30	60	180	90	60	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
4	Karauli	203	204	72	0	10	42	0	13	10	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>697</b>	<b>438</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>459</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>29</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>														
5	Munger	101	25	1	1	3	10	0	37	12	0	0	0	0	0
6	Kishanganj	132	118	0	0	0	0	0	14	2	0	0	0	0	0
7	Sambalpur	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
8	Sundergarh	212	208	15	3	4	31	0	0	14	0	0	0	10	0
9	Gumla	106	50	2	2	2	29	0	21	28	4	8	10	21	0
10	Ranchi	162	48	0	0	13	103	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
11	Malda	118	13	0	1	1	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>831</b>	<b>462</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>1</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>														
12	Dahod	235	105	31	79	67	52	0	12	42	12	0	0	14	0
13	Jhabua	88	27	3	87	52	91	21	3	0	0	0	2	5	6
14	Bhandara	240	180	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	0
15	Bilaspur	208	64	5	92	79	154	13	4	1	0	0	1	58	1
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>771</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>7</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>														
16	Devangere	60	90	9	30	50	50	30	6	6	0	1	8	8	9
17	Medak	41	60	14	61	70	4	0	29	14	7	17	7	1	0
18	Palakkad	41	166	8	16	44	30	4	3	19	4	6	13	14	1
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>10</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>														
19	North Lakhimpur	228	83	4	14	15	163	47	20	36	3	5	1	14	30
20	South Garo Hills	79	152	2	69	119	192	50	0	13	1	5	1	5	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>30</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2748</b>	<b>1827</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>649</b>	<b>622</b>	<b>1404</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>77</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

Table 5.10 : District wise Distribution of Cultivation Assets Created by Job Cardholders Before and After Joining the Scheme

S. No	Districts	Before								After						
		Sewing	Tube	Ge nt.	Bul lock	Tract or	hresher	Harv ester s	Othe rs	Sewi ng	Tu be	Ge nt.	Bullo ck	Tra ct or	Thre sher	Harves ters
		Mac hine	Wel l	Se t	Car t					Mac hine	We ll	Set	Cart			
	<b>Northern Region</b>															
1	Barabanki	46	26	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0
2	Sonbhadra	0	6	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	Sirsa	26	0	0	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	Karauli	22	0	0	102	0	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>															
5	Munger	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	Kishanganj	0	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	Sambalpur	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Sundergarh	12	1	1	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Gumla	2	2	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0
10	Ranchi	0	10	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	Malda	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>															
12	Dahod	0	0	0	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0
13	Jhabua	0	0	1	23	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
14	Bhandara	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15	Bilaspur	0	0	5	42	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>															
16	Devangere	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17	Medak	27	8	1	27	10	0	0	0	7	0	4	3	2	0	0
18	Palakkad	0	13	3	2	5	0	2	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>															
19	North Lakhimpur	4	152	0	67	0	0	47	0	1	1	0	22	0	0	0
20	South Garo Hills	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	1	0	2	0	0	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>485</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Note : NA - Data not available

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 5.11 : District wise Distribution of Livestock Created by the Beneficiaries Before & After Joining the Scheme**

S. No	Districts	Before				After			
		Milk animal	Goat / Sheep	Poultry duck	Pigs	Milk animal	Goat/ Sheep	Poultry duck	Pigs
	<b>Northern Region</b>								
1	Barabanki	154	24	1	0	4	4	1	4
2	Sonbhadra	78	81	81	5	2	11	7	0
3	Sirsa	180	90	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	Karauli	102	70	10	15	0	45	0	10
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>514</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>14</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>								
5	Munger	36	107	74	7	20	93	56	2
6	Kishenganj	68	109	86	37	39	62	66	11
7	Sambalpur	39	13	3	1	85	29	32	1
8	Sundergarh	72	75	82	45	0	0	35	20
9	Gumla	114	96	61	6	105	72	57	0
10	Ranchi	57	34	57	8	0	0	0	0
11	Malda	91	53	85	32	90	55	82	33
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>477</b>	<b>487</b>	<b>448</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>66</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>								
12	Dahod	43	19	17	39	20	10	0	0
13	Jhabua	116	177	0	0	8	11	0	0
14	Bhandara	74	47	0	43	0	0	0	0
15	Bilaspur	60	44	78	0	38	15	64	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>								
16	Devangere	74	29	32	0	31	5	7	46
17	Medak	85	68	8	0	18	4	3	0
18	Palakkad	70	61	36	0	38	31	11	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>46</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>								
19	North Lakhimpur	79	89	86	36	56	83	70	1
20	South Garo Hills	45	46	19	43	6	9	8	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>1</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1637</b>	<b>1332</b>	<b>816</b>	<b>317</b>	<b>470</b>	<b>539</b>	<b>499</b>	<b>115</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

