Benchmarking Public Service Delivery at the Forest Fringes in Jharkhand, India.

A PILOT CITIZEN REPORT CARD

PUBLIC AFFAIRS FOUNDATION
BANGALORE, INDIA

October 2004

List of Contents

LIST OF TABLES

ABBREVIATIONS & ACRONYMS

CRC	Citizen Report Cards
DoF	Department of Forests
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
JFM	Joint Forest Management
NTFP	Non Timber Forest Products
OBC	Other Backward Classes
PAF	Public Affairs Foundation
PHC	Primary Health Centre
VFMPC	Village Forest Management & Protection Committee
SC	Scheduled Castes
SHG	Self Help Group
ST	Scheduled Tribes

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 What is the Citizen Report Card?

The Citizen Report Card (CRC) is a simple but powerful tool to provide public agencies with systematic feedback from users of public services. CRCs elicit feedback through sample surveys on aspects of service quality that users know best, and enable public agencies to identify strengths and weaknesses in their work.

In the context of sector reform programmes, CRCs provide an empirical "bottom-up" assessment of the reach and benefit of specific reform measures. It serves to identify the key constraints that citizens (especially the poor and the underserved) face in accessing public services, benchmark the quality and adequacy of these services as well as the effectiveness of staff providing services. These insights help generate recommendations on sector policies, programme strategy and management of service delivery, to address these constraints and improve service delivery.

Citizen Report Cards entail a random sample survey of the users of different public services (utilities), and the aggregation of the users' experiences as a basis for rating the services. CRCs also help to convert individual problems facing the various programmes into common sector issues. It facilitates prioritization of reforms and corrective actions by drawing attention to the worst problems highlighted. CRCs also facilitate cross fertilization of ideas and approaches by identifying good practices.

Citizen Report Cards provide a benchmark on quality of public services as experienced by the users of these services. Hence, they go beyond the specific problems that individual citizens may face, and place each issue in the perspective of other elements of service design and delivery, as well as a comparison with other services, so that a strategic set of actions can be initiated.

Citizen Report Cards capture citizens' feedback in simple and unambiguous terms by indicating their level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Apart from giving summative feedback on services, CRCs also capture the user feedback on specific aspects of the service. For example, the most basic but clear feedback that a citizen may give about the quality of drinking water is total dissatisfaction. To appreciate this feedback, we must relate it to the ratings given to other dimensions by the same person. For example, adequacy of water supply may be rated worse than quality. When we look at these two pieces of information, we can conclude that quality of water supply may be a

cause of dissatisfaction, but the priority for corrective action may be on providing adequate water supply. Hence **measures of citizens' satisfaction** across different dimensions of public services constitute the core of Citizen Report Card studies.

Citizen Report Cards do not stop with mere measures of satisfaction - they go on to enquire into specific aspects of interaction between the service agency and the citizen, and seek to identify issues that emerge in connection with the same. In more simple terms, it suggests that dissatisfaction has causes, which may be related to the quality of service enjoyed by the citizen (like reliability of water supply, or availability of learning materials in a public school), the type of difficulty encountered while dealing with the agency to solve service problems (like complaints of water supply breakdown), and hidden costs in making use of the public service (special tuition fees to teachers or investments in filters to purify "drinking water"). Therefore we can see that Citizen Report Card studies go into different **aspects of performance in interfacing with citizens**, to provide indicators of problem areas in public services.

Citizen Report Card studies are not merely a means of collecting feedback on existing situations from citizens. They are also a means for testing out different options that citizens wish to exercise, individually or collectively, to tackle current problems. For example, whether citizens were willing to pay more or be part of citizens' bodies made responsible for managing public water sources. Hence, Report Cards are also means for **exploring citizens' alternatives** for improvements in public services.

An important aspect of Report Cards is the credibility they have earned. The conclusions in a Report Card are not opinions of a few persons who think in a particular manner, nor the complaints of a few aggrieved citizens. The methodology involves systematic sampling across all subsections or segments of citizens - including those who are satisfied as well as the aggrieved - and presents a picture that includes all opinions. This is possible because the methodology makes use of advanced techniques of social science research, for selecting samples, designing questionnaires, conducting interviews, and interpreting results. As a result, the report cards provide **reliable and comprehensive** representation of citizens' feedback.

1.2 Outcomes of Citizen Report Cards

The concept of citizen feedback surveys to assess the performance of public services is relatively new, and fast gaining wide acceptance. The responses to Report Cards indicate impact at four levels:

Stimulating Reforms: Report Card studies clearly brought to light a wide panoply of issues, both quantitative and qualitative that send strong signals to public service providers. The use of a rating scale permitted the respondents to quantify the extent of their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the service of an agency, as well as different dimensions of its service. The inter-agency comparisons that a report card permits make possible quantification and rankings, which demand attention in a way that anecdotes do not.

Activating Stakeholder Responsiveness: Many agencies used the Citizen Report Card findings as a diagnostic tool to trigger off further studies and strategise internal reforms. These findings have also helped the senior leadership to monitor effectiveness of service delivery across wide areas, in a simple and direct manner and free of technical details. For administrators and planners, CRC findings have provided insights into aspects of service delivery where greater care, supervision and investment may be required.

Raising Public Awareness: Citizen Report Card findings are always placed in public domain and disseminated widely through the media. Needless to say, specific findings and the novelty of the method used, make it useful and attractive for the media. Since issues of poor public service come up from time to time, the media as well as researchers link it to Citizen Report Card findings, and use the valid and reliable base for raising issues and proposing change.

Mobilization of State – Public Partnerships: Seminars and meetings are an integral part of disseminating Citizen Report Card findings, and involve both government officials and representatives of civil society organizations and NGOs. Citizen Report Cards have given civil society organizations a handy tool to focus on issues of concern and stimulated them to move from anecdotal and subjective issues to facts and figures while requesting public service agencies for specific improvements in priority areas. It also provided these groups with an opportunity to understand the constraints under which service providers' function, and explore options for community initiatives for problem solving.

In short, the insights derived from CRCs can shed light on the degree to which pro-poor services are reaching the target groups, the extent of gaps in service delivery, and the factors that contribute to any misdirection of resources and services. They help identify issues tat constrain the poor from accessing and using the services, like availability, ease of access, quality, reliability and costs. CRCs also help to identify possible ways to improve service delivery by actively seeking suggestions from citizens. Finally, CRC findings help test from the citizens' point of view some of the policy conclusions reached in other analytical studies.

