



THE U. S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
NEW DELHI, INDIA

**PL 480, TITLE II, FOOD FOR WORK
IMPACT EVALUATION**

STUDY OF LOW COST HOUSING: CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES
(COCHIN ZONE)

JANUARY, 1983

THE U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

NEW DELHI, INDIA

P.L. 480, TITLE-II, FOOD FOR WORK

IMPACT EVALUATION

STUDY OF LOW COST HOUSING : CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES
(COCHIN ZONE)

CONDUCTED BY
THE RESEARCH INSTITUTE, SAJAGIRI

JUNE, 1984

C O N T E N T S

1. Preface
2. Summary
3. Introduction
4. Analytical Framework
 - Universe of the study
 - Sampling Design
 - Sample size
 - Stratification plan
 - Selection of the Control Group
5. Analytical Findings
 - Adequacy of FFW assisted houses
 - Incidence of illness
 - Reduction of birth
 - Foodgrain storage facility
 - Impact on assets owned
 - House-hold employment
 - Income level of beneficiaries
 - Ownership of house prior to FFW house
 - Ownership of house plot
 - Cost of low cost housing
 - Priorities of choice for further FFW projects
6. Annexures (1 to 4)
7. Appendix - Questionnaire

ii

P R E F A C E

The United States Agency for International Development, India (USAID) commissioned the Research Institute, Rajagiri, to undertake a sample-survey based study for impact evaluation of Low Cost Housing projects supported by the Catholic Relief Services (CRS) PL 480 Title - II Food For Work (FFW) program in Cochin Zone. This study report covers Low Cost Houses constructed during the fiscal years 1979, 1980 and 1981 under CRS Cochin Zone consignees.

The Institute gratefully acknowledges the contribution of MS. Uma Devi. Appreciation is also to MS. Nanda Bhaskar, MS. Belsa Francis, Mr. M.S. Jayagopal and Mr. Babu Sacaria, all of whom contributed to the preparation of an excellent research design, conducting field investigation and data preparation. The Institute greatly appreciates the role and services of Mr. R.K.Verma, Secretary, Centre for Development Strategies (CDS), New Delhi, who provided outstanding consultancy services by organising and co-ordinating efforts to complete data analyses and report writing.

Lastly, the Institute is indebted to USAID, in general, for commissioning the study and to Mr. John Paul Chudy and Mr. M.C.Gupta, in particular, who provided continued and sustained guidance at various stages of the work, especially during preparation of the research design and analysis plan.

111

S U M M A R Y

The analysis of beneficiary-profile revealed that most of the beneficiaries were non-agricultural and agricultural labourers in the income range of Rs.500 or less per month. Drinking water was most commonly available to beneficiaries from wells. Electricity was available in most villages, but only a few beneficiaries had house-hold connections. Only a few beneficiaries had private latrines.

Analysing the impact aspect of the project, it is observed that the beneficiaries would not have constructed the house without FFW assistance. The cost of a house is nearly Rs.4,000 and FFW commodities constitute 10% to 24% of the total cost in the three years. Almost all the beneficiaries were satisfied with the completion of the project and were willing to live in these houses permanently. For almost all the beneficiaries, the house was adequate to live. Living in the FFW assisted house may have helped in reducing sickness. For the beneficiaries, who lived in FFW low cost houses for longer periods, the incidence of sickness was lower. Acquisition of new house has helped beneficiaries to have foodgrain storage facility. Beneficiaries accumulated assets after acquiring the house and value of assets owned increased with the duration of stay since the house was completed.

Thus, the FFW assisted house contributed in improving living conditions of beneficiaries who belonged to rural poor and who were living in 'kutchas' damaged houses prior to the project which were inadequate for the family.

CHAPTER - 1
LOW COST HOUSING STUDY

INTRODUCTION:

In India, the largest international bilateral food commodity program is the PL 480 Title II Program. The food for Work (FFW) program accounted for 54534 metric tons out of an annual total of approximately 333,000 metric tons under bilateral FFW program.* Sponsor of the FFW program in India is Catholic Relief Services (CRS). CRS manages the program through four zonal offices in Calcutta, Bombay, Madras and Cochin, with its headquarters in New Delhi.

Objectives of the CRS FFW Program:

CRS gives a very high priority to economic and community development projects undertaken with gift food in return for work accomplished. These projects are called 'Food for Work (FFW) projects. Food given in this manner offers an incentive for workers to participate in undertaking projects which would benefit them and community at large.

The FFW program, therefore, has two general objectives, namely, (a) to supplement the diet of unemployed labourers and their families and (b) to organise the unemployed labourers to work on community and economic development projects.

In order to achieve its objectives, the CRS had embarked on a variety of projects, such as:

(a) Agriculture/Economic development projects which include construction of water production and control projects (wells, dams, reservoirs, ponds) and fences, improvement of land through clearing, drainage, reforestation, levelling and cultivating, and construction and renovation of commodity storage facilities. Priority is given to projects which will contribute to an increased or improved food supply in areas where the supply is inadequate.

(b) Educational Development Projects - Educational development projects are those which improve the self help capability of individuals. Such activities include literacy classes, vocational training courses, particularly in agriculture and fishing, training of handicapped, child-care etc.

(c) Community Development Projects - Include construction of roads, small bridges, emergency shelters, child feeding centres, construction of streets in villages and low cost houses.

*During U.S. fiscal year 1974,

(d) Health and Sanitation Projects - Include construction of drains/ditches, latrines and sewage disposal tanks.

In order to assess the development impact and the effectiveness of the FFW program implemented by CRS, an indepth impact evaluation study conducted in Cochin Zone was entrusted to Research Institute, Rajagiri, Kalamassery. The study was financed by the United States Agency for International Development.

Low cost housing was selected for study in Cochin Zone because when the study was planned in FY 80, low cost housing accounted for the greatest share of mandays utilized in FFW in the zone. The project type accounting for the largest share of mandays utilized was selected in each of the four zones for study.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

This impact study was intended to address the following issues:

- 1) What standard of housing is appropriate for the rural poor, recognising that Kutcha construction may free more FFW resources to build more houses.
- 2) Since the proportional input of FFW into a low cost house is known to be small compared to the other material and skilled labour inputs the study has attempted to determine if, FFW house would have been built without the FFW input .
- 3) Is it possible to identify quantifiable indicators of the FFW assisted low cost house, to (a) improve the beneficiary family's health, (b) reduce fertility, (c) contributed to the employment stability of the head of household.
- 4) What was the availability to the beneficiary of complementary inputs to complete the house and to maintain it after completion.
- 5) Finally, to provide a meaningful profile of beneficiaries, i.e., house occupant.

DESCRIPTION OF THE POPULATION AND SAMPLE SIZE:

There are 28 consignees under the Cochin Zone of Catholic Relief Services. 27 of these consignees are located in the State of Kerala. One consignee is located in Mangalore, Karnataka State.

CRS Cochin Zonal Office was contacted for the collection of data for selecting universe and sample for the study. Out of a total of 28 consignees in Cochin Zone, it was found that 27 consignees involved themselves in low cost housing projects during the period under study. The tools used for the study included a low cost housing study questionnaire (to be canvassed with selected beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries) and a village profile (to be canvassed at village level in selected village).

A comparison group of 60 strong non-applicants was also studied. The non-beneficiaries were selected based on the following criteria:

- 1) The house of a non-beneficiary was within a radius of 500 metres of the FFW assisted house.
- 2) In case a house was not available within 500 metre radius, the investigator proceeded to his right and took the first strong non-applicant house.
- 3) The respondents of comparison group had never applied for FFW assisted house.
- 4) The socio-economic status of the non-beneficiary was determined to be similar to that of the beneficiary.

The detailed methodology involved in the selection of sample for each year is given in the following chapter.

DATA COLLECTION:

A two weeks intensive training was given to the research investigators prior to their data collection. They were all post-graduates with some prior experiences in conducting survey.

Before the commencement of field work, the consignees were informed during one of their meetings at the CRS Zonal Office, of the evaluative study and its objectives by the CRS Zonal Office staff. They were also informed of the month the investigators would visit their office for collecting data. The investigators were given introductory letters before the start of field work. They were also provided with a copy of 'Instruction for collecting data'. The investigators selected beneficiaries using random table from the list of beneficiaries, wherever they were available with the project holders. Interviews were conducted from June to October 1982.

LIMITATION:

Interviewing a total of 300 beneficiaries from 60 project holders for three years FY 79, 80 and 81 was a difficult task as time limit was imposed on the research team. The task was made further difficult because of non-maintenance of muster rolls by a few project holders. The investigators had to depend on the memory of the project holders in such cases to locate the respondents. Most of the respondents being agricultural labourers and working on daily wages, had to be contacted at the place of their work, sometimes miles away from their respective homes.

