CONTRIBUTION OF COMMON PROPERTY RESOURCES IN HUMAN DEVELOPMENT: A SUSTAINABLE APPROACH FOR RURAL COMMUNITIES

Article Particulars: Received: 12.01.2018 Accepted: 15.01.2018 Published: 20.01.2018

MANU PRAKASH PATHAK
Ph.D Research Scholar, Centre for Rural Development
Annamalai University, Annamalainagar, India

Dr.P.MURUGESAN
Assistant Professor & Project Director
ICSSR Sponsored Major Research Project
Centre for Rural Development, Annamalai University
Annamalainaga, Chidambaram, Tamil Nadu, India

Abstract

*The Common Property Resources refer to the resource accessible to the community of a village and to which no individual has exclusive property rights. They include village pastures, community forest, waste land, common threshing grounds, waste dumping places, watershed drainages, village ponds, tanks, rivers, bands, and river beds. The CPRs are the resources, which are collectively used by the group of people. These resources include community forests, common grazing grounds, tanks and their beds, foreshores, threshing ground, rivers and river beds, water sheds, etc. The CPRs form the main thrust of the rural economics and the absence of these resources could mean the difference between life and death to members of the rural communities. The CPRs contribute a lot to the village economies, the rural poor, particularly, survive on these resources to a greater extent (**Olubukola, 1996**). This is because CPRs are used on a daily basis for food, medicine, shelter and financial income. United Nations estimates indicate that up to 70 per cent of the world's poor are female; women in developing countries constitute the majority of the labour force, playing a key role in managing community resources and helping to protect the environment.*

***Keywords**: CPRs, poor people's livelihoods, rural economics, village economies, Common Property Resources, caste groups*

Introduction

The Common Property Resources are also helpful in achieving the subsidiary activities like supplying the inputs to land cultivation and household consumption as well as accumulating total land holdings by encroaching adjacent pramboke land (Government Land) to patta lands of the households. The major Common Property Resources indicators which show the performances of the respondents are:

1. The ratio of Common Property Resources items to the total asset value.
2. Extent of employment generated through Common Property Resources activities.
3. The ratio of Common Property Resources man-days generated to the total employment of the female respondents.
4. Ratio of each Common Property Resources of income to the total Common Property Resources income , and
5. The ratio of Common Property Resources net income to the total income generated by the female respondents in the study areas.

Statement of the Problem

Common Property Resources in human development among rural households with special reference to tribal and non-tribal areas in Tamilnadu, India. Further, it compares the pattern of CPR usage in terms of income generation, employment generation and asset generation between the tribal. Along with type of activities, nature and extent of CPR usage in survey regions. The CPRs are the resources, which are collectively used by the group of people. These resources include community forests, common grazing grounds, tanks and their beds, foreshores, threshing

ground, rivers and river beds, water sheds, etc. The CPRs form the main thrust of the rural economics and the absence of these resources could mean the difference between life and death to members of the rural communities. The CPRs contribute a lot to the village economies, the rural poor, particularly, survive on these resources to a greater extent (**Olubukola, 1996**). This is because CPRs are used on a daily basis for food, medicine, shelter and financial income. United Nations estimates indicate that up to 70 per cent of the world's poor are female; women in developing countries constitute the majority of the labour force, playing a key role in managing community resources and helping to protect the environment.

Objectives

Based on the statement of the problem and research issues, the objectives are framed as follows:

1. To indentify the variations in dependency on Common Property Resource parameters according to occupation and caste groups in the surveyed regions.
2. To explore the inter-linkages between CPRs and women empowerment in the study regions, and
3. To suggest suitable policy measures to sustainable use of CPRs and thereby empower the rural women.

Review of Literature

Beak and Ghosh (2000) analysed the relationship between CPRs and rural poor in India. This study explores that the first insensitive study of CPRs in West Bengal in post independent times showed that CPRs are of crucial importance to poor people's livelihoods even in a region where mostly land is privately owned. At a level similar to the forest and arid regions of India they have been more intensively studied. The study found that CPRs, made up to about 12 percent of poor household's income, fuel and fodder, were the most important CPRs accessed by the poor, access was generated and women and girls are mainly responsible for collection of CPRs. The globalization process of privatization of property and marketization of common goods for the profit of a few are at play here, and the upshot is a relative decline in poor people's livelihoods.