1.3 The Pilot Citizen Report Card in Jharkhand

Recent assessment of rural poverty in India identifies the state of Jharkhand to be of particular concern because the absolute numbers of poor are high and increasing. Jharkhand's forest dependant poor are especially vulnerable in this context. Forest fringe communities represent about 60% of the total state population and over 90% of the state's tribal people. Tribal groups strongly identify with forests for subsistence and cultural/spiritual reasons, as a safety net, and as a primary source of income. Strengthening community control over forest assets has been shown to make significant and culturally appropriate contributions to poverty alleviation, empowerment, transparency, and environmental conservation throughout the world.

In this newly formed "tribal" state, politicians and civil servants are making a concerted effort to identify and address the development needs of isolated and under-served tribal groups. To this end, state leaders are attempting to harness forests (which cover 2.4 million hectares or 30% of the state) to support poverty alleviation efforts. The state's progressive Joint Forest Management policy (JFM, 2001) demonstrates commitment to reform by expanding benefit shares and control over usufruct rights for participating communities and relying on self-initiated groups. Many valuable lessons have emerged from recent experience in the Indian forestry sector and global analysis of the forests and poverty nexus: 1) tenurial rights and associated responsibilities must be clearly defined and well disseminated; 2) careful assessment of pre-existing patterns of resource use are needed to avoid unintended and unmitigated access restrictions; 3) skills in conflict management and strategic communication are essential; 4) devolving planning and decision-making to local communities and front-line staff generates new ideas and unanticipated but more sustainable solutions; 5) community managed forests make important contributions to both increased productivity *and* improved conservation of biodiversity. These need to be kept squarely in focus in any development intervention.

As part of its reengagement in the sector in India, the World Bank is involved in developing a participatory forest management project with a total project cost of US$65 million. The project will be in active operation from 2005 to 2009.

The primary objective of this project is to improve the livelihoods of poor forest dependant communities by strengthening their access to and control over natural resources. The expected outcomes include 1) increased capacity of self-initiated community institutions to exercise their rights and responsibilities in forest management and decentralized planning; 2) coordination among service providers (state forest department, tribal institutions/local Panchayats, NGOs, other line agencies responsible for provision of infrastructure, health, education, credit, etc.) improves; 3)

stakeholders acquire new roles, skills, and incentives to support, regulate, and monitor participatory forest management; 4) increased opportunities to access and market forest and non-forest products; and 5) expanded forest resources provide increasing returns (usufruct to communities and ecosystem services to society) over time.

1.3 Demand & Rationale for Citizen Report Cards in Jharkhand

Combating rural poverty and improving livelihoods in the forest fringe areas depends in an important way on increasing access to and the productivity of forest resources on which the rural population is highly dependent. But it depends equally importantly on ensuring improvements in delivery of services such as roads, credit, drinking water, health, education, sanitation, livestock and agricultural extension services, electricity and energy, all of which contribute to welfare in direct or indirect ways. Against this backdrop, a CRC study plays an important role in: (i) helping benchmark the initial state of these services including building up a comparative picture, (ii) identifying the problems and shortcomings as perceived by the intended beneficiaries, and (iii) in designing solutions and strategic approaches to planning complementary investments and making cost effective improvements in the quality of such services.

In the specific context of the Jharkhand forest livelihoods project, the CRC findings and inputs are expected to provide the following stakeholders with a relevant set of enabling information:

a. National & Sector Ministry Levels

- National level coordination/allocation bodies like finance and planning may get insights to ***reallocate resources*** across services, locations and segments of population.
- CRC findings may trigger the ***design of incentives*** for better performers and disincentives to put pressure on inefficient ones.
- The institutionalisation of CRCs will make the functioning of the government more ***transparent and create space*** for the civil society to participate and partner in matters of governance.

b. Public Service Providers / Agencies

- ***Implications for the design of the service***. CRCs provide critical information, which may point to the need for a redesigning of the approach and processes of delivery.

- ***Reallocation of resources and people to remedy the gaps identified by CRCs.*** E.g., increased training of personnel, creation of redress mechanisms, etc.
- ***Implications of responding to the need of different segments of service users.*** E.g., economic variations (poorest of the poor Vs rest); spatial variations (urban Vs rural); gender variations (men Vs women)
- ***Need to seek additional resources or improved policies.*** E.g., increased dissemination of information through Citizen Charters, new laws to assure Right to Information, Creation of forums for public interfaces, public information and education campaigns.
- ***Prioritizing issues and designing `quick-win' solutions***. CRC findings assist in strategically facilitating an avenue to initiate a dialogue with various stakeholders and carrying out practical problem solving actions.

c. Donors

- ***Redesign programmes*** to directly impact on the critical and strategic issues identified by the survey
- ***Improving the targeting of the interventions*** to locations and communities that are worst affected.
- ***Providing indicators*** on themes/issues where service delivery systems need to be strengthened
- Providing a ***critical set of `benchmarks'*** which can be used to assess the impact of development interventions.

d. Civil Society / NGOs

- Sets a base for `***demand mobilization***' for good governance by converting individual issues to collective themes
- Provides a credible tool for effective ***follow-up actions***
- Comparative statistics provide good handles to effectively ***lobby for change***
- Opens up possibilities for sector level ***consultations and dialogues*** with service providers.
- Facilitates ***networking*** with other stakeholders on common action agenda.

1.4 Design of the Pilot Intervention

Since user feedback mechanisms like CRCs are untested in the forest sector, a pilot intervention was designed to explore the feasibility of CRCs to generate focussed and useful information. The pilot exercise focussed on four critical services that impact on rural livelihoods – Drinking Water, Health, Primary Education, Rural Credit & Forestry services. The Department of Forests (DoF), Government of Jharkhand was identified as the anchor institution for

this exercise. The assignment was carried out by the Public Affairs Foundation (PAF), a sister non-profit company promoted by Public Affairs Centre which pioneered the concept of Citizen Report Cards.

The pilot exercise operated in a modular phase, starting with strategic presentations to DoF officials to familiarise them with the CRC approach and identifying the relevant issues to define the contours of the probe by conducting diagnostic FGDs in selected forest fringe locales. The second phase focussed on the actual conduct of the field survey; the field operations were carried out by ORG Private Limited, a leading social research agency. PAF provided all technical inputs like defining the sample frame, designing the survey instrument, pre-tests to lay down quality control parameters, coding, data entry and analysis of findings. The third phase focuses on post survey actions like drafting the final report, dissemination of findings and recommendations for future institutionalisation and scaling up of the approach.