However, we are proud to report that research team worked earnestly to overcome the obstacles to make the study as objective as possible.

CHAPTER 2

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

The study was conducted on the basis of a sample survey of selected beneficiaries, i.e., owners of FFW assisted low cost houses built in CRS's Cochin Zone. The stages involved from the identification of the study universe to the ultimate selection of the beneficiaries and approaches adopted under each stage are outlined below. (For details, see annexures 1 & 2).

UNIVERSE OF STUDY

Out of a total of 28 consignees in CRS's Cochin Zone, one consignee did not undertake low cost housing activity in any of the three years. So, the universe for FY 81 consisted of the 27 consignees. However, two of these 27 consignees did not cover low cost housing activity in either FY 79 or FY 80, and one consignee during these two years, was under the administrative control of Bangalore Zone. Excluding these three consignees, the relevant universe of FY 79 and FY 80 comprised of 24 consignees.

SAMPLING DESIGN

Sampling design approach was similar in all the three years, viz, FY 79, 80, 81. A multi-stage stratified sampling was adopted with the first stage unit (FSU) being consignee, second stage unit (SSU) being project, and the last stage being the beneficiaries of low cost houses.

SAMPLE SIZE

On considerations of cost, management and assumed relative homogeneity among low cost housing beneficiaries (rural poor), total sample size for all the three years was fixed at 300, i.e., 100 in each year. On similar considerations, the number of beneficiaries to be selected per project was pre-fixed at 5, and number of projects per consignee at 2. Thus, in each year, 10 consignees, 20 projects and 100 beneficiaries were selected.

STRATIFICATION PLAN

In each of the study year, the consignees of the relevant universes were stratified in basically two strata; the stratification variable was the total number of mandays utilized (MDU) by the consignee on low cost housing activity. Stratum I under each year comprised of the largest top few (3 or 4) consignees who together accounted for a substantial number of MDU's in that year. These consignees under Stratum I were different in each year (only one happened to be common in each year). Non-stratum I consignees were further stratified in three sub-strata. For this purpose, the consignees were listed in descending order of MDU's and appropriate cut-off points were chosen on the basis of judicious balance between (a) percentage of MDU's and percentage of projects in the stratum, and (b) width of the class interval.

From each selected consignee, two projects were selected with probability proportional to size; size being the number of mandays utilized in the project. From each selected project, 5 beneficiaries were selected with simple random sampling without replacement.

SELECTION OF THE CONTROL GROUP

A comparison group of 60 non-beneficiaries was selected in a manner that one non-beneficiary was selected under each selected project area. The non-beneficiary was a strong non-applicant, i.e., one who had never applied for FFW assisted low cost housing but was a potential applicant in terms of fulfilling all the eligibility criteria for submitting an application. Broadly, it was desired that socio-economic status of the non-beneficiaries should be as similar as possible to that of the beneficiaries before the project initiation. A judgement factor was involved in identifying such strong non-applicant.

CHAPTER 3ANALYTICAL FINDINGSADEQUACY OF HOUSE FOR LIVING

It is important to note from table 1 that more than 95% of beneficiaries would not have constructed the house without FFW assistance. It is gratifying to observe from Table 2 further that almost all beneficiaries expressed their desire for permanent stay in the FFW constructed houses. Further, more than 65% of beneficiaries in 1979 and 80% in 1980 and 1981 reported the completion of house construction as satisfactory. When asked about the inadequacy, 70% of the beneficiaries felt the house was adequate for the family. The things missing were reported mainly as doors, plastering and flooring (Table 8).

It is observed from table 3 that the approximate size of the house ranged mainly between 150 to 300 sq. feet. For some of 1979 beneficiaries, it was even more than 400 sq. feet. The number of persons living were mainly 2 to 3 for 1979 beneficiaries and 6 to 7 for 1980 and 1981 beneficiaries (Table No. 4).

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFICIARIES ACCORDING TO THE
CAPACITY TO BUILD THE HOUSE WITHOUT FFW ASSISTANCE

	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>
YES	3	3	1
NO	97	97	99

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFICIARIES ACCORDING TO
DESIRE TO LIVE IN THE HOUSE

	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>
TEMPORARILY	2	2	1
PERMANENT	98	98	99

TABLE 3DISTRIBUTION OF THE BENEFICIARIES BY
APPROXIMATE SIZE OF THE HOUSE SQ.FT.

		<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>	<u>AGGREGATE %</u>
1.	-50	-	2	-	1
2.	51-100	2	-	7	3
3.	101-150	7	2	18	9
4.	151-200	23	29	26	26
5.	201-250	21	38	11	23
6.	251-300	17	17	19	18
7.	301-350	12	3	7	7
8.	351-400	5	8	6	6
9.	-401	13	1	6	7

TABLE 4DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFICIARIES BY NUMBER OF
PERSONS LIVING IN THE HOUSE

	<u>NUMBER OF PERSONS</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1.	1	4	-	1	2
2.	2	38	3	8	16
3.	3	42	6	7	18
4.	4	8	18	16	14
5.	5	6	27	28	21
6.	6	2	20	18	13
7.	7	-	16	21	12
8.	8	-	6	1	2
9.	9	-	4	2	2

TABLE 5DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFICIARIES ACCORDING TO
ADEQUACY OF THE FFW ASSISTED HOUSE

	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>
YES	73	72	67
NO	27	28	33

TABLE 6DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFICIARIES ACCORDING TO INADEQUACY
(FOR THOSE WHO ANSWERED 'NO')

	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>
Too small	94	93	49
Inferior quality		7	15
Weak roof			6
Kutcha Construction			3
Poor roof	6		27

TABLE 7DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFICIARIES ACCORDING TO
INADEQUACY OF COMPLETION OF HOUSE

	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>
YES	32	19	18
NO	68	81	82

TABLE 8

DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFICIARIES ACCORDING TO
WHAT WAS MISSING IN THE CONSTRUCTED HOUSE
(FOR THOSE WHO ANSWERED 'NO' ABOVE)

	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>
Roof	3	2	3
Doors	8	14	14
Window	2		1
Flooring	9	4	7
Plastering	17	6	14
Ceiling	2		1
More than one item missing	59	74	5

HOUSEHOLD HISTORY OF ILLNESS

One of the important objectives of the study is whether there is reduction in the illness because of improved living conditions in the FFW constructed house. The beneficiaries were asked the question about the family illness during past one year. About 33% of 1979 beneficiaries, 44% of 1980 and 46% of 1981 beneficiaries reported the incidence of illness during last year. T.P. and respiratory troubles were the main diseases reported by the beneficiaries of all the three years. The number of members suffering from disease were 0.33, 0.62 and 0.64 per beneficiary for 1979, 1980 and 1981 respectively. The period of illness was 48, 54 and 62 days for 1979, 1980 and 1981 per beneficiary respectively. Thus, it is observed that FFW assisted house appears to have helped in reducing the illness as it gradually decreased with the number of years of stay in the house (refer to tables 9 and 10).

TABLE 9 : INCIDENCE OF ILLNESS

	Incidence (% of house- holds)	No. of members suffering from illness per household	Duration of illness per household (Days in a year)
<u>Beneficiary</u>			
1979	33	0.33	48
1980	44	0.62	54
1981	46	0.64	62
<u>Non-beneficiary</u>	48	0.62	101

TABLE 10: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFICIARIES
ACCORDING TO NATURE OF ILLNESS

	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>
Bronchitis and Respira- tory diseases	28	20	22
Tuberculosis	28	24	28
Ulcer	13	12	15
Others	31	44	35

REDUCTION OF BIRTHS

Another important objective of the study relates to impact of stay in the FFW constructed house on reducing the births in the beneficiary households. The information on births in the household was collected in the past 12 months at the time of inquiry which was 1982. It is observed from tables 10 & 11 that beneficiary households of 1979 had significantly lower births (4%) as compared to 1980 and 1981 beneficiary households (ie being 10% for 1980 and 12% for 1981 households) and non-beneficiaries households (13%). Similarly, expected births during next 3/7 months (with reference to the time of inquiry) were reported as significantly lower for 1979 beneficiary households as compared to beneficiary households of 1980, 1981 and also non-beneficiary households. However, it is unclear this reduction in birth rate is attributable

to the low cost houses, or some other variable, such as, the introduction of a family planning program into the area which was not tested for.