Beck and Ghosh (2000) estimated roughly that the CPRs currently add some US $ 5 billion a year to the incomes of poor rural households in India, or about 12 % to household income of poor rural households. In Pani (water) panchayats (R.S. Deshpande and Ratna Reddy: 1990), every rural household has an equal share in irrigation and water resources. The water rights are tradable, so that even the landless labourers gain from the irrigation resources generated. Grassroots democracy is used to integrate environmental regeneration and rural development to alleviate poverty.

Parikh and Vijayalaxmi (2000) analysed the various types of uses of CPRs in Indian villages. They showed that approximately in 80 percent of the villages, people share open water sources which are not used for drinking. In 40 per cent of the villages, grazing and pasture lands are available as CPRs. In rural Tamil Nadu bio-fuel is the main source of cooking fuel for about 96 per cent households. Use of dung cake for cooking is not very common in the area, kerosene is mostly used for lighting purpose. In Tamil Nadu, almost 100 per cent villages have been electrified. Most of the literature interprets rural poor mainly using / depending on CPRs, especially for their fuel and fodder collection, however, CPRs give life sustenance to rural people, particularly to poor. In recent years, most of the village commons have degraded into open access situation due to weak property rights relations, institutional arrangements and breakdown of local authority system (village panchayat). The main causes of this exclusion are agricultural intensification, commoditization of CPRs, environmental degradation and population growth.

Data Sampling

In order to analyse the dependency on CPRs, nature and the extent of CPRs activities between tribal and non-tribal groups, the above two parameters are used for the selection of tribal block and non-tribal blocks from the selected districts at the **second level**. At the **first level**, according to the Tamil Nadu Economic Appraisal (2008-09) "CPRPI (Common Property Resources

Performance Index) is prepared for each of the districts in Tamil Nadu state on the basis of "Total area under CPR to the Total Geographical Area of the District" and "per capita availability of CPRs.". With this background, the districts are categorized as "high CPR districts", "medium CPR districts" and "low CPR districts". Then, the Karur, Dindigul and Nagapattinam districts are selected as high, medium and low CPR districts, respectively. 240 respondents are selected in the each of the above selected districts, by using Disproportionate Stratified Random Sampling method.

Table 1.1 Sampling Design of the Study

Sl. No.	District	Sample Category		Total
1.	Karur (High CPR)	40	40	80
2.	Dindigul (Medium CPR)	40	40	80
3.	Nagapattinam (Low CPR)	40	40	80
Total		**120**	**120**	**240**

Framework of Analysis

Percentage analysis and table presentation are used to compare the socio-economic variables among the groups of rural population on the basis of occupations and caste. The level of variation in dependency on CPR parameters in terms of asset generation, employment generation and CPR income generation according to occupation and caste in the tribal and non-tribal respondents are analysed by applying the Multi-variate ANOVA Model.

For exploring the variations in empowerment according to occupation and caste groups in the tribal and non-tribal areas, the Multi-variate ANOVA Model is applied. In order to analyse the most influential personal and economic factors of the women respondents and their corresponding influence on the levels of empowerment (low, medium and high), the Multinomial Logistic Regression Model is employed. The Multiple Linear Regression Model (MLRM) is also applied to identify the most influential personal and economic factors that determine empowerment in the tribal, non-tribal and the pooled regions.

Result and Discussion

The contribution of CPRs to the total household's asset according to caste and occupation between Tribal and Non-tribal respondents the contribution of CPRs to the total household's asset between tribal and non-tribal respondent according to occupation and caste. The CPRs used in performing assets generation of the sample respondents are indicated by building, and agricultural implements. The common property resources items such as mud, sand, bamboo, limestone, clay, timber, thatched, etc, are used for building constructions. Similarly, the wooden ploughs, carts, levelers, chaff cutters and other hand tools are prepared as agricultural items from the common property resources. The items for making cots, chairs, tables and other furniture items are also prepared by using common property resources items for making consumer durables. However, these items are included in the total common property resources assets value in the present analysis. Hence, the values of consumer durables through common property resources are meager in the study region. In addition to these, total common property resources items include the accessory items used for machinery, well, electric and oil pumps. The objective of the present study aims at estimate the various forms of asset generated by the households and the share of common property resources to the total assets values among the occupational, caste groups in the tribal, non-tribal and the pooled regions.