The rest of this report is presented along the following format: ***Section 2*** details the sample design and methodology. ***Section 3*** discusses the key findings from the four sectors – Drinking Water, Health Services, Primary Education, Rural Credit & Forestry Services. ***Section 4*** discusses the key pointers and conclusions from this pilot intervention.

2. METHODOLOGY

The technical component of a ***Citizen Report Card study*** involves the following stages:

- Identification of issues through Focus Group Discussions
- Designing the survey instruments
- Identifying the scientific sample for the survey
- Conduct of survey by a technically competent agency
- Collection of qualitative data
- Coding, analysis and interpretation of findings

2.1 Identification of survey issues

To identify critical issues and themes, diagnostic FGDs were carried out in three locations. The diagnostic FGDs are planned to identify critical contextual variables and dimensions of service provisioning, for designing the pilot survey. Structured probes are used to test out the relevance and criticality of *a priori* selected variables. Semi structured and open probes are used to collect context and sector specific variables. The FGDs were recorded for transcription and analysis. The FGD protocols were cleared with the local partner – Department of Forests, Government of Jharkhand and also with the World Bank. See ***Annexure 1*** for a report of the diagnostic FGDs.

2.1.1 Defining the Parameters for the Probe

Access refers to the proximity of the service facility to the household or the user of the service. Government norms for access often tend to be based on population criteria. For example, the location of primary health centres is based on population norms. But from a user perspective, it is the distance or nearness to the facility that matters most. The adoption of this approach in the present study will yield results that are different from the application of government norms. Sometimes, the service infrastructure may exist somewhere in the proximity of the user, but the service may not be available in a convenient manner, making access nominal. Therefore, from a user perspective, it is effective and easy access that matters.

Use of a service tells us whether a household actually utilises a public service. In a monopoly situation, access and use may be identical. But when other options are available, people may prefer to use facilities other than the government's. The reasons for such choices could be many, but this study does not probe them in depth. The interest here is only to ascertain whether people tend to use a public service facility once it is accessible.

Quality/reliability is a more complex dimension of a service from the standpoint of measurement. It refers to the features of a service that are not self-evident from the physical good or infrastructure involved. Households may not be able to observe or assess all such features, especially the technical aspects of quality. But they can comment on other important aspects of quality. One such is the reliability of a service. The user of a service, for example, may find the processes and interactions with the service provider (predictability, responsiveness, corruption, etc) unsatisfactory. He/she then may attribute low quality or reliability (an aspect of quality) to that service.

A major innovation of the CRCs is in quantifying subjective experiences like satisfaction which reflects the overall assessment of a service by the user, based on his/her experience. In this assessment, the person implicitly brings in his/her expectations or standards that in turn may also be influenced by the past experience of others in the community, one's educational level and awareness of the working of government. Given the low levels of education, income and mobility of the respondents in this study, it is likely that their expectations from services are more modest in contrast to those of people in more developed countries. Irrespective of how a person arrives at his/her assessment of satisfaction, it is an internal assessment on which he/she may act. Admittedly, satisfaction reflects personal judgements of users and can be measured only through the information provided by them. In this study, a two-stage approach for measuring satisfaction has been adopted. Users are first asked whether they are satisfied or dissatisfied with a service or certain dimensions of it. Depending on the answer, they are probed further and asked whether they are strongly (fully) satisfied or dissatisfied. Thus the user feed back on satisfaction may fall into one of four categories: fully satisfied, partially satisfied, partially dissatisfied and fully dissatisfied.

2.2 Design of the survey instrument

Key Variables and themes identified from the FGDs were converted into a questionnaire. The Survey Instrument had three sections (see ***Annexure 2***):

- Identification section (***location, details of interview etc***)
- Socio economic profile (***age, gender, educational status etc***)
- Feedback on services (***access, use, quality, costs, reliability etc***)

The survey instrument was translated into Hindi after validation checks involving translation and retranslation by different professionals. A detailed pre testing was conducted in three villages to field test the survey instrument and fine-tune the questions.

Apart from the survey instrument, a Village Profile Sheet was also designed to collect critical information related to village-level infrastructure facilities (***Annexure 3***)

2.3 Identifying the Sample

A multi stage stratified random sampling procedure has been followed to select the respondents.

Stage I – In the first stage of Sampling, 8 forest divisions from the state were chosen using judgmental sampling. Discussions were conducted with senior officials of the Forest Department before these eight divisions were chosen. Within each division fall a number of ranges, from among which one from each division was chosen judgmentally through discussions with forest officials. The divisions were chosen in such a manner that two fell within the highly dense areas, four within the medium dense areas and two within the sparse areas. The Sample of Divisions and Ranges is given below.

Table 1
SELECTED DIVISIONS & RANGES

Division	Range
Dhanbad (L)	Chas
Sahibgang (L)	Pakur Damin
Chatra North (M)	Huntergunj
Saranda (D)	Kiriburu
Ranchi West (M)	Banari
Chaibasa North (M)	Chandil
Garwa South (D)	Bhandaria
Ranchi East (M))	Kanke

L- Low Forest Density; M – Medium Forest Density; D –Dense Forest Density

Within each range five villages were selected, two with high forest cover (More than 25000 Ha), one with medium forest cover (5001 to 25000 Ha of Forest Cover) and two with low forest cover (less than 5000 Ha of Protected Forest Cover. The data for the forestry cover in the villages was obtained from the department of forestry. Here also a judgmental sampling was followed and in each range one village with a functional Village Forest Management & Protection Committee (VFMPC) was selected. In each village it was decided to select one hamlet and interview 10 households.

A total of 40 villages were selected and a plan of selection of 10 households per village was made. The respondent selection has been done following the systematic sampling procedure. The standard sample interval was 3 in most of the cases. This is mainly because, in most of the sample villages, the village had less than three hamlets and each of such hamlets had around 30 households. However, in ranges such as Kanke Range, Chatra North, Banari,

there were hamlets that had less than 10 households. In those villages more than one hamlet had to be chosen.