## 6. Migration

**Table 6.1 : District wise Distribution of Respondents regarding Migration of Family Members in search of Work**

S. No	Districts	Household Migrated to Town in Search of Work		
		Yes	No	Total
	<b>Northern Region</b>			
1	Barabanki	18	282	300
2	Sonbhadra	0	300	300
3	Sirsa	0	300	300
4	Karauli	112	185	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>1067</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>			
5	Munger	96	204	300
6	Kishenganj	16	284	300
7	Sambalpur	0	300	300
8	Sundergarh	38	262	300
9	Gumla	34	266	300
10	Ranchi	79	221	300
11	Malda	48	252	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>1799</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>			
12	Dahod	233	67	300
13	Jhabua	192	108	300
14	Bhandara	228	72	300
15	Bilaspur	10	290	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>577</b>	<b>623</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>			
16	Devangere	77	223	300
17	Medak	90	210	300
18	Palakkad	25	275	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>708</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>			
19	North Lakhimpur	300		300
20	South Garo Hills	2	298	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1502</b>	<b>4495</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source: IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 6.2 : District wise Distribution of Respondents Knowledge about Mass Migration from the Village in Search of Work**

S. No	Districts	Household Migrated to town in search of Work		
		Yes	No	Total
	<b>Northern Region</b>			
1	Barabanki	79	221	300
2	Sonbhadra	0	300	300
3	Sirsa	0	300	300
4	Karauli	0	297	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>1118</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>			
5	Munger	47	253	300
6	Kishenganj	3	297	300
7	Sambalpur	0	300	300
8	Sundergarh	0	300	300
9	Gumla	8	292	300
10	Ranchi	6	294	300
11	Malda	145	155	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>1895</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>			
12	Dahod	126	174	300
13	Jhabua	0	300	300
14	Bhandara	0	300	300
15	Bilaspur	0	300	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>1074</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>			
16	Devangere	34	266	300
17	Medak	120	180	300
18	Palakkad	0	300	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>746</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>			
19	North Lakhimpur	98	202	300
20	South Garo Hills	150	150	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>812</b>	<b>5185</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 6.3 :District Wise Distriibution of respondents Knowledge regarding Parmanent Migration from the Village Seasons in which migration takes place**

S.No	Districts	Household response of Permanent Migration from the Village			
		Yes	No	No response	Total
	<b>Northern Region</b>				
1	Barabanki	0	300	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	0	300	0	300
3	Sirsa	0	0	300	300
4	Karauli	6	291	0	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>891</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>				
5	Munger	4	296	0	300
6	Kishenganj	7	293	0	300
7	Sambalpur	0	300	0	300
8	Sundergarh	0	0	300	300
9	Gumla	5	295	0	300
10	Ranchi	8	292	0	300
11	Malda	13	287	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>1763</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>				
12	Dahod	0	300	0	300
13	Jhabua	0	300	0	300
14	Bhandara	0	300	0	300
15	Bilaspur	0	300	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>				
16	Devangere	20	280	0	300
17	Medak	1	299	0	300
18	Palakkad	2	298	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>877</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>				
19	North Lakhimpur	0	300	0	300
20	South Garo Hills	0	300	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>5331</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007