It is seen from the results that the share of common property resources to the total value of building works out to be 35 per cent in the tribal area and 32 per cent in non-tribal area and the pooled region analysis indicates to the tune of 33 per cent. In other words, out of 100 per cent building value of the sample respondents around 33 to 35 per cent of them is contributed by the common property resources items such as sand, timber, mud, bamboo, etc. When the occupational holders are compared, the usage of common property resources is the highest to the tune of 38 per cent for 'working groups' of agricultural and non- agricultural labourer and 33 per cent in each marginal farmer and 'other farmer' groups. It is clear from the results that the marginal farmers and 'other farmers' have used the common property resources for their house consumption and consumer durables in the form of sandal wood, teak, kongu, which have high commercial value and these items are much predominant in the non-tribal areas. On the other

hand, the higher common property resources items consumed by the working groups are in the form of mud, sand, limestone, bamboo and thatched, about 38 per cent of common property resources of these items are available at free of cost in the respondents' villages and most of the items are brought to their residence with head loads by involving their own family labour. While the results on common property resources items consumed in the building value among the caste groups are compared, the SC/ST groups consumed 36 per cent of common property resources items in the tribal areas. On the other hand, the BC and MBC caste groups have consumed around 34 per cent in each of non-tribal and the pooled regions. The BC and MBC groups access the CPRs from the forest area by using their own family labourers. Sometimes, the BC and MBC are having land ownership and they brought these common property resources items from the forest area by employing their own labourers, who are generally involved in the cultivation process of their own land. From the results of building value, the common property resources items consumed are relatively higher by the tribal people than that of non-tribal people. Similarly, the working groups of agricultural and non-agricultural labourers are taking maximum advantages in the tribal area, whereas the marginal farmers and 'others farmers' group take advantage of these items in the non-tribal area. In the case of caste-wise analysis, the SC/ST groups have the maximum advantage from these sources in the tribal area, whereas, the MBC and BC caste groups, who have the maximum share in the total population of the non-tribal area, take the advantage of the CPRs. It is also interesting to observe that the common property resources items used to the total value of agricultural implements are meagre to the tune of around 10 per cent, irrespective of regions i.e. tribal and non-tribal areas. In other words, out of 100 per cent value of agricultural implements possessed by the respondents, around 10 per cent of them is shared from the common property resources items. When the occupational holders are compared among the regions, the marginal farmers and 'other farmers' have the maximum advantage in procuring the common property resources items in the preparation of agricultural implements in both tribal and non-tribal areas. Interesting analysis of the present study is to examine the contribution of common property resources to the total asset value possessed by the sample respondents in the study region. From this analysis, one can understand to what extent the tribal and non-tribal female folk involved in accumulating the common property resources to the total assets value of their households. The share of common property resources items used to the total asset value is around 46 per cent, irrespective of regions. It means that out of 100 per cent total assets possessed by the respondents, about 46 per cent is shared from the common property resources in both tribal and non-tribal regions. It the occupational holders are compared, the contribution of common property resources is the highest to the tune of 47 per cent in the working groups of agricultural and non-agricultural labourer in the tribal area. At the same time, about 48 per cent are cornered from the common property resources by the marginal farmers and 'other farmers' groups in the non-tribal area. While taking this analysis among the caste groups, the SC/ST group avails the maximum advantage of procuring common property resources in the tribal area to the extent of 47 per cent. On the other hand, around 46 per cent common property resources items are consumed to the total assets value by MBC and BC caste groups in the non-tribal areas.

On the whole, the contribution of common property resources items to the building assets value is 33 per cent and the agricultural implements consume 19 per cent in the study region. The contribution of common property resources to the total assets value of the study region is 46 per cent. It means that the remaining 54 per cent of items are shared by purchasing of inputs from the open market for the construction of buildings such as bricks, cement, steels, etc. As a whole, the common property resources items used for building construction are relatively higher in tribal area than in non-tribal area. In the case of occupational category, the working group of agriculture and non-agriculture labourer is taking maximum (47 per cent) advantage in the tribal area in the asset creation from common property resources. On the other hand, the Marginal Farmers and Other Farmers of Small Farmer, Medium Farmers and Large Farmers take the advantage of the common property resources items in asset generation (48 per cent) in the non-tribal area. According to caste, the low caste SC/ST group takes a higher advantage in common property resources asset generation in the tribal area. At the same time, the MBC and BC caste groups enjoy the maximum advantage from the common property resources as compared to other

non-tribal caste groups. The share of common property resources items used to the total asset value is 46 per cent, irrespective of tribal and non-tribal regions. By comparing the common property resources items used in the asset generation of female respondents, the building construction consumes 33 per cent, followed by agricultural implements at 11 per cent.