Elsewhere in each village, we have taken one hamlet on the basis of the specified initial guidelines. That means five hamlets from five sample villages. We have selected two interior hamlets (most distant from the nearest transport facility in the respective sample villages) and one hamlet in the medium range of distance of the respective village. And the remaining two hamlets have been taken on the criteria of closeness to the available transport facility of the respective sample villages.

Two lists of sample villages were prepared. One was the original sample set and the other, a buffer sample, anticipating some ground level difficulties. Barring some exceptional logistical difficulties, the survey was carried out within the given sample sets.

Changes have been reported in the following ranges; the main reason for not conducting survey in these sample villages was due to insurgency.

BANARI (1 village),
BHANDHRIA (1 village)
CHATRA NORTH (1village)
KANKE (1 village)

For simultaneous survey across all eight ranges, four teams were deployed. Each team had surveyed two ranges. The team composition was 1 Supervisor and four investigators i.e. five members team headed by the supervisor. Two senior professionals coordinated the whole exercise. Both coordinators made extensive field visit along with their teams and during the survey period, they were physically present in their respective divisions. An extensive 3 day briefing session was conducted for all field enumerators. Two senior representatives from PAF attended the briefings and also accompanied the teams and conducted spot checks and back checks. The enumerators were recruited from the local areas knowing local language and dialect. Sufficient care was also taken such that the enumerators take sufficient time in rapport building and explain the exact meaning of the question to the respondents.

During their stay in the field, the coordinators performed back checks & spot checks. Besides monitoring field teams and regular day to day checking of schedules, the coordinators also conducted FGDs - one from each range i.e. total of eight FGDs. For maintaining overall quality of the survey, each team was monitored closely by the team supervisor. The supervisors were given a strict mandate of conducting 10 percent back checks apart from spot checks. Besides field back checks and spot checks, the supervisor performed daily verification of each completed schedule after the completion of field work for the day.

The data has presented by the "dense areas" and "non dense areas". The data for non dense areas has been obtained by clubbing the responses from medium and low dense areas.

2.4 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILES

The sample of 400 households was selected from dense and non dense regions (ranges); 98 households were selected from dense regions and 302 households from non-dense regions. Overall, the households in the forest regions were found to be weak in land base. Thirteen per cent of the households do not own agricultural land and land holdings of three fourth of the households are either marginal or small. The households living in dense regions have relatively less land compared to the households living in non-dense regions. The average size of holding in dense region is 2.3 acres compared to 5.6 acres in non-dense regions.

Land is a major asset particularly for the households, who are living on the forest fringe areas. The households without land are more marginalized and they are the poorest of the poor. The poorest of the poor are more in dense area (15.3%) compared to non-dense areas (12.3%).

Table 2
Distribution of Households by Land Holdings

Size of holdings	Dense	Non-dense	Total
Land less	15 (15.3)	37 (12.3)	52 (13.0)
Less than 2.5 acres	63 (64.3)	148 (49.0)	211 (52.8)
2.5 to 5 acres	13 (13.3)	77 (25.5)	90 (22.5)
Above 5 acres	7 (7.1)	40 (13.2)	47 (11.7)
Total	98 (100)	302 (100)	400 (100)
Average size (acres)	2.34	5.59	4.82

The main occupation of the chief wage earner of the sample households was mostly agriculture (63%) or agriculture labour (25.3%). They are also variations in the main occupation of the chief wage earner across the regions. Higher percentage of households (33.6%) in dense regions reported labourer as the main occupation compared to the non-dense regions (22.5%). Further, 58.2 per cent households in dense region reported agriculture as the main occupation of the chief wage earner as against 64.6 per cent in non-dense regions.

An overwhelming 82 per cent of sample households reported dependency on forest for some produce or the other. The percentage of households reported dependency on forest produces is more in dense regions (86.7%) compared to non-dense regions (80.5%).

The average annual income of the households who reported dependency on forest produce works out to Rs.13750 per household. The average household income is less in dense regions (Rs.11470) compared to non-dense regions (Rs.14547). The landless reported Rs.12727 per household.

The caste composition of the sample households shows that Scheduled Tribe is the major caste group (50.9%), followed by Other backward castes (30.2%) and Scheduled Castes (12.8%). The general category is a minor group with 6.1 per cent. Percentage of SC and ST households are more in dense regions than in non-dense regions. SC & ST put together account for about 72 per cent of households in dense regions and 61 per cent in non-dense regions.

Table 3
Caste Composition of Sample Households

Castes	Dense	Non-dense	Total
Scheduled Caste	15.3	11.9	12.8
Scheduled Tribe	56.5	49.0	50.9
Other backward castes	20.0	33.7	30.2
General	8.2	5.4	6.1
N= 400	N=98	N=302	N=400

The differences in size of holdings, occupation of the chief wage earners, dependency on forest produce, reported annual income of the households and the caste composition in dense and non-dense regions show that the households in dense regions are weak in economic status and are likely to be more vulnerable to scarcity conditions compared to the households in non-dense regions.

2.5 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

- The building blocks of any user's feedback study are ordinal in nature and are based on experienced responses. Several words like "scarce", "adequacy", "satisfaction" have been asked in the manner that the respondent best comprehends; thus, there is some subjectivity in the study
- This exercise was designed as an exploratory step to test the application of user feedback surveys in the context of forest fringe communities. The

findings from this pilot study are intended to be only indicative and not representative.

- The sampling adopted in the study was not purely probabilistic. The ranges and villages were chosen using a judgemental sampling frame. Thus the current data set cannot provide any multivariate logit and ANOVA analysis. Findings are indicative and not conclusive. However further exploration and analysis of data and application of sophisticated statistical models can be undertaken in the scale up study
- Levels of satisfaction are highly correlated with expectation and importance assigned to services. Expectation and Importance across regions vary and thus may result in a change in the satisfaction level. This aspect was not included in the currently study.

3. SECTOR FINDINGS

3.1 DRINKING WATER

■ *Main sources of drinking water*

➲ Community hand pumps (40%), community wells (22%) and private wells (18%) are the three most used facilities for drinking water. A fairly large proportion of households (12%) depend on surface water sources like lakes, rivers and streams; this proportion is significantly higher for those residing in non dense forest ranges (12%) than those in dense areas (7%) and for Scheduled Tribe communities (15%) than for others.