TABLE 11: ACTUAL AND EXPECTED BIRTHS IN THE HOUSEHOLD

	Actual births during the past one year		Expected births during the next 3-7 months	
	% of house hold	Births per house hold	% of house hold	Births per house hold
<u>Beneficiary</u>				
1979	4	0.04	2	0.02
1980	10	0.14	5	0.07
1981	12	0.12	4	0.04
Non-beneficiary	13	0.13	5	0.05

FOODGRAINS STORAGE FACILITY

Availability of foodgrain storage facility, as given in Table 12, was reported by about 30% of 1979, 37% of 1980 and 14% of 1981 beneficiaries. For non-beneficiaries, the corresponding percentage was 14. The storage facility was made of either wood or bricks or metal. The higher percentage of 1979 and 1980 beneficiaries having storage facility indicated that FFW assisted house have helped in having storage facility for foodgrains.

TABLE 12 : AVAILABILITY OF FOODGRAINS STORAGE FACILITY BY TYPE

	BENEFICIARIES			NON-BENEFICIARIES
	1979	1980	1981	
Wood	12	9	5	5
Bricks	10	19	1	6
Metal	8	8	3	10
Others	1	1	5	-

IMPACT ON ASSETS OWNED

More than 20% of beneficiaries owned cows, around 15% goats and 18% fowls, 2 to 7% owned buffalows, pigs and ducks each. The value of other assets was Rs.1260 for 1979 beneficiaries, Rs.1091 for 1980 beneficiaries, Rs.563 for 1981 beneficiaries and Rs.427 for non-beneficiaries. Of this, the gold jewellery was worth Rs.651, Rs.520, Rs.258 and Rs.185 for 1979, 1980 and 1981 beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries respectively. Assets of beneficiaries have shown increasing trend with duration since the project was completed. Thus, higher values of assets owned by 1979 and 1980 beneficiaries as compared to 1981 beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries specially gold jewellery, is a good indicator of beneficiaries' increased prosperity and sense of security under Indian context (see Table 13)

TABLE 13: LIVESTOCK AND ASSETS OWNED

LIVESTOCK (% OF HOUSEHOLD OWNING)	BENEFICIARIES			NON-BENEFICIARIES
	1979	1980	1981	
Buffaloes	3	7	6	2
Cows	24	24	21	19
Goats	15	21	10	5
Pigs	4	3	2	
Fowls	14	19	21	12
Ducks	3	2	5	2
<u>OTHER VALUABLES</u> (Value in Rs./household)				
Gold jewellery	651	520	258	185
Furniture (chair, table, cot, etc.)	239	219	108	55
Kitchenware (utensils, stove)	123	115	67	71
Others (Bicycle, wrist watch, radio, etc.)	250	237	130	116
	1260	1091	563	427

HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYMENT

The employment for upto three working members of the household separately on FFW, Agricultural Labour and non-agriculture labour is presented in table 14. The total household employment for beneficiaries for three years does not seem to have any relationship with the duration of stay in the FFW constructed house. The low-cost house seems to have no impact on household employment.

TABLE 14: HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYMENT

	On FFW		Ag. Labour		Non-Ag. Labour		Total Mandays per Household
	Working Members	Number of days	Working Members	Number of days	Working Members	Number of days	
<u>Beneficiaries</u>							
1979	2.0	24	1.5	46	1.5	128	208
1980	2.5	18	1.4	77	1.5	232	327
1981	2.4	37	1.4	59	1.4	164	260
Non-Beneficiaries	-	-	1.4	79	1.5	213	292

INCOME LEVEL OF BENEFICIARIES

Most beneficiaries worked as non-agricultural labour. Majority of them had incomes less than Rs.500 per month. Almost all of them were living in damaged 'Kutchha' house which was also inadequate for the family. All of them, with few exceptions, could not have built a house without the help of FFW Program. Comparisons between socio-economic character of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries also revealed that both belonged to poor rural class. Thus, choice of beneficiaries seem to be appropriate, i.e., rural poor class who needed the house and they were able to make use of this asset in improving their lot.

OWNERSHIP OF HOUSE PRIOR TO FFW HOUSE

One of the objectives of the study was to find out whether FFW assisted house was the first house owned by the beneficiaries. It is observed from Table 15 that 64% of 1979 beneficiaries, 57% of 1980 beneficiaries and 47% of 1981 beneficiaries owned a house before. But, in almost all the cases, the house was 'Kutchha' house. As the house was too small for the family or damaged because of 'kutchha' construction, the need for the new house was reported by almost all.

TABLE 15: DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFICIARIES ACCORDING TO OWNERSHIP OF HOUSE, TYPE OF HOUSE & CONDITION

	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>
(a) Self owned	64	57	47
(b) <u>Type of house</u> *			
'Kutchas'	97	93	96
Pucca	-	5	-
Mixed	3	2	4
(c) <u>Condition of house</u>			
Damaged	21	11	31
Too small	72	86	65
Poor roof	7	3	4

OWNERSHIP OF HOUSE PLOT

Nearly 90% of beneficiaries owned the plot on which house was constructed. For the rest, it was either owned by father, mother or uncle.

As given in Table 16, the mortgages against the house was reported by about 1/4th of the beneficiaries. The mortgages were mainly to cooperative societies and bank for 1979 and 1980 beneficiaries and to private persons and cooperative societies for 1981 beneficiaries.

- *Kutchas houses: house with mud walls and thatched roof.
- Mixed house: house with brick walls and thatched roof.
- Pucca houses: house with brick walls and tiled roof.

TABLE 16: % DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFICIARIES ACCORDING TO OWNERSHIP OF PLOT, MORTGAGE.

	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>
Plot owned	90	82	94
Mortgaged	30	26	25

COST OF LOW-COST HOUSING

The beneficiaries provided the information in terms of quantity and value of inputs (Questions No. 3.12 of Questionnaire). The beneficiaries themselves calculated the value of the inputs at the purchasing price for purchased inputs and for FFW assistance.

The average cost of construction of low-cost houses, as given in Table 17, was Rs.4649, Rs.3455 and Rs.4378 for 1979, 1980 and 1981 beneficiaries. FFW assistance was Rs.625, Rs.838 and Rs.470 for 1979, 1980 and 1981 beneficiaries. Thus, the FFW assistance was a considerable help to beneficiaries, as it was a substantial amount, both in value as well as share, to total expenditure.

TABLE 17: EXPENDITURE ON LOW-COST HOUSING
(Rs. per household)

	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>
Material inputs	3345	2774	3132
Labour	1304	981	1246
Total:	<u>4649</u>	<u>3455</u>	<u>4378</u>
FFW assistance	625	838	470

TABLE 18: DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFICIARIES ACCORDING TO THE AGENCY OF MORTGAGE
(for those who answered 'yes')

<u>To</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>
Private persons	11	8	40
Money lender	7	15	16
Bank	25	19	4
Cooperative Society	54	46	28
C.C.D.A.	3	12	12

MODE OF USING FFW COMMODITIES OF HOUSE

In a majority of the cases, as given in Table 19, commodities were given to the beneficiaries by the project holder and the beneficiary paid the workers himself.

TABLE 19: DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFICIARY BY THE MODE OF USE OF FFW COMMODITIES IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF HOUSE

<u>Mode of use/year</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>
(a) Project holders made by weekly payment directly to workers	8	6	9
(b) The commodities were given to the respondent by the project holder and he paid to the worker himself	83	64	64
(c) Construction done directly under the supervision of the Parish priest	3	-	1
(d) Received Tiles	6	9	7
(e) Received materials	-	15	11
(f) Received Cash	-	4	5

ANNEXURE NO. 1

This section deals with the details of Universe of the study and the method applied for drawing sample from the Universe.

1. Universe of the Study:

There were 28 consignees in Cochin Zone. But it was found that only 27 consignees were involved in low cost housing project during the periods under study, i.e., Fy 79, 80 and 81. So, excluding Trivandrum, which was not involved in the above said project, the Universe for Fy 81 consists of 27 consignees.

It was also found that besides Trivandrum BSS, Thiruvalla and Sultan Battery also were not involved in the low cost housing project during Fy 79 & 80. Therefore, the data for these years were not available. Hence, excluding the four consignees, the Universe for Fy 79 & 80 consists of 24 consignees. Table 20 gives the distribution of mandays and the number of projects for all the consignees for the years Fy 79, Fy 80 and Fy 81 respectively.