The extent of employment generated by CPRs according to occupation and caste groups in the study area. One of the objectives of the present study is to estimate the dependency on CPR by the rural women among the occupational and caste groups in terms of employment generation. It is noted from the study that the rural women are involved in collection of CPR items such as fodder, dung, manure, grass rope, honey, raw materials, fish, timber, fire wood (for own use and selling purposes) and medicinal herbs. As far as tribal area is concerned, the rural women get 86.54 days of employment generated through CPRs on an average. Among the caste groups, SC/ST has higher employment, which is little higher than that of others (86.83 days). In the case of BCs and MBCs, the average employment generated through CPRs is estimated at 86.79 and 86.15 days, respectively. Further, the results showed that SC/ST respondents are able to get 86.83 days of employment from CPR sources such as fodder, dung manure, grass rope, honey, raw materials and fishing in a year. As far as SC/STs are concerned, it is found that more employment is generated through CPR sources such as fodder, dung manure, grass rope, honey, raw materials, and fishing, which are followed by collection of timber and fire wood (66.17 days). Besides, 73.33 days of employment are generated through collection of medicinal herbs.

As far as non- tribal areas are concerned, the results reveal that the CPR sources such as fodder, dung manure, grass rope, honey, raw materials, and fishing have generated 96.33 days of employment, followed by collection of timber and firewood at 65.78 days, besides the collection of medicinal herbs generated employment to the extent of 58.33 days among SC/STs. As far as MBCs in the non-tribal area are concerned, it is found that fodder; dung manure, grass rope, honey, raw materials, and fishing have generated 93.14 days of employment, followed by collection of medicinal herbs (67.71 days). Further, collection of fire wood and timber has generated employment to the extent of 40.43 days among MBCs in non-tribal area. In respect of BC in non-tribal area results showed that the CPR sources such as fodder, dung manure, grass rope, honey, raw materials, and fishing have generated 69.25 days of employment, followed by timber and firewood collection (40.25 days) on an average. In addition, the collection of medicinal herbs has generated employment for about 23.25 days.

Among the different categories of occupation groups in the tribal area viz., working groups, marginal farmers and other farmers, the study has revealed that working group in BC category has got more number of days of employment generated through CPR sources (260 days) when compared with marginal farmer (231 days) and other farmers (137days) from the same category itself. Among MBCs, other farmers get less employment generated through CPR (130 days) when compared with working groups (267days) and marginal farmers (193days). However, working groups belonging to SC/ST categories have got more employment from all the sources of CPRs (270.01days) when compared with marginal farmers (252.92 days) and other farmers (159 days) from the same category itself. Further, the study has found that SC/STs in the non-tribal area got more employment (96.33 days) from CPR sources such as fodder, dung manure, grass rope, honey, raw materials, and fishing, followed by collection of timber and fire wood (65.78 days) and collection of medicinal herbs (58.33 days). In case of BCs in the non-tribal, the same trend is noticed except collection of timber and fire wood. In case of MBCs the trend is the same as it is observed among SC/STs. The available pooled data show that more days of employment (91.72 days) are generated through CPR sources such as fodder, dung manure, grass rope, honey, raw materials, and fishing followed by collection of timber, firewood (90.23) and collection of medicinal herbs (78.47days). However, it is observed that this trend is not noticed among MBCs in the study area. On the whole, the result shows that the CPR sources have generated 225.69 days of employment among SC/STs and 212.85 days among MBCs, respectively. In the case of BCs, the employment generation is estimated at 183.86 days on an average per year. The average number of days of employment generated among all the caste groups through CPR sources is estimated at 206.88 days.