Table 4
Distribution of Households by Main Sources of Drinking Water

(All figures in percentages)

Normal Water Source	Total	Dense ranges	Non dense ranges
Private hand pump	4.5	3.1	5.0
Private well	17.5	13.3	18.9
Community hand pump	39.5	32.7	41.8
Common public tap	2.3	2.0	2.4
Community well	22.3	34.7	18.2
Surface water source	11.5	7.1	12.9
Others	2.3	7.1	0.8
Base – Total Households	N=400	N=98	N=302

➲ Profiles of drinking and domestic usage do not vary much, though the usage of surface water is relatively higher for domestic needs (22%); more than one-fourth (26%) of those residing in non dense forest ranges report using surface water sources to meet domestic water requirements.

➲ For the majority of the respondents (60%), lack of alternatives is the major reason for the choice of the current source for drinking water, followed by ease of access (38%).

Incidence of scarcity

- A large proportion of respondents reported scarcity (67%) of water during the last one year. An overwhelming 80% of respondents in dense forests reported scarcity.

Table 5
Proportion of Households Experiencing Scarcity (by Source of Water)

(All figures in percentages)

Source of Normal Use	All regions together		Dense Ranges		Non dense ranges	
	Total users	% reporting scarcity	Total users	% reporting scarcity	Total users	% reporting scarcity
Private hand pump	4.5	39	3.1	100	5.0	27
Private well	17.5	56	13.3	69	18.9	53
Community hand pump	39.5	70	32.7	97	41.7	63
Common public tap	2.3	67	2.0	100	2.3	57
Community well	22.3	81	34.7	82	18.2	80
Surface water source	11.5	65	7.1	43	12.9	69
Others	2.3	50	7.1	29	0.7	100
Base – Total Households	N=400	N=269	N=98	N=78	N=302	N=191

The percentages Reporting Scarcity are calculated on basis of households reporting scarcity from users of that facility

- Users of community wells experienced more scarcity (81%) compared to rest of the sources; the comparative proportion was the lowest for the users of private hand pumps (39%).
- The summer months of May & June account for about 92% of the water scarcity period.
- Community hand pumps (31%), surface water (28%) & community wells (24%) are the most used sources for drinking water during scarcity times (***see Table 6***). While community hand pumps (46%) are used the most in the dense forest ranges during scarcity times, it is surface water sources which support large numbers (36%) in the non dense ranges.

Table 6
Major Support Sources during Scarcity

(All figures in percentages)

Water Sources	Total	Dense ranges	Non dense ranges
Private hand pump	1.1	1.3	1.0
Private well	8.9	11.5	7.9
Community hand pump	31.2	46.2	25.1
Common public tap	1.5	2.6	1.0
Community well	24.2	28.2	22.5
Surface water source	27.5	6.4	36.1
Others	5.6	3.8	6.4
Base: Those who reported scarcity	N=269	N=78	N=191

- The response of households to scarcity offers some interesting insights. While users of protected water sources migrate to other protected sources, the trend for those already using unprotected sources is to move to other unprotected sources, thereby mitigating their vulnerability. Also, users of wells in general depend on unprotected sources during scarcity; 26% of private well users and 79% of those using community wells shift to unprotected sources during scarcity.

Table 7
Transitions in Drinking Water Sources during Scarcity (by Source of Water)

(All figures in percentages)

Source during normal times	Source During Scarcity Times					
	Private hand pump	Private well	Community hand pump	Common public tap	Community well	Surface water source
Private hand pump (N=7)	28.6	14.0	42.9	14.5	0	0
Private well (N=39)	0	38.5	30.8	2.6	12.8	15.3
Community hand pump (N=110)	0.9	3.6	51.8	0	14.5	29.2
Common public tap (N=6)	N too small[1]					
Community well (N=72)	0	2.8	13.9	0	61.1	22.2
Surface water source (N=30)	0	7.0	6.7	0	0	76.3

(Covered Rainwater Catchments and other minor sources are not included)

[1] The absolute N for users of community Hand Pump and Other Sources are too low. Thus percentage figures are not provided

- Respondents also reported that they had to travel greater distances to collect drinking water during times of scarcity. While 80% of those using public sources reported access to sources within 300 meters from their residences, the proportion reporting on similar lines during times of scarcity is only 47%. Also, during scarcity a higher proportion (8%) reported travelling over a kilometre to source water as compared to 2% reporting on similar lines during normal times.
- While half of the male respondents could access water from public sources within 300 meters from their residences during times of scarcity, only about a fourth of women respondents reports in the affirmative on this. Further, about 12% of the women respondents reported travelling over a kilometre to access water during scarcity times; the comparable proportion for male respondents were much lower at 8%.
- During both normal and scarcity times, it is adult women who fetch water for the house; during times of scarcity, an overwhelming 79% of households reported that it is women who fetch water for the house. Also, feedback from the women respondents indicate that a much higher proportion of girls fetch water during scarcity times (37%) as compared to normal times (25%); interestingly, according to the male respondents, these proportions are much lower – 15% & 13% respectively.

Reliability of Public Water Sources

- Reliability of public water sources comes across as a major issue; feedback from the majority of respondents using public water sources (72%) indicate that government supplied water sources are not reliable. Sources getting dried up (34%) and poor maintenance (27%) are quoted as the major reasons for the sources being not reliable; a relatively higher proportion in the dense ranges (40%) quoted poor maintenance as a reason for high levels of unreliability.

Community Involvement in Maintenance

- Overall, 63% of the respondents reported that they were involved in maintaining public water sources. This proportion is observed to be high for households in the OBC (72%) and SC (69%) categories as compared to ST (58%) and general categories (51%). As to be expected, involvement from the poorest segments is lower (59%) in relation to the rest (65%).
- Among those households involved in maintaining public water sources, almost half (49%) report involvement in the form of financial contributions, almost one fourth in the form of labour (24%) and the rest report contributing in both forms. Interestingly, a slightly larger proportion of the poorest (54%) report financial contributions as compared to the rest (48%).

■ *Satisfaction with Drinking Water Sources*

➲ Overall, across all sources, respondents have expressed higher satisfaction with the quality of water (56%) as compared to adequacy (49%). Communities living in the dense forest ranges have indicated higher dissatisfaction on quality and adequacy (***see table 8***). Further, adequacy comes across as a major problem for the poorest of the poor with only 45% reporting satisfaction as compared to 58% satisfied respondents from the rest.