TABLE 20

LIST OF ALL THE CONSIGNEES IN THE UNIVERSE
TOTAL NUMBER OF MANDAYS FOR EACH YEAR
AND THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PROJECTS

CONSIGNEES	FY 79		FY 80		FY 81	
	MANDAYS	NO. OF PROJECTS	MANDAYS	NO. OF PROJECTS	MANDAYS	NO. OF PROJECTS
Alleppey	17240	9	39000	11	39900	15
Payangadi	15733	5	14080	6	14100	8
Cochin	70200	3	57780	3	16500	3
Changanacherry	21000	9	79000	4	13800	5
Kanjirapally	19226	2	50400	4	30895	3
Ernakulam	42300	15	33000	16	61500	4
Angamaly	37800	12	7800	2	16500	9
Sultan Battrey	-	-	-	-	6000	1
Kalamassery	49500	15	61900	23	26100	15
Kothamangalam	8700	2	4500	1	19900	1
Kottayam	17400	2	23040	2	19500	2
Palai	16080	1	43490	4	52800	2
Quilon	68700	13	105000	19	525000	21
Trivandrum (Vallayanbalam)	18000	9	51000	31	17400	11
Trivandrum (Patton)	24600	13	121800	40	56100	12
Tellicherry	12000	4	6600	2	3000	1
Trachur	64378	16	58500	18	47661	21
Palghat	9300	1	99000	6	21000	2
Irinjalakuda	36000	13	46440	17	21000	2
Varapoly	17600	4	33000	2	10500	2

CONSIGNEES	FY 79		FY 80		FY 81	
	MANDAYS	NO. OF PROJECTS	MANDAYS	NO. OF PROJECTS	MANDAYS	NO. OF PROJECTS
Vijayapuram	17100	5	32700	11	27000	12
Thiruvalla	-	-	-	-	35187	12
BSS, Trivardrum	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thalayola-parambu	21300	4	9600	2	3000	1
Munnar	2400	1	57700	19	42623	28
Calicut	3600	3	22698	6	7500	2
Manantoddy	3000	1	19200	1	5000	2
Mangalore	-	-	-	-	157634	52
Alleppey	17240	9	39000	11	39900	15
Payangadi	15733	5	14080	6	14100	8
Cochin	70200	3	57780	3	16500	3
Changanacherry	21000	9	79000	4	13800	5
Kanjirapally	19226	2	50400	4	30895	3
Ernakulam	42300	15	33000	16	61500	4
Angamaly	37300	12	7800	2	16500	9
Sultan Battrey	-	-	-	-	6000	1
Kalamassery	49500	15	61900	23	26100	15
Kothamangalam	8700	2	4500	1	19900	1
Kottayam	17400	2	23040	2	19500	2
Palai	16080	1	43490	4	52800	2
Quilon	68700	13	105000	19	52500	21
Trivandrum (Vallayambalam)	18000	9	51000	31	17400	11

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Trivandrum (Pattom)	24600	13	121800	40	56100	12
Tellicherry	12000	4	6000	2	3000	1
Trichur	64378	16	58500	18	47661	21
Palghat	9300	1	99000	6	21000	2
Irinjakuda	36000	13	46440	17	40800	15
Varapoly	17600	4	33000	2	10500	2
Vijayapuram	17100	5	32700	11	27000	12
Thiruvalla	-	-	-	-	35187	12
BSS, Trivandrum	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thalayolaparambu	21300	4	9600	2	300	1
Munnar	2400	1	57700	19	42623	28
Calicut	3600	3	22698	6	7500	3
Manantoddy	3000	1	19200	1	5000	2
Mangalore	-	-	-	-	157634	52

As the Universe for each year differs in the total number of consignees and also in the frequency of mandays, separate selection was made for each year, even though the procedure followed for the selection was the same.

PART - I

2. Stratification of Universe for the Fy 79:

It was decided to stratify the Universe of low cost housing consignees for the year Fy 79 into 4 strata as per details given below:

Stratum I comprises 3 consignees having the largest number of mandays. S1 was chosen in a manner to account for a reasonable proportion of total mandays in the Universe. Table 21 gives a description of Universe of S1. This approach was adopted to facilitate inter-zonal comparison for asset studies in the low cost housing. Cochin, Quilon and Trichur fall in stratum I having the highest number of mandays.

TABLE 21

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MDU'S AND PROJECTS BY CONSIGNEE IN STRATUM I AND ALLOCATION OF PROJECTS

Stratum I	Distribution of projects		Distribution of MDU's (00)		Mid-value of 2&4	Allocation of Sample Project in 6	Adjustment I	Adjustment II
	1 No.	2 %	3 No.	4 %				
Cochin (92/003)	3	9.38	702	34.53	21.96	1.32	2	2
Quilon (92/0013)	13	40.62	687	33.79	37.20	2.23	2	2
Trichur (92/0017)	16	50.00	644	31.68	40.84	2.45	2	2
Total	32	100.00	2033	100.00	100.00	6.00	6	6

The remaining Universe (Non-Stratum) was stratified into 3 strata S2, S3 and S4 arranging all the consignees in descending order of mandays and choosing the cut-off points on the basis of a balance between stratum wise percentage distribution of mandays and of projects intensity on the one hand and width of the class intervals of the strata on the other. Table 22 gives such distribution for all strata.

TABLE 22

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MDU'S AND PROJECTS BY STRATUM
AND ALLOCATION OF PROJECTS

Stratum	Distribution of projects		Distribution of MDU's (00)		Mid-value of 2&4	Range of MDU's in 1000	Allocation of Sample Project in 20	Adjustment I	Adjustment II
	1 No.	2 %	3 No.	4 %					
I	32	19.75	2033	33.16	26.45	64-70	5.29	5+1	6
II	55	33.95	1656	27.01	30.48	36-49	6.09	4	4
III	67	41.36	2172	35.43	38.40	12.24	7.68	6	6
IV	8	4.94	270	4.40	4.67	Below 24	0.934	3+1	4
Total:	162	100	6131	100	100	-	20	20	20

2.1 Allocation of consignee to strata & selection thereof

The total number of consignees that could be selected in the sample was determined in the range of 8 - 12. This took into account the following considerations. The total sample size of beneficiaries for the year FY 79 was determined at 100.

There is another stage in the selection process of projects or project identification number. The number of projects that could be selected was determined in the range of 15 - 20, i.e., on the average 5 beneficiaries were selected from a selected project. In general, a minimum of 2 projects need be selected from each selected consignee to provide for a study of inter-stratum variations.

In order to provide for as much in er-zonal comparison as possible among various asset evaluation studies, each of the three consignees in stratum I were selected. This left 7 consignees to be allocated to S₂, S₃ and S₄. The basis of the allocation is determined to be a balance almost the midvalue, between percentage distribution of total number of projects and mandays of the universe of S₂, S₃ and S₄ (Table 23).

2 3 4

Taking into consideration percentage distribution over the three strata reflected in Table 22, particularly the last column (Adjustment I), 7 consignees were allocated to these strata. This gave 2 consignees to S₂, 3 to S₃ and 2 to S₄; giving a total of 10 consignees for all the 4 strata.

TABLE 23

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF CONSIGNEES AND MANDAYS
OVER S₂, S₃ AND S₄

STRATUM	DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS		DISTRIBUTION OF MDU'S '00'		MIDVALUE OF 2 & 4	ALLOCATION OF CONSIGNEES 7	ADJUSTMENT I
	(1) No.	(2) %	(3) No.	(4) %			
II	55	42.31	1656	40.42	41.36	2.89	2
III	67	51.54	2172	53.00	52.28	3.66	3
IV	8	6.15	270	6.58	6.36	0.45	2
TOTAL	130	100.00	4098	100.00	100.00	7.00	7

Allocated number of consignees from each of the three strata were selected with probability proportion to size, size being number of mandays utilized. List of selected consignees by stratum is given in Tables 24, 25 and 26.

TABLE 24
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MDU'S AND PROJECTS BY CONSIGNEE
IN STRATUM 2 AND ALLOCATION OF PROJECTS

STRATUM	DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS		DISTRIBUTION OF MDU'S '00'		MIDVALUE OF 2 & 4	ALLOCATION OF SAMPLE PROJECT IN 4	ADJUSTMENT I	ADJUSTMENT II
	(1) No.	(2) %	(3) No.	(4) %				
Ernakulam (92/006)	15	50	423	46.07	48.04	1.93	2	2
Kalanassery (92/009)	15	50	495	53.93	51.96	2.07	2	2
TOTAL:	30	100	918	100.00	100.00	4.00	4	4

TABLE 25

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MDU'S AND PROJECTS BY CONSIGNEE
IN STRATUM 3 AND ALLOCATION OF PROJECTS

STRATUM	DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS		DISTRIBUTION OF MDU'S '00'		MIDVALUE OF 2 & 4	ALLOCATION OF SAMPLE PROJECT IN 6	ADJUST- MENT I	ADJUST MENT II
	(1) No.	(2) %	(3) No.	(4) %				
Changanacherry (92/004)	9	60.00	210	35.18	47.59	2.86	3 - 1	2
Talayolaparambu (92/0028)	4	26.66	213	35.68	31.17	1.87	2	2
Kottayam (92/0011)	2	13.34	174	29.14	21.24	1.27	1 + 1	2
TOTAL:	15	100.00	597	100.00	100.00	6.00	6	6

TABLE 26

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MDU'S AND PROJECTS BY CONSIGNEES
IN STRATUM 4 AND ALLOCATION OF PROJECTS

STRATUM	DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS		DISTRIBUTION OF MDU'S '00'		MIDVALUE OF 2 & 4	ALLOCATION OF SAMPLE PROJECT IN 4	ADJUST- MENT I	ADJUST MENT II
	(1) No.	(2) %	(3) No.	(4) %				
Calicut (92/0026)	3	60	36	29.27	44.64	1.78	2	2
Kothamangalam (92/0010)	2	40	87	70.73	55.37	2.22	2	2
Total:	5	100	123	100.00	100.00	4.00	4	4

Ernakulam and Kalamassery fall in stratum II, Changanacherry, Thalayolaparambu and Kottayam in III and Calicut and Kothamangalam in Stratum IV.