Conclusion

The CPR items used for thatched and house construction (timber, mud, sand, limestone and bamboo), agricultural implements (wooden ploughs, carts, levelers and chaff cutters and others hand tools) and consumer durables (chairs, tables, and other furniture) are also included under the category of CPR asset generation of the households. The contribution of CPR to the total asset value differs in terms of occupation as well as the caste groups. It means that the share of CPR asset value to the total asset value generated by the female respondents differs significantly between the tribal and non-tribal areas. The results imply that the non-tribal folk have used the CPR items for their house consumption and consumer durables from the material procured in the form of sandalwood, teak, and kongu, which have high commercial value. Similarly, the CPR items used by the tribal folk are in the form of timber, mud, sand, limestone, bamboo and thatches. Hence, the valued CPR items are the maximum for the non-tribal folk as well as the other working groups of agricultural and non-agricultural labourers and SC/ST group. Moreover, these CPR items are available at free of cost in the adjacent forest areas and in the respondents villages and therefore, the transport cost is not involved for bringing these items by the working group, especially SC/ST groups, as they use their own family labourers. Therefore, the usage of CPR items is more beneficial in asset generation for the non-tribal group than for the tribal group.

The employment generation includes the collection of dung manure, grass rope, fodder, wood and timber for self-use and selling, timber used for building materials, raw material like dung, fishing and medical herbs. The man-days of employment of human labour are estimated as an adult woman, who toils for 8 hours in CPRs collection. The results of Multi-Variate ANOVA model show that there is a significant variation of employment generation between occupation and caste groups among the tribal and non-tribal rural women. The working groups are taking major advantage from CPRs in the form of timber and wood for their household cooking as well as commercial purposes. The same trend could be noticed in marginal and other farmer categories in the surveyed area. It is also interesting to note that the marginal farmers are mostly involved in collection of timber and wood for selling as well as for their household cooking. Besides this, these farmers involve themselves in collection of raw materials, dung collection, in addition to gathering medicinal herbs. Therefore the man-day of employment from CPRs is higher for working group than for 'Other farmers'. Similarly, the MBC and SC/ST caste groups' degree of dependency on CPR items of man- days is higher as compared to BC groups. It can be safely concluded that the man-days of employment on CPRs increase, when the caste hierarchy decreases and hence, there is a negative relationship between them. The man- days of employment generation on CPR for working group are the highest due to the activities of cattle rearing, fodder, dung manure collection, followed by grazing, timber collection, etc. The total household income includes the net income obtained from CPR, agricultural, and non- agricultural of the female households. The present analysis is helpful to understand the share of CPRs income to the total household income particularly, weaker sections like low caste groups, whose dependency on CPR is obviously high. The total CPR income constitutes fodder, grass rope, dung manure, fuel wood, timber, building materials, products collection including fishing, irrigation, herbals, horticulture and so on.

The results indicate that the CPR income for the tribal area is 0.57 and for the non-tribal area is 0.60. Out of 1 rupee of total household income, about 57 paise is shared by total female group in the tribal area and 60 paise is cornered by the non-tribal female respondents. The results indicate that the share of CPR income to the total household income is relatively higher for the non-tribal areas than tribal areas. The comparisons of the CPR net income among the occupational groups have shown some interesting results. Out of rupee 1 of total households income, about 69 paise is shared by working groups from CPRs, followed by 63 paise for marginal farmer and it is the least for 'other farmers' at 0.60 paise. It means that the working groups and marginal farmers are the highest gainers from the CPR sources as compared to other farmers. The highest gaining of CPR income by the working groups is mainly attributed to the collection of CPR products, dung manure collections, fodder collections, etc.

The share of CPR net income to the total household income by caste-wise explains that out of one rupee of CPR income, about 61 paise is cornered by SC/ST, followed by MBC at 60 paise and BC at 54 paise. The results imply that the SC/ST group is the major gainer from CPRs when compared to BC and MBC caste groups. Hence, the lowest caste group in the ladder is taking full advantage from CPRs as compared to the high caste groups. However, the share of CPR income is more or less equal between MBC and SC/ST groups. The highest gaining from CPR income by the SC/ST groups is mainly attributed to the activities of fishing, dung and fuel collection along with other CPR products collections. The results of the second hypothesis conclude that the level of dependency on CPRs parameters in terms of employment generation, income generation, asset generation and man-days of employment are significantly differ according to occupation and caste groups in the tribal, non-tribal and pooled region analysis of the study.