Table 8

Satisfaction of Users with Quality & Quantity of Water

(All figures in percentages)

Source of Water	Quality of Water								
	Satisfied (N=215)			***Dissatisfied(N=121)***			***Don't Know/CS (N=64)***		
	Dense	***Others***	***Total***	***Dense***	***Others***	***Total***	***Dense***	***Others***	***Total***
Private hand pump (N= 18)	N too small		78	N too small		06	N too small		16
Private well (N=70)	39	63	59	39	19	20	22	18	21
Community hand pump (N=158)	38	73	66	41	20	24	21	07	10
Common public tap (N=10)	**N too small**[2]								
Community well (N=89)	27	36	33	71	29	45	02	35	22
Surface water source (N=46)	N too small	49	44	N too small	49	48	N too small	02	08
Others (N=9)	**N too small**								
	Adequacy of Water								
Private hand pump (N= 18)	N too small		78	N too small			N too small		22
Private well (N=70)	31	63	57	23	19	20	46	18	23
Community hand pump (N=158)	06	57	47	38	31	32	56	12	21
Common public tap (N=10)	**N too small**								
Community well (N=89)	03	31	20	47	33	38	50	36	42
Surface water source (N=46)	N too small	72	67	N too small	26	24	N too small	02	09
Others (N=9)	**N too small**								
Adequacy	**N= 183**			**N=116**			**N=101**		

Base : All Respondents

[2] The absolute N for users of community Hand Pump and Other Sources are too low. Thus percentage figures are not provided

- Across sources, hand pumps (both private and public) are rated to be the most satisfactory. At the other end of the spectrum are community wells and surface water sources.
- Across forest types, satisfaction ratings from communities in the dense forest ranges are much lower compared to the rest. The high proportions of respondents in the dense ranges who are unable to indicate their satisfaction levels may perhaps reflect upon the high levels of variations.
- Analysis of levels of satisfaction show that except for private hand pumps, complete satisfaction scores for both quality and adequacy are well below 50%.
- Major reasons for dissatisfaction are lack of alternatives (55%), sources drying up (18%) and distance to water source (16%).

Table 9

Levels of Satisfaction on Quality & Quantity of Water

(All figures in percentages)

Source of Water	Quality of Water								
	Completely Satisfied			***Partially Satisfied***			***Dissatisfied***		
	Dense	***Others***	***Total***	***Dense***	***Others***	***Total***	***Dense***	***Others***	***Total***
Private hand pump	N too small		78	N too small		-	N too small		22
Private well	23	44	40	15	19	19	62	37	41
Community hand pump	28	47	43	9	26	23	63	27	34
Common public tap	**N too small[3]**								
Community well	6	18	14	21	18	19	73	64	67
Surface water source	N too small	15	13	N too small	33	30	N too small	52	57
Others	**N too small**								
	Adequacy of Water								
Private hand pump	N too small		78	N too small			N too small		22
Private well	31	46	43	-	18	14	69	36	43
Community hand pump	3	41	34	3	16	13	94	43	53
Common public tap	**N too small**								
Community well	-	18	11	3	13	9	97	69	80
Surface water source	N too small	31	28	N too small	41	39	N too small	28	33
Others	**N too small**								

Base: Those who opined about satisfaction and dissatisfaction (excluding the Don't Know/Can't Say Cases) N= 336 For Quality and 299 for Adequacy

[3] The absolute N for users of community Hand Pump and Other Sources are too low. Thus percentage figures are not provided

■ *Willingness to Pay*

➲ While a little over a third of the respondents (35%) expressed willingness to pay operating costs if piped water is made available for them, almost half of the respondents reported willingness to pay for maintenance costs. A larger proportion of women respondents (57%) expressed a willingness to pay for the operating costs as compared to 35% of male respondents.

SUGGESTIONS FROM USERS

- ⏭ Need to explore new approaches towards providing water supply in forest fringes.
- ⏭ Need to focus on timely maintenance & upkeep
- ⏭ Protecting and developing traditional water sources like ponds

Self Help to the Rescue!

For the villagers of *Jurgu village (Chandil Range*), self help was the best help when it came to ensuring reliability of public water supply. Last summer, the villagers were forced to depend on 5 hand pumps out of the installed 15, as the remaining had broken down. The only other alternative was a stream in the forest, located more than 8 kms from the village. Repeated reminders and complaints by the villagers to the block office fell on deaf ears. Finally, fed up with the apathy of officials, the villagers gathered outside the Block Development Office in a large group and demanded immediate repair of the hand pumps. Within 7 days of this incident, 5 hand pumps were repaired by the block office. However, this bitter experience prompted the villagers to take initiatives to maintain public drinking water sources. Today, for all minor break downs, the villagers collect money among them and depend on the local mechanics to repair the pumps. There is also one community well in the village which the villagers clean themselves once a year.

3.2 HEALTH SERVICES

■ *Incidence of Health Problems*

➲ Cough, fever and Malaria were reported as the most common ailments by the respondents; overall, about 1 in 2 respondents reported cases of Malaria in the family during the last one year. The incidence of malaria was lower in the dense areas (36 %) as compared to the non-dense ranges (52%). The occurrence of malaria was also reported to be relatively higher among the OBCs (58%) and women (53%).

Table 10
Major Health Problems Faced in the Last Two Years

(All figures in percentages)

Health Problems	Total	Dense ranges	Non dense ranges
Malaria	48	36	52
Cough & Cold	68	56	72
Snake/Scorpion Bites	5	4	6
Gynaecological Problems	7	3	8
Others	9	12	8
Total	N = 400	N=98	N=302

Base: All Respondents

■ *Accessibility of the health facilities*

➲ Availability of government health facilities like PHCs and Sub centres is quite low; only one in five villages had public health facilities. On the other hand private doctors were present in 46% of the villages.

➲ Access to medical facilities, wherever they were available, is reported to be good.

■ *Usage of the health facilities*

➲ One in five respondents who sought treatment during the last one year reported using a Government health facility. The usage of Govt. facility was lower in the dense forest ranges (15%) as compared to the non dense (23%) areas.

➲ Majority of the respondents (64%) who sought treatment during the last one year preferred using a private health facility.

- Traditional healers were preferred by 11 % of the respondents; this proportion was higher among respondents in the dense areas (20%) as compared to the non dense areas (7%).

- No significant difference in the usage pattern was observed between castes or between the poor and relatively well off people. This indicates that availability of a facility primarily determines the usage patterns.