P A R T - II2.3 Allocation of projects, consignees and selection thereof:

The allocation of the projects to the 4 strata is indicated in Table 2. The basis of allocation is determined to be a balance almost the midvalue between percentage distribution of projects and mandays of all the consignees in each stratum. Out of a total number of 20 projects, 6 projects have come in S1, 4 in S2, 6 in S3 and 4 in S4. Allocation of the number of projects for each selected consignee was done by finding the midvalue between the percentage distribution of mandays and projects of each selected consignee (Tables 21, 23, 24 & 25 give such distribution for all strata).

3. Selection procedure for the year Fy 80

The Universe of low cost housing study for the year Fy 80 consisted only of 24 consignees.

P A R T - I3.1 Stratification of Universe:

The Universe of consignees for the Fy 80 was stratified into 4 strata. Stratum I comprises of 4 consignees having the largest number of mandays. Table 27 gives a description of the Universe of S1.

TABLE 27

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MDU'S AND PROJECTS BY CONSIGNEES
IN STRATUM I AND ALLOCATION OF PROJECTS

STRATUM	DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS		DISTRIBUTION OF MDU'S '00'		MIDVALUE OF 2 & 4	ALLOCATION OF SAMPLE PROJECTS IN 8	ADJUST- MENT I	ADJUST- MENT II
	(1) No.	(2) %	(3) No.	(4) %				
Trivandrum (Pattom) (92/0015)	40	57.97	1218	30.08	44.03	3.52	4 - 2	2
Quilon (92/0013)	19	27.55	1050	25.94	26.74	2.14	2	2
Palghat (92/0018)	6	8.69	990	24.56	16.57	1.33	1 + 1	2
Changanacherry (92/0004)	4	5.79	790	19.52	12.66	1.01	1 + 1	2
Total:	69	100.00	4048	100.00	100.00	8.00	8	8

Trivandrum, Quilon, Palghat and Changanacherry fall in Stratum - I.

The remaining universe (non-stratum) was stratified into 3 strata S2, S3 and S4 arranging all the consignees in descending order of mandays and choosing the cut-off points as was done in the case of FY 79. Table 28 gives the distribution for all strata.

TABLE 28

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MDU'S TO PROJECTS BY
STRATUM AND ALLOCATION OF PROJECTS

STRATUM	DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS		DISTRIBUTION OF MDU'S '00'		MIDVALUE OF 2 & 4	RANGE OF MDU'S PROJECTS IN(00')	ALLOCATION OF SAMPLE PROJECTS 20	ADJUST- MENT I	ADJUST- MENT II
	(1) No.	(2) %	(3) No.	(4) %					
	69	27.38	4048	37.58	32.48	79-121	6.50	6 + 2	8
	117	46.43	4282	39.75	43.09	43-61	8.61	9 - 2	7
	59	23.41	2165	20.09	21.75	14-39	4.35	4 - 1	3
	7	2.77	279	2.58	2.68	Less than 14	0.53	1 + 1	2
Total:	252	100.00	10774	100.00	100.00	-	20.00	20	20

100 beneficiaries were to be selected from 20 projects of 10 consignees.

TABLE 29

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF CONSIGNEES & MANDAYS OVER S2, S3 & S4

STRATUM	DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS		DISTRIBUTION OF MDU'S '00'		MIDVALUE OF 2 & 4	ALLOCATION OF SAMPLE PROJECTS IN 8	ADJUST- MENT I	ADJUST- MENT II
	(1) No.	(2) %	(3) No.	(4) %				
	117	63.94	4282	63.66	63.80	3.83	3-1	2
	59	32.24	2156	32.19	32.20	1.93	2	2
	7	3.82	279	4.15	4.00	0.24	1+1	2
Total:	183	100.00	6726	100.00	100.00	6.00	6	6

Taking into consideration percentage distribution over the 3 strata reflected in Table 29, particularly the last column (Adjustment), 6 consignees were allocated to these strata. This gave 2 consignees to S2, 2 to S3 and 2 to S4.

Allocated number of consignees from each of the three strata were selected with probability proportion to size, size being number of mandays utilized. List of selected consignees by stratum is given in Tables 30, 31 and 32.

TABLE 30

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MDU'S & PROJECTS BY CONSIGNEES
IN STRATUM II AND ALLOCATION OF PROJECTS

STRATUM	DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS		DISTRIBUTION OF MDU'S '00'		MIDVALUE OF 2 & 4	ALLOCATION OF SAMPLE PROJECTS IN 4	ADJUST- MENT I	ADJUST- MENT II
	(1) No.	(2) %	(3) No.	(4) %				
Kalama- ssery (92/009)	23	57.5	619	57.16	57.33	2.29	2	2
Irinjaila- kuda (92/0019)	17	42.5	464	42.84	42.67	1.71	2	2
Total:	40	100.00	1083	100.00	100.00	4.00	4	4

TABLE 31

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MDU'S & PROJECTS BY CONSIGNEES
IN STRATUM III AND ALLOCATION OF PROJECTS

STRATUM	DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS		DISTRIBUTION OF MDU'S '00'		MIDVALUE OF 2 & 4	ALLOCATION OF SAMPLE PROJECTS IN 4	ADJUST- MENT I	ADJUST- MENT II
	(1) No.	(2) %	(3) No.	(4) %				
Verapoly (892/0020)	2	15.38	330	45.83	30.61	1.22	1+1	2
Alleppey (92/0001)	11	84.62	390	54.16	69.39	2.77	3-1	2
Total:	13	100.00	720	100.00	100.00	4.00	4	4

TABLE 32

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MDU'S & PROJECTS BY CONSIGNEES
IN STRATUM IV & ALLOCATION OF PROJECTS

STRATUM	DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS		DISTRIBUTION OF MDU'S '00'		MIDVALUE OF 2 & 4	ALLOCATION OF SAMPLE PROJECTS IN 4	ADJUST- MENT I	ADJUST- MENT II
	(1) No.	(2) %	(3) No.	(4) %				
Thalayola- parambu (92/0028)	2	50	96	55.17	52.29	2.10	2	2
Angamaly (92/0007)	2	50	78	44.83	47.42	1.90	2	2
Total:	4	100	174	100.00	100.00	4.00	4	4

Kalamassery and Irinjalakuda come in Stratum II, Verapoly and Alleppey in Stratum III and Talayolaparambu and Angamaly in Stratum IV.

PART - II

3.2 Allocation of projects, consignees & selection thereof:

On allocating 20 projects to 4 strata, 8 projects have come in S1, 4 in S2 and 4 in S3 and 4 in S4. Allocation of the number of projects for each selected consignee was done by finding the mid-value between percentage distribution of mandays and projects of each selected consignee (Tables 28, 29, 30 & 31). The number of projects and mandays of each selected consignee were listed and the selection were done by probability proportion to the size, size being the number of mandays utilized.

4. Selection procedure for the year Fy 81:

The same procedure was adopted to draw sample for the years Fy 81 from their respective universe.

The Consignees & Project Holders (PH), stratawise selected for the Fy 81, are as follows:

Strata I	-	1) Mangalore (96/0002)
		2) Tiruvalla (92/0022)
		3) Palai (92/0012)
		4) Quilon (92/0013)

Strata II	-	1) Trichur (92/0017)
		2) Ernakulam (92/0015)
		PH - 4
Strata III	-	1) Kanjirapally (92/0005)
		2) Vijayapuram (92/0021)
		PH - 4
Strata IV	-	1) Cochin (92/0003)
		2) Kottayam (92/0011)
		PH - 4

ANNEXURE NO. 2ESTIMATION PROCEDURE

Notations used:

h = suffix for stratum

i = suffix for consignee

j = suffix for project

k = suffix for beneficiary

Y_{hijk} = value of a character under study
(say cost of house) for Kth sampled beneficiary of jth project
of ith consignee of hth stratum.