The Important Policy Suggestions are Framed from the Findings of the Present Study as detailed below:

1. The Government authorities may use women SHGs to manage and protect the CPRs at the village level, which may enhance women empowerment and income generation.
2. The policy makers may intensify the management and protection of CPRs through the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act.
3. The quality and quantity of available CPRs at village level may be surveyed to protect the CPRs for the future generation.
4. Regular supervision of Block Development Officers may help to avoid the encroachments and protection of CPRs.

References

1. Beck, Tony. Madan G Ghosh (2000), *"Common Property Resources and the Poor: Findings from West Bengal"*, Economic and Political Weekly. 35:3: 147-153.
2. Jodha (1990), *"Rural Common Property Resources: Contributions and Crisis"*, Economic and Political Weekly, Pp70-75.
3. Jodha (1992), *"Common Property Resources: A Missing Dimension of Development Strategies"*, World Bank Discussion Papers, No.169. Washigton. Pp.36-39.
4. Kanchan Chopra Gopal K Kadekodia MN Murty (1989), *"Peoples' Participation and Common Property Resources"*, Economic and Political Weekly, p 23-30.
5. Kanchan Chopre S.C.Gulati (2001), *"Migration, CPRs and Environmental Degradation. Inter linkages in India Arid and Semi-arid Regions"*, Sage Publications New Delhi.
6. Jodha (1990), *"Rural Common Property Resources: Contributions and Crisis"*, Economic and Political Weekly, Pp70-75.
7. Jodha (1992), *"Common Property Resources: A Missing Dimension of Development Strategies"*, World Bank Discussion Papers, No.169. Washigton. Pp.36-39.
8. Jothi Parikh and VijayaLaxmi (2000), *"Bio Fuel Pollution and Health linkages"*, A survey of rural Tamil Nadu, Economic Political Weekly, November 18.
9. Kanchan Chopra Gopal K Kadekodia MN Murty (1989), *"Peoples' Participation and Common Property Resources"*, Economic and Political Weekly, p 23-30.*linkages in India Arid and Semi-arid Regions"*, Sage Publications New Delhi.
10. Murugesan. P and D. Namasivayam. (2011). "Common Property Resources and the Dimensions of Rural Poverty in Tamil Nadu." Annamalai Journal of Humanities, Vol.47.
11. Murugesan. P and D. Namasivayam. 2011. "Dynamics of Common Property Resources among the States in India." Annamalai Economic Paper, 2011, Vol. 6. (ISSN 0975 - 1279)
12. Pradhan B (2003), "Measuring Empowerment: A Methodological Approach", Society for International Development, New Delhi: SAGE Publications, pp. '51ff'.
13. Saravanakumar (2007)' "CPR and Dynamics of Rural Poverty in TamilNadu", unpuplished Ph.D thesis by Dept. of economics, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar.

Caste	Occupational Category	Tribal					Non-tribal					Pooled				
		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
BC	Working Groups	0.26	0.09	47428.57	124285.71	0.38	0.27	0.09	49090.91	114545.45	0.42	0.27	0.09	48444.44	118333.33	0.41
	Marginal farmers	0.38	0.10	46923.08	97692.31	0.48	0.32	0.10	62692.31	135384.62	0.46	0.35	0.10	54807.69	116538.46	0.47
	other farmers	0.34	0.13	50454.55	115000.00	0.44	0.35	0.11	53571.43	115238.10	0.46	0.34	0.11	51976.74	115116.28	0.45