**Table 6.4 : District Wise Distribution of Respondents Opinion regarding Income by Migrating to other places**

S. No	District	Wages Upon Migration is more than Local Wages			Total
		Yes	No	No response	
	<b>Northern Region</b>				
1	Barabanki	47	253	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	0	300	0	300
3	Sirsa	0	0	300	300
4	Karauli	45	252	0	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>805</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>				
5	Munger	36	264	0	300
6	Kishenganj	27	273	0	300
7	Sambalpur	0	300	0	300
8	Sundergarh	83	217	0	300
9	Gumla	101	199		300
10	Ranchi	59	241	0	300
11	Malda	84	216	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>390</b>	<b>1710</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>				
12	Dahod	48	252	0	300
13	Jhabua	57	243	0	300
14	Bhandara	0	0	300	300
15	Bilaspur	11	289	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>784</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>				
16	Devangere	6	284	10	300
17	Medak	160	140	0	300
18	Palakkad	2	243	57	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>667</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>				
19	North Lakhimpur	136	164	0	300
20	South Garo Hills	300	0	0	300
	<b>Sub- Total</b>	<b>436</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1200</b>	<b>4130</b>	<b>667</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 6.5 : District Wise Distribution of Respondents Opinion Regarding Measures initiated by Gram Panchyat(GP) to check the Migration**

S. No	Districts	GP initiated Measures to check Migration			Total
		Yes	No	No response	
	<b>Northern Region</b>				
1	Barabanki	221	79	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	300	0	0	300
3	Sirsa	0	0	300	300
4	Karauli	112	185	0	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>633</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>				
5	Munger	55	245	0	300
6	Kishenganj	0	300	0	300
7	Sambalpur	0	0	300	300
8	Sundergarh	43	157	100	300
9	Gumla	195	105	0	300
10	Ranchi	203	97	0	300
11	Malda	235	65	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>731</b>	<b>969</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>				
12	Dahod	0	0	300	300
13	Jhabua	63	237	0	300
14	Bhandara	0	0	300	300
15	Bilaspur	281	19	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>				
16	Devangere	8	273	19	300
17	Medak	125	175	0	300
18	Palakkad	141	133	26	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>581</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>				
19	North Lakhimpur	98	202	0	300
20	South Garo Hills	300	0	0	300
	<b>Sub -Total</b>	<b>398</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2380</b>	<b>2272</b>	<b>1345</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

**Guidelines issued to staff engaged in field study:**

Guidelines were issued to the survey teams to study the following aspects and to submit in their reports after their return. They have submitted their respective district reports after their survey of the districts. These 20 district reports were already submitted to PEO Division which covers the following points.

In addition to the above, the survey teams also engaged local investigators to collect the beneficiary level primary data which was compiled and submitted alongwith all-India report.

A). **Bottlenecks at the institutional level**

1. technical & administrative hurdles faced by all the officials involved in implementing the scheme
2. grass-roots level difficulties; views/opinions of GP Members, GS members
3. coverage of beneficiaries : BPL Vs Any rural house-hold
4. difficulties in compliance of features of the NREG Act.
5. Capacity building (staff, training, adhoc recruitments etc.)
6. views of stakeholders (right from GP to district officials, and others) on the convergence of other programmes with NREG Scheme

B). **Observations on Social Audit, Transparency, Village-level monitoring:**

1. General awareness of the scheme among rural folk
2. Grama Sabha involvement: Unilateral Vs Democratic process
3. comments on functioning of social audit,
4. opinion of members of Village-Level Monitoring Committees (VMC)

C). **Observations on role of GP:**

1. Local needs Vs Top-down guidelines
2. shortage of manpower to handle the records & multiple registers
3. identification of works and shelf of works
4. Local politics: Gram Panchayat Vs Gram Sabha
5. Registration of households and issue of Job Cards
6. Overall capability of GP to tackle this kind of gigantic scheme like NREGA

D). **Difficulties faced by GP in implementation of scheme**

1. technical sanction, Administrative sanctions
2. procedural flaws in technical estimates

3. extent of autonomy in planning processes
4. delay in procedures and processes

E). Observations on Payment of Wages:

1. Equal pay or gender-biased wages
2. Cash Vs Cheque/Post Office/Bank A/c
3. promptness of payment, delay & reasons
4. Labour – material ratio & cost

F). Work-site and muster roll Observations:

1. Basic facilities i.e., sheds, drinking water, crèche,
2. participation rate of women,
3. random checking of work-force vis-à-vis muster-roll entries
4. observations on entries in muster-roll, i.e., wages, job card details,
5. views of some wagers i.e., local monitoring committee members

G). Positive Impact of the Scheme:

1. Creation of durable assets at village and household level.
2. arresting out-migration
3. enhanced quality of life, assured wages
4. scope for perspective planning at village level