N_{hj} and n_{hij} are total number of beneficiaries and number of
sampled beneficiaries of jth project, of ith consignee of hth stratum
respectively.

n_{hi} number of sampled projects of ith consignee of hth stratum.

n_h number of sampled consignees of hth stratum.

P_{hij} probability of selection of jth project of ith consignee of
hth stratum.

P_h probability of selection of ith consignee of hth stratum.

Estimation of total for a variable (say cost of the house)

$\sum_{k=1}^{n_{hij}} Y_{hijk}$ gives the total of cost of n_{hij} house of jth
selected project of ith consignee of hth stratum.

$$\hat{Y}_{hij} = \frac{N_{hj}}{n_{hij}} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{n_{hij}} Y_{hijk}$$

\hat{Y}_{hij} is the estimation

of total cost for all beneficiaries of above project. Similarly:

$$\hat{Y}_{hi} = \frac{1}{n_{hi}} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{Y_{hij}}{P_{hij}}$$

is the estimate of total cost of houses for ith consignee for all its projects.

Similarly,

$$\hat{Y}_h = \frac{1}{n_h} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{Y_{hi}}{P_{hi}} \quad \text{is the estimate of}$$

totals for all consignees in hth stratum and $\hat{Y} = \sum_{h=1}^4 \hat{Y}_h$ gives

estimate of total cost of houses in all four strata in the zone.

Estimate of total number of beneficiaries in the Zone

$$\hat{N}_{hi} = \frac{1}{n_{hi}} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{N_{hij}}{P_{hij}} \quad \text{is the}$$

estimate of number of beneficiaries in the ith consignee.

$$\hat{N}_h = \frac{1}{n_h} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{N_{hi}}{P_{hi}} \quad \text{give the estimate of}$$

number of beneficiaries for all consignees in hth stratum.

$$\hat{N} = \sum_{h=1}^4 \hat{N}_h \quad \text{is an estimate of total number of}$$

beneficiary for all four strata in the zone.

Estimate of average (Cost of the house)

Estimate of average cost of the house will be obtained by $\frac{\hat{Y}}{N}$.

Similarly, averages for other variables are obtained.

ANNEXURE NO. 3SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF
BENEFICIARIES AND NON-BENEFICIARIESProfile of Beneficiaries and Non-BeneficiariesBeneficiaries:

- Sex** : More than three fourths of the beneficiaries in all the three years were males.
- Age** : 79%, 90% and 72% of them for years 1979, 1980 and 1981 were in the age group 31-60 years.
- Education** : The majority had education upto primary level. A small percentage of them were either graduates or with higher qualification.
- Marital Status** : A large majority was married, there were 6% to 9% of beneficiaries in the three years who were not married.
- Religion** : Majority of the beneficiaries were Christians. Between 11% to 16% in the three years are Hindus.
- Caste** : Around 40% of them belong to Scheduled Caste, Scheduled Tribes and other backward classes for all the three years.
- Occupation** : The majority of them were working as labourers. A small number was unemployed.
- Income** : 86%, 92% and 98% of the beneficiaries for the years 1979, 1980 and 1981 respectively have monthly incomes less than Rs.500.
- Land Holding** : Almost all beneficiaries had land of their own. However, average land holding of a beneficiary was one fifth of an acre (20 cents) approximately. The area of land leased in/leased out was negligible.
- Electricity use** : Majority of the beneficiaries were from villages which had electricity. However, only one fourth of the beneficiaries were having electricity in their houses.
- Latrine Use** : Nearly three fourth use no latrine. However, 27%, 12% and 9% of beneficiaries for years 1979 and 1980 and 1981 respectively had private latrines.
- Bathroom facility** : Around 90% of the beneficiaries had common bath room facility. 20%, 8% and 5% of beneficiaries for

years 1979, 1980 and 1981 respectively had private bath rooms.

Water Supply : Source of supply of drinking water for 60%, 81% and 78% of beneficiaries for years 1979, 1980 and 1981 respectively, was outside their houses and sources were tap, well and canal. A very few had tap or hand pump in their houses. Nearly one fifth of beneficiaries had wells inside the compound of their houses.

Family Size : Average family size of the beneficiaries for the years 1979, 1980 and 1981 were 5.4, 5.6 and 5.2 respectively.

Non-Beneficiaries:

Non-beneficiaries had almost the same characteristics as those of beneficiaries. Variations, if any, were small. Amongst non-beneficiaries, 94% were males, 70% were within the age-group of 30-60 years, 68% were low caste, 55% were christians, 90% were having incomes less than Rs.500/- per month, 13% had electricity in their houses, 90% used open latrines, 98% had common bath rooms. The average family size of non-beneficiaries was 6.0. The average holding size was less than one fifth of an acre (about 20 cents). The source of water supply for 60% of non-beneficiaries was well outside the compound, for 24% tap water outside the compound and for 17% canal/mountain water.

ANNEXURE NO. 4STATISTICAL TABLES (NO. 33 TO 37)ALLOCATION OF SAMPLE SIZE

TABLE 33

YEAR	STRATUM	NO.OF CON- SIGNEE IN STRATUM	NO.OF CON- SIGNEE	<u>SAMPLE ALLOCATION</u>	
				PROJECTS	BENEFI- CIARIES
1979	I	3	3	6	30
	II	4	2	4	20
	III	12	3	6	30
	IV	5	2	4	20
	Sub-Total:	24	10	20	100
1980	I	4	4	8	40
	II	8	2	4	20
	III	8	2	4	20
	IV	4	2	4	20
	Sub-Total:	24	10	20	100
1981	I	4	4	8	40
	II	6	2	4	20
	III	6	2	4	20
	IV	11	2	4	20
	Sub-Total:	27	10	20	100
GRAND TOTAL:		<u>75</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>300</u>

TABLE 34 SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTER OF BENEFICIARIES & NON-BENEFICIARIES
(PERCENTAGE)

SEX	BENEFICIARY			NON-BENEFICIARY
	1979	1980	1981	
Male	75	84	77	94
Female	25	16	23	6
<u>Age</u>				
Upto 30 years	11	12	14	-
31-40 years	28	33	31	12
41-50 years	25	29	25	33
51-60 years	26	16	16	25
61-70 years	5	8	10	17
71-80 years	5	2	4	13
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Caste</u>				
Scheduled Castes	2	2	8	10
Scheduled Tribes	0	0	0	2
Other Backward Classes	38	34	32	56
Others	60	64	60	32
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Religion</u>				
Hindu	16	11	16	40
Muslim	4	6	8	5
Christian	77	83	76	55
Others	3	0	0	0
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

SEX	BENEFICIARY			NON-BENEFICIARY
	1979	1980	1981	
<u>Education</u>				
Illiterate	16	37	22	22
Literate but no formal education	8	4	5	9
Primary	42	36	41	45
Secondary	22	18	29	18
Graduation and above	12	5	3	6
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Marital Status</u>				
Married	79	83	81	81
Unmarried	9	7	6	2
Widow/Widower	8	8	12	15
Separated	1	1	1	2
Divorced	3	1	-	-
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Occupation</u>				
1. Agriculture	2	5	5	2
2. Agriculture Labour	9	25	19	20
3. Non-Agriculture Labour	38	46	50	35
4. Dairy Farming	0	0	0	0
5. Artisan	3	1	1	5
6. Business/Profession	15	5	11	14
7. Service	15	5	3	5

SEX	BENEFICIARY			NON-BENEFICIARY
	1979	1980	1981	
8. Student	0	5	0	-
9. Unemployed	16	4	7	17
10. Fisherman	2	4	2	2
11. Rubber Tapping	0	0	2	-
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Monthly Income</u>				
1. Less than 100	20	9	34	34
2. 101-200	27	35	38	31
3. 201-300	15	31	23	17
4. 301-400	13	12	2	8
5. 401-500	11	5	1	-
6. 501-600	4	5	0	2
7. 601-700	4	-	0	2
8. 701-800	2	0	2	-
9. 801-900	2	1	0	-
10. 901-1000	1	1	0	3
11. 1001-and above	1	1	0	3
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Electricity use</u>				
In the village	51	71	76	87
In the House	7	5	0	2
In both the house and village	24	15	16	11
N.R.	18	9	8	-
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

SEX	BENEFICIARY			NON-BENEFICIARY
	1979	1980	1981	
<u>SANITATION</u>				
<u>Latrine</u>				
Private	27	12	9	5
Common	8	5	2	5
Open	65	83	89	90
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Bath rooms</u>				
Private	20	8	5	2
Common	80	92	95	98
Open	0	0	0	0
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Source of Water Supply</u>				
<u>Hand Pump</u>				
Inside the house	3	2	0	-
Outside the house	1	2	3	5
<u>Well Water</u>				
Inside the compound	26	17	22	7
Outside the compound	40	44	46	60
<u>Tap Water</u>				
Inside the house	0	0	1	0
Outside the house	17	20	22	24
<u>Canal/Mountain Water</u>	9	17	10	17
	96 ^{1/}	102 ^{2/}	104 ^{2/}	113 ^{2/}

- 1) The remaining 4% is non-response.
- 2) The total exceeds 100 as some households have more than one source of water supply.