	Total	0.34	0.11	48857.14	111190.48	0.44	0.32	0.10	55111.11	120888.89	0.45	0.33	0.10	52091.95	116206.90	0.45
MBC	Working Groups	0.35	0.09	64500.00	147000.00	0.44	0.31	0.11	62812.50	144375.00	0.43	0.33	0.10	63461.54	145384.62	0.44
	Marginal farmers	0.33	0.11	65000.00	145833.33	0.44	0.35	0.11	67538.46	142307.69	0.47	0.34	0.11	66320.00	144000.00	0.46
	other farmers	0.38	0.08	65000.00	135000.00	0.48	0.38	0.10	67000.00	130000.00	0.52	0.38	0.09	65857.14	132857.14	0.50
	Total	0.35	0.09	64833.33	143333.33	0.45	0.34	0.11	65285.71	141142.86	0.46	0.34	0.10	65076.92	142153.85	0.46
SC/ST	Working Groups	0.41	0.10	49137.93	99310.34	0.50	0.27	0.11	52066.67	132666.67	0.39	0.37	0.10	50136.36	110681.82	0.47
	Marginal farmers	0.27	0.10	44500.00	115000.00	0.39	0.32	0.14	62857.14	124285.71	0.51	0.29	0.12	52058.82	118823.53	0.44
	other farmers	0.27	0.12	56222.22	127777.78	0.44	0.29	0.12	58333.33	120000.00	0.49	0.28	0.12	57629.63	122592.59	0.47
	Total	0.36	0.11	49500.00	107916.67	0.47	0.29	0.12	56775.00	125500.00	0.46	0.33	0.11	52806.82	115909.09	0.46
Total	Working Groups	0.38	0.10	52217.39	113478.26	0.47	0.29	0.10	55380.95	132380.95	0.42	0.33	0.10	53727.27	122500.00	0.45
	Marginal farmers	0.33	0.10	52428.57	119142.86	0.44	0.33	0.11	64636.36	135757.58	0.48	0.33	0.11	58352.94	127205.88	0.46
	other farmers	0.33	0.11	54769.23	122051.28	0.45	0.33	0.11	57266.67	119111.11	0.48	0.33	0.11	56107.14	120476.19	0.47
	Total	0.35	0.10	53108.33	117916.67	0.46	0.32	0.11	58633.33	128333.33	0.46	0.33	0.11	55870.83	123125.00	0.46

Table 1.3 Extent of Employment Generated from CPRs According to Caste and Occupation among the Female Respondents

Caste	Occupational Category	Tribal				Non-tribal				Pooled			
		A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
BC	Working Groups	94.32	100.7	65.7	260.7	92.19	88.3	69.5	133.7	97.7	94.7	67.6	222.2
	Marginal farmers	91.92	82.31	57.7	231.9	89.23	45.4	39.6	92.85	90.6	63.9	48.7	151.8
	other farmers	53.57	32.86	51.4	137.9	95.45	46.8	59.1	147.5	79.2	41.4	56.1	141.7
	Total	**86.79**	**71.25**	**69.1**	**226.5**	**69.25**	**40.3**	**23.3**	**211.5**	**78.5**	**57.2**	**48.2**	**183.9**
MBC	Working Groups	87.5	95.63	86.9	267.9	92.5	52.5	77.5	222.5	89.6	77.1	82.9	249.6
	Marginal farmers	97.5	70	85.4	193	93.85	33.9	67.3	198.4	95.6	51.2	76	222.8
	other farmers	73.5	38	48	130	92.82	41.3	64.4	195	85.4	40	58.1	183.5
	Total	**86.15**	**66.17**	**73.3**	**226.3**	**93.14**	**40.4**	**67.7**	**205.2**	**90.2**	**52.3**	**70.3**	**212.9**
SC/ST	Working Groups	85.97	84.83	79.1	270	54.67	40	39	259	87.2	69.6	65.5	259.9
	Marginal farmers	51	64	78	252.9	53.57	15.7	23.6	174.2	52.1	44.1	55.6	203.1
	other farmers	67.78	35.56	26.7	159	87.5	50	10	201.4	80.9	45.2	15.6	176.7
	Total	**86.83**	**83.69**	**60.8**	**231.3**	**96.33**	**65.8**	**58.3**	**124.7**	**91.7**	**74.4**	**59.5**	**225.7**
Total	Working Groups	86.79	84.62	61	232.4	94.56	68.2	46.8	209.6	91	75.8	53.4	220.2
	Marginal farmers	89.67	66.74	68.2	224.6	79.88	42.3	53.9	176.1	85	55.1	61.4	201.4
	other farmers	82.14	72.86	73	228	83.48	34.6	47.1	165.2	82.8	54.3	60.4	197.5
	Total	**86.54**	**74.33**	**67.3**	**228.1**	**86.38**	**49.9**	**49.4**	**183.6**	**86.5**	**62.1**	**58.3**	**206.9**

Source: *Computed;*

Note: *A. Fodder, dung manure, grass rope, honey, raw material fishing etc, (No of days); B. Collection of timber/wood for household cooking and selling (No of days); C. Collection of Medicinal herbs (No. of days); D. Total common property resources employment (No. of days)*