Table 11
Preferred Health Facility of Households during the Last 1 Year

(All figures in percentages)

Health Facilities	Total	Dense ranges	Non dense ranges
Govt. Facility	21	15	21
Private Facility	64	58	66
Traditional Healers	11	20	7
Charitable	1	2	2
Others	3	5	4
Total	N=314	N=87	N=227

Base: Those who faced problems in the last 1 year

- One fourth of respondents who visited a government facility did so in their capacity as inpatients while the rest visited as out patients. The proportion of in-patients was more in the dense areas (46%) than the non dense areas (20%).

■ *Reasons for Using the particular health facility*

- Overall, accessibility to facilities, quality of services and cost of services come across as key reasons for choosing a particular health facility. While a third of the respondents emphasise proximity to facilities and better quality of services provided as the factors for preferring a particular facility, about one-fourth pick out cost of treatment as a key factor. The other reasons mentioned by the respondents were low cost treatment (22%), known staff at the health facility (3%).

- Across forest range types, while quality of treatment is seen as a key factor for choosing a facility (1 in 2 respondents find this as the critical factor), it's proximity to medical facilities which is seen as critical in non dense ranges.

Table 12
Reasons for choosing the Health Facility

(All figures in percentages)

Reasons	Total	Dense ranges	Non dense ranges
Facility is near to my house	34	25	37
Treatment is inexpensive	22	19	23
Facility was recommended to me	2	2	2
Staff is known to me	3	0	3
Treatment is better there	33	49	29
Others	6	5	6
Total	N=285	N=67	N=218

Base: Those who visited the facility and were able to recall the reason

Reasons for not using the Govt. health facility

- Poor quality of service was reported as the main reason (45%) by the respondents for not using a government facility, even when it is available. The other reasons mentioned were long distance (24%) and non availability of the doctors (13%).

Reliability of the Service

- In a government facility, a high proportion of users mentioned the presence of doctor at the time of visit (92 %). However, the presence of paramedical staff was reported on a much lower scale at 59%.

- Around 45 percent of the respondents mentioned that the medicine was provided at a government health facility. The availability of medicines was much lower in the dense ranges as compared to the non dense ranges; in the dense ranges only 31 % of the respondents mentioned that medicines were available while the corresponding percentage in the non dense regions was 48.

- Among those respondents who had received medicines in a government facility, around 23 percent reported receiving the medicines free of cost.

- Finally, 85% of users of government facilities reported they were cured after receiving treatment at facility. This percentage was higher in the non dense ranges with 86 % of the users reporting in the affirmative compared to 76% in the dense areas. Also, the proportion reporting on similar lines was much higher (93%) for users of private facilities.

Table 13
Reliability of the Service

(All figures in percentages)

Parameters	Total		Dense ranges		Non dense ranges	
	G (N=103)	P (N=182)	G (N=10)	P (N=46)	G (N=93)	P (N=136)
Doctor available at the time of visit	92	92	100	92	90	92
Paramedics available at the time of visit	59	36	62	42	58	34
Medicine were provided	45	37	31	4	48	47
Medicine were provided free of cost	23	-	23	-	23	-
Patient was cured	85	93	77	88	87	95

G = Government Facility
P = Private Facility

■ *Satisfaction with the Health Service*

- About 89 % of the users of Govt hospital mentioned that they were satisfied with the time taken to attend them. Around 80 percent mentioned that they were satisfied with the behaviour of doctors and other staff. Around 82 % mentioned that they were satisfied with the helpfulness of the staff.

- Those who visited the Govt. hospital as an inpatient were also asked about the level of satisfaction with respect to the cleanliness of the rooms, behaviour of nurses and quality of food. The percentage of respondents satisfied with the three services was 9 %, 23 % and 14 % respectively.

- The level of satisfaction on all these attributes was higher for the well off people than the poorest people.

- With respect to the private service providers, the level of satisfaction with respect to the time taken to attend was 88%, doctor and staff behaviour was 89 %, helpfulness of staff was 83 %, cleanliness of rooms for in-patients was 12 % and behaviour of nurses was 12 %.

- Overall the level of satisfaction was more in Govt facilities with respect to the time taken to attend and behaviour of nurses than the Private facilities.

- The level of satisfaction was lower in the dense areas than the non dense for the outpatients for both Govt. and Private facilities. However this was

opposite for the inpatients where the level of satisfaction was more in the dense areas

Table 14
Satisfaction with Specific Service Parameters

(All figures in percentages)

Parameters	Total		Dense ranges		Non dense ranges	
	G (N=103)	P (N=182)	G (N=10)	P (N=46)	G (N=93)	P (N=136)
Time Taken (For All)	89	88	77	72	92	94
Behaviour of the doctors/other staff (For All)	80	89	62	88	85	90
Helpfulness of the staff (For All)	82	83	69	78	85	84
Cleanliness of Rooms (For Inpatients)	9	12	15	22	8	9
Behaviour of Nurses (For Inpatients)	23	12	54	22	15	9
Quality of Food (For Inpatients)	14	5	31	4	10	6

G = Government Facility
P = Private Facility

- ***Help from the Forest Department***

➲ A small proportion of the respondents (3%) mentioned that they had received support like provision of vehicles, helping out in admission, etc. from the forest department officials in usage of health services; this percentage was slightly higher in case of the poorest people

- ***Incidence of Vaccination***

➲ Around 65 % of the respondents mentioned that children below 5 years got vaccinated during the last 1 year; oral Polio drops accounted for about 98% of the reported vaccinations. The percentage was higher in case of the relatively well of people than the poorest people.

- ***Overall level of Satisfaction***

➲ The overall level of satisfaction was slightly more in case of private facilities as around 67 % of the respondents mentioned that they were satisfied with the service provision. With respect to the users of Govt. facilities the corresponding percentage was 66. The respondents in the dense areas were less satisfied (51 %) than the people in the non dense areas (62 %)

Table 15
Levels of Satisfaction

Health Facilities	Level of Satisfaction								
	Completely Satisfied			*Partially Satisfied*			*Dissatisfied*		
	Dense	*Others*	*Total*	*Dense*	*Others*	*Total*	*Dense*	*Others*	*Total*
Govt. (N = 103)	-	35	28	46	37	39	54	28	34
Private (N = 182)	18	39	34	44	30	33	38	31	33

■ *Reasons for Dissatisfaction*

➲ The major reasons for dissatisfaction were expensive treatment, accessibility problems, non availability of doctors, and lack of transportation.