LAND HOLDING SIZE

HOLDING SIZE (Cents)	BENEFICIARY			NON-BENEFICIARY
	1979	1980	1981	
0 - 1	0	3	0	7
2 - 5	31	27	47	29
5 - 10	21	34	22	19
10 - 20	17	15	13	17
20 - 30	12	11	8	14
30 - 50	11	2	7	8
> 50	8	8	3	6
Total	100	100	100	100
Average Holding Size	<u>20</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>17</u>

NOTE: 100 cents equal one acre.

TABLE 35 DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFICIARIES ACCORDING TO NATURE OF ILLNESS (for those who reported illness)

	BENEFICIARIES			NON-BENEFICIARIES
	1979	1980	1981	
Malaria	-	-	-	-
Typhoid	-	7	3	11
Chicken pox	-	12	3	4
Whooping Cough	-	-	3	-
Bronchitis	3	7	5	4
Pneumonia	3	7	8	29

T.B.	28	24	28	4
Chest Pain	3	3	5	-
Respiratory Diseases	25	13	17	37
Rheumatism	-	-	-	-
Blood Pressure	3	-	3	-
Fever	3	5	2	-
Ulcer	13	12	15	4
Tumor/Cancer	6	2	2	-
Jaundice	-	5	-	-
Mumps	-	-	-	-
MESSLES	-	3	-	-
Skin diseases	10	-	3	7
ENT Problem	3	-	3	-
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

TABLE 36 : EXPENDITURE ON FFW ASSISTED HOUSE
(Quantities per house-hold)

<u>MATERIAL</u>	<u>UNIT</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>
<u>Material</u>				
FFW grain	Kg.	637	508	365
FFW oil	lt.	18	16	12
Wood	cuft	29	23	24
Bricks	Nos.	2830	2613	2250
Earth (gravel)	Lorry	11	9	11
Roofing tiles	Nos.	842	664	764
Roofing thatch	Bundles	0.41	0.22	168
Other material		7	4	6
<u>Skilled Labour</u>				
Mason	Mandays	23	24	20
Carpenter	"	19	13	14
Others	"	0.10	0.44	0.92
Unskilled labour	"	49	19	24

TABLE 37: EXPENDITURE ON LOW COST HOUSE - ITEM-WISE

(Rs. per beneficiary)

ITEM	YEARS		
	1979	1980	1981
<u>Material Inputs</u>			
Wood	1215	913	1055
Bricks	769	547	785
Earth	166	80	145
Roofing	730	794	838
Cement	465	140	309
<u>Labour</u>			
Mason	505	434	495
Carpenter	406	290	431
Unskilled Labour	393	257	320
Total:	<u>4649</u>	<u>3455</u>	<u>4378</u>
<u>FPW Assistance</u>			
Grain	491	690	378
Oil	134	148	92
Total	<u>625</u>	<u>838</u>	<u>470</u>

11

THE RESEARCH INSTITUTE
RAJAGIRI COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
KALAMASSERY - 683 104

USAID FFW EVALUATION INTERVIEW SCHEDULE (FOR BENEFICIARIES)
RANDOM SAMPLE SURVEY OF LOW COST HOUSING

Col No.	Q No.	Description	Code	
1 - 5	1	Identifying Data		
	1.1	Name of Consignee.....		
	1.2	Name of the Project holder....		
	1.3	Location of the project holder....		
	1.4	Location of FFW Low cost housing...		
	1.5	Code Number of the consignee.....		
	2	Respondent Characteristics		
6	2.1	Sex	Male	1
			Female	2
7	2.2	Age	Upto 30 Years	1
			31-40	2
			41-50	3
			51-60	4
			61-70	5
			71 and above	6
8	2.3	Education	Illiterate	1
			Literate but no formal Education	2
			Primary	3
			Middle	4
			Secondary	5
			Graduation and above	6

Col. No.	Q. No.	Description		Code
9	2.4	Caste	Scheduled Caste	1
			Scheduled Tribe	2
			Other Backward Community	3
			Others (Specify)	4
10	2.5	Religion	Hindu	1
			Muslim	2
			Christian	3
			Others (Specify)	4
11	2.6	Marital Status	Married	1
			Unmarried	2
			Widow, Widower	3
			Separated	4
			Divorced	5
12	2.7	Occupation:	Agriculture	1
			Agricultural Labourer	2
			Non-Agricultural Labourer	3
			Dairy Farming	4
			Artisan	5
			Business Profession	6
			Service	7
			Student	8
			Others (Specify)	9
13.14	2.8	Approximate monthly income of the household in the last 12 months (in Rupees)	Upto 100	1
			101 - 200	2
			201 - 300	3
			301 - 400	4
			401 - 500	5
			501 - 600	6

Col. No.	Q No.	Description	Code
		601 - 700	<input type="checkbox"/> 7
		701 - 800	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
		801 - 900	<input type="checkbox"/> 9
		901 - 1000	<input type="checkbox"/> 10
		Unwilling to disclose	<input type="checkbox"/> 11
		Unable to specify	<input type="checkbox"/> 12
	2.9	Assets owned: Does the respondent own any of these assets	
		(a) Livestock (Give numbers)	
15 - 16		Buffaloes	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
17 - 18		Cows	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
19 - 20		Pigs	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
21 - 22		Goats	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
23 - 24		Fowl	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
25 - 26		Ducks	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
27 - 28		Others (Specify)	
		(b) Other assets (Give price of each items)	
29 - 30 - 31		Bicycle	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
32 - 33 - 34		Wrist Watch	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
35 - 36 - 37 - 38		Gold Jewellery	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
39 - 40		Stove	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
41 - 42 - 43		Radio / Transistor / Tape Recorder	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
44 - 45 - 46		Chair	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
47 - 48 - 49		Table	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
50 - 51 - 52		Cot	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
53 - 54 - 55		Aluminium / Brass / Steel Utensils	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
56 - 57 - 58		Vessels	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
59 - 60 - 61		Sewing Machine	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
62 - 63 - 64		Almirah	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
65 - 66		Others (specify)	
67	2.10	Does respondent have food-grain storage facility	
		Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
		No	<input type="checkbox"/> 2

Col. No.	Q. No.	Description	Code
68	(a) If 'Yes', Specify		
	(1) Material made from.....		
		Wood	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
		Bricks	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
		Metal	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
		Others 4
69 - 70	(2) Capacity (actuals grain Level)	
	2.11	Land holding	
71	(a) Does the respondent hold any land		
		Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
		No	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
72 - 73	(b) Total land leased in (actuals in cents)	
74 - 75	(c) Total land leased out (actuals in cents)	
76 - 77	(d) Total operational land holding (actuals in cents)	
	3.	House Characteristics	
78	3.1	When was the beneficiaries house completed?	
		Fy 81	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
		Fy 80	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
		Fy 79	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
79	3.2	Is the house	
		Pukka	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
		Kutcha	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
		Mixed	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
80	3.3	Is the house a new construction	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
		Repaired	<input type="checkbox"/> 2

END CARD 1

Col. No.	Q. No.	Description	Code
1 - 5	1	Identifying data	
6	3.4	Is this the respondents first self owned house	
		Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	1
		No <input type="checkbox"/>	2
7	3.5	If 'Yes', indicate where he lived before it was completed	
		Father's house <input type="checkbox"/>	1
		Other relative's House <input type="checkbox"/>	2
		Rented House <input type="checkbox"/>	3
		In a house provided by land lord <input type="checkbox"/>	4
		Others (specify)	5
8	3.6	If 'no' indicate what kind of house he had before	
		Kutcha <input type="checkbox"/>	1
		Pukka <input type="checkbox"/>	2
		Mixed <input type="checkbox"/>	3
		Other (specify)	4
9	3.7	If this is not the respondent's self owned house, indicate why a new house was needed ie., previous house was	
		Damaged <input type="checkbox"/>	1
		Too small for the family <input type="checkbox"/>	2
		A kutcha house and respondent wanted a pukka house <input type="checkbox"/>	3
		Other Reasons (Specify)	4
10	3.8	If the self owned house was repaired, indicate why repairing was necessary ie., the house was	

Col. No.	Q. No.	Description	Code
		Damaged	1
		Too small for the family	2
		A kutchha house and the respondent wanted a pukka house	3
		Other Reasons (specify)	
	3.9	Water, Electricity and Sanitation	
		(a) Water Supply	
11		Whether the respondent has	
		(1) Hand pump	
		Inside the house	1
		Outside the house	2
12		(2) Well water	
		Inside the compound	1
		Outside the compound	2
13		(3) Tap Water	
		Inside the house	1
		Outside the house	2
14		(4) Canal Water	
		Inside the compound	1
		Outside the compound	2
15		(5) Mountain water	
		Inside the compound	1
		Outside the compound	2
16		(b) Electricity	
		Whether available	
		in the village	1
		in the house	2
		In both the house and village	3
17		(c) Number of living rooms (actual)	
		(d) Sanitation :-	
18		(1) Latrine	
		Private	1
		Common	2
		Open	3

Col. No.	Q. No.	Description	Code
19		(2) Bathroom	
		Private	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
		Common	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
20	3.10	Indicate approximate size of the house in sq. ft.	
		Less than 50	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
		51 - 100	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
		101 - 150	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
		151 - 200	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
		201 - 250	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
		251 - 300	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
		301 - 350	<input type="checkbox"/> 7
		351 - 400	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
		400 and above	<input type="checkbox"/> 9
21	3.11	How many people do live in the house (actual no.).....	
	3.12	(a) Indicate expenditure on FFW assisted house (actual no.).....	
22-23-24	(1) FFW	(1) FFW Grain	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Kg.
25 - 26		(2) FFW oil	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> lt.
27 - 28		(3) Wood	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> cu.ft.
29-30-31-32		(4) Bricks	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> nos.
33		(5) Earth (gravel)	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Lorry
34-35-36		(6) Roofing Tile	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> no.
37 - 38		(7) Roofing Thatch	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> bundles
39 - 40		(8) Other materials (specify)	
		(9) Skilled labour	
41 - 42		(1) Mason	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> mandays
43		(2) Carpenter	<input type="checkbox"/> mandays
44		(3) Other (specify)	

Col. No.	Q. No.	Description	Code
45 - 46		(10) Unskilled labour.....	
	(b)	Indicate expenditure on FFW assisted house (Value in Rs.)	mandays.
47-48-49-50		(1) FFW Grain	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
51-52-53-54		(2) FFW Oil	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
55-56-57		(3) Wood	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
58-59-60		(4) Bricks	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
61-62-63		(5) Earth (Gravels)	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
64-65-66		(6) Roofing Tile	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
67-68-69		(7) Roofing Thatch	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
70-71-72		(8) Other materials	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
73-74-75		(9) Mason	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
76-77-78		(10) Carpenter	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
79 - 80		(11) Unskilled labour.....	

END CARD II

Col. No.	Q. No.	Description	Code
1 - 5		Identifying data	
	4	Household information (only those who live in the house)	
6 - 7	4.1	How many of your sons do live with you? (actual No.)	
	4.2	Give their ages (actuals)	
8 - 9		Son 1	1111
10 - 11		Son 2	111
12 - 13		Son 3	11
14 - 15		Son 4	1
16 - 17		Son 5	1
18 - 19		Son 6	1
20 - 21	4.3	How many of your daughters do live with you (actual No.)	
	4.4	Give their ages (actuals)	
22 - 23		Daughter 1	11
24 - 25		Daughter 2	11
26 - 27		Daughter 3	11
28 - 29		Daughter 4	11
30 - 31		Daughter 5	11
32 - 33		Daughter 6	11
34	4.5	Is there any one else living with you	
		Yes	1
		No	2
	4.6	If yes give their ages and their relation to the respondent (actuals)	
35 - 36		1 Father	11
37 - 38		2 Mother	11
39 - 40		3 Brother	11

Col. No.	Q. No.	Description	Code
41 - 42		4 Sister	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
43 - 44		5 Son in-law	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
45 - 46		6 Daughter-in-law	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
47 - 48		7 Grand Father	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
49 - 50		8 Grand Mother	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
51 - 52 - 53 - 54		9 Others (specify) ..	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
55	47	(a) Has there been any birth in the household during the past 12 month period	
		Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
		No	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
56		(b) If Yes indicate how many (actual No.)	
57	48	(a) Is the household expecting any births during the next 3 to 7 months	
		Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
		No	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
58		(b) If Yes, indicate how many (actual No.)	
	5	Household history of illness	
59	51	Has any member of the house been ill during the past 1 year?	
		Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
		No	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
60	52	If yes, give the name of (a) Name of illnesses	
		Malaria	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
		Typhoid	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
		Chickenpox	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
		Whooping cough	<input type="checkbox"/> 4

Col. No.	O. No.	Description	Code
		Bronchitis	5
		Pneumonia	6
		T. B.	7
		Respiratory Diseases	8
		Any other specify
61-62		(b) How many members suffered from the sickness (actual)
63-64-65		(c) Indicate the total number of days of sickness (actual)	
	6	House characteristics	
	6.1	How were the FFW commodities used in the construction of the house.	
66		(1) Project holders made bi-weekly payments directly to workers	1
		(2) The commodities were given to the respondent by the project holder and he paid the workers himself	2
		(3) The commodities were given directly to the respondent and he in turn sold them using the proceeds for purchase of Materials and payment of labour	3
		(4) Other specify
67	6.2	Was the house adequately completed required	
		Yes	1
		No	2
68	6.3	If not indicate what was missing	
		Roof	1
		Doors	2
		Floor	3
		Others (specify)

Col. No.	Q. No.	Description	Code
69	6.4	Does the respondent believe that the FFW assisted house is adequate for his needs	
		Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
		No	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
70	6.5	If 'no' why	
		Too small	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
		Inferior quality	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
		Weak roof	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
		Kutchha construction	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
		Poor floor	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
71	6.6	(a) Does the respondent own the land on which the house is built	
		Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
		No	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
72		(b) If no, then by whom.	
		Father	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
		Mother	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
		Grand Parents	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
		Brother / Sister	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
		Uncle / Aunty	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
		Others specify	... 6
73	6.7	(a) Are there any mortgages against the house	
		Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
		No	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
74		(b) If yes to whom	
		Private	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
		Money lender	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
		Bank	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
		Co-operative society	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
		Other specify	... 5
75	6.8	(a) Do you propose to live in the house	
		Temporarily	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
		Permanently	<input type="checkbox"/> 2

Col. No.	Q No.	Description	Code
76 - 77		(b) If temporarily, how long you propose to live here (actual month)	
78	6.9	If the FFW house is brick (Pukka) were FFW commodities used to pay for makings bricks, as well as pay for unskilled labour	
		Yes	1
		No	2
79	6.10	If yes, was this done in the previous year, as a separate FFW project	
		Yes	1
		No	2
80	6.11	Would the respondent have built the house without FFW assistance	
		Yes	1
		No	2

END CARD III

Col. No.	Q. No.	Description	Code
1-5		Identifying data	
	7	Employment (preceding 12 Calendar months)	
6	7.1	(a) How many members worked on FFW projects (Actual no.)
		(b) For how many days (Actual)
7 - 8 - 9		Member 1
10 - 11 - 12		Member 2
13 - 14 - 15		Member 3
16	7.2	(a) How many members worked on agricultural land (Actual)	
		(b) For how many days (Actual)	
17 - 18 - 19		Member 1
20 - 21 - 22		Member 2
23 - 24 - 25		Member 3
26	7.3	(a) How many members worked as non-agricultural labourers (Actual)
		(b) For how many days (Actual)	
27 - 28 - 29		Member 1
30 - 31 - 32		Member 2
33 - 34 - 35		Member 3
36	7.4	(a) How many members were unemployed	
		(b) For how many days
37 - 38 - 39		Member 1
40 - 41 - 42		Member 2
43 - 44 - 45		Member 3

Col. No.	O. No.	Description	Code
	8	Household employment profile:-	
46 - 47	(a)	Working members (Actual numbers)	
	(a)	Adult males	
	(b)	Adult females	
	(c)	Children	
48 - 49	(b)	Non-working members	
	(a)	Adult males	
	(b)	Adult females	
	(c)	Children	
50	9	Prioritize your choice for future ITW Project possibilities. Rank I as most preferred, followed by II, III and on for as many as are relevant.	
		1	New irrigation wells
		2	Deepening/Cleaning irrigation wells
		3	Tanks/Dams/Reservoirs
		4	Bund construction
		5	Land clearing/levelling
		6	Bench Terracing
		7	Road construction
		8	Drinking water wells
		9	School/Community center/Health center/Godown Construction
		10	Low cost housing

Col. No.	Q. No.	Description	Code
	11	Vocational training	
	12	Construction of Drains/ Ditcher latrines/Sewage Disposal tanks	
	13	Others (specify)	

OBSERVATION OF THE INTERVIEWER

Name of the interviewer

Date

Place

Time

Checked by

(Name)