SUGGESTIONS FROM USERS

⏭ Need to bring in more villages under the coverage of public health facilities
⏭ Need to improve the behaviour of the staff at the public health facilities

Seeking Divine Interventions…

For the villagers of *Garia Kocha* Hamlet in *Jurgu village* (*Chandil Range*), prayers are mostly to seek blessings of a medical kind – Malaria Pills! For getting those vital anti Malarial drugs, the villagers have to depend on a private doctor who charges rupees 20 to 30 for treating Malaria. And for more complicated cases, even prayers are not sufficient. In case complications arise in delivery cases, the expectant mother has to be moved to Jamshesdpur which is around 60 KM from the village. The main road from the village is also around 10 KM away and there are no means of proper means of transportation apart from vans. The total cost incurred in a delivery case comes to around Rs.10,000. This kind of an expense makes life awful for the villagers. Apart from the private doctor in the village, there are no other government health facilities in the village. The villagers mostly depend upon traditional healers in case of ailments like snake bites, cough and cold, stomach disorders etc. In case of normal delivery without complications the only available person is the untrained traditional birth attendant. The villagers mentioned that though normal birth within the village was not a costly affair due to the presence of TBAs, proper hygiene was not maintained during delivery. In most cases, the umbilical chord was often cut using any blade available.

3.3 PRIMARY EDUCATION

Extent of Enrolment

- Out of the 400 sample households, school going children were present in only 233 households, and out of those 233 households, about 95 % (220 households) reported to send at least one boy or a girl child to the school.

Availability & Accessibility of Schools

- Primary School was present in almost 85 % (i.e. in 35 of 41) of the villages.[4]
- The users of the government primary school mentioned that about 78 % of them had to travel a distance less than a KM. In dense areas the percentage of people reported of travelling less than a KM was more (85 %) than non dense areas (76 %)
- In private primary schools, only 23 % of them reach the school within a KM.

Table 16
Availability of & Access to Primary Schools

(All figures in percentages)

Accessibility	Total	Dense ranges	Non dense ranges
Primary School Present in the Village (N = 40 Villages)*	85	-	-
Travel less than a KM (Govt. Schools)N= 198 **	78	85	76
Travel less than a KM (Private Schools)N= 14 **	23	0	27

* From Village Profile Sheet Data
** Charitable or NGO run Schools are not included, thus total not adding up to 220)

Usage of Schools

- About 90 % of the students in the sample reported studying in a government primary school. The dependence on government primary schools by the poor was found to be total; all students belonging to landless households used only government primary schools.

[4] A middle School was present in 29 % of the villages while a high school was present in 10 % of the villages.

- Significant differences were not present in the usage of government primary schools between the two forest areas. However, usage of NGO run schools were more in the dense areas (8 %) as compared to the non dense areas

- In most of these schools (96 %) the medium of instruction was Hindi. However there were some English Medium Schools spread mainly across non dense ranges (5 %).

Table 17
Usage Profile of Primary Schools

(All figures in percentages)

Schools	Total	Dense ranges	Non dense ranges
Government Primary Schools (N=198)	90	89	90
Private Schools (N=14)	6	3	7
Charitable/NGO Run Schools (N=8)	4	8	3
Total	N=220	N=60	N=160

Base: Households having children in school going age and sending their child to school

Quality of Service provided in Govt. Schools

- Information pertaining to several parameters reflecting the quality of education was captured during the survey. About 87 % of the parents of children going to a Government Primary School had mentioned that the school building is safe; this proportion was much lower in the dense areas (62 %) as compared to the non dense areas (96 %)

- About 88 % of the parents reported that their children sit on the floor as no other seating facility is available; comparatively, a lesser proportion of students in the dense ranges reported sitting on the floor as compared to those in the non dense ranges.

- Feedback on availability of sanitation facilities in schools give much cause for worry as only 15 % of the respondents reporting that toilets are available and functional; this proportion was slightly higher in the dense areas as compared to the non dense areas

- However separate toilets for girls and boys was available only in the non dense areas

- About 76 % of the respondents mentioned that drinking water was available in the school. The availability was much higher in non dense areas (82 %) than dense areas (59 %)

- Free text books were given in almost 75 % of the schools, while note book was given in only 21 % of the schools. Uniform on the other hand was provided in only 3 % of the schools.

- Regularity of teachers was same in the dense and non dense areas. In both cases 76 percent of the respondents mentioned that teachers were regular

- The parents were also asked about the visible outcomes after studying in a school. About 91 % of them mentioned that their children can read numbers, 84 % can write alphabets and 76 % can read simple words. However, these outcomes were much better in the non dense ranges.

- With respect to all these parameters significant differences were not observed across the income category.

Table 18
Quality Dimensions of Government Primary Schools

(All figures in percentages)

Quality	Total	Dense ranges	Non dense ranges
School have a proper Safe Building	87	62	96
Seating arrangements on the Floor	84	76	88
Toilets are available and functional	15	18	13
Separate toilet for Girls	9	0	14
Drinking water available	76	59	82
Free Text Books Given	75	75	75
Free Note Book Given	21	26	19
Free Uniform Given	3	2	4
Teachers present on most of the days	76	76	77
Child can count numbers	91	85	92
Child can write all alphabets	84	75	87
Child can read simple words	76	70	78
Total	N=220	N=60	N=160

Base: Households having children in school going age and sending their child to school

Level of Satisfaction

- The respondents with school going children were asked about the level of satisfaction on the quality of teaching, school building, behaviour of teachers and overall satisfaction.

- It was noticed that about 56 % were satisfied with the quality of teaching, 75 % were satisfied with the behaviour of teachers and overall 49 % were satisfied.

Again, comparatively the feedback was on the more negative side in the dense ranges.

- Analysis of the levels of satisfaction reflects that total satisfaction with government primary schools is below 50%.

Table 19
Levels of Satisfaction with Specific Parameters

(All figures in percentages)

Quality	Total	Dense ranges	Non dense ranges
Quality of Teaching	56	33	64
Behaviour of Teachers	75	61	77
Overall	49	47	50
Total	N=220	N=60	N=160

Base: Households having children in school going age and sending their child to school

Reasons for dissatisfaction

No provision of separate toilet facilities for boys and girls, no presence of play ground and inconvenient location of the school were quoted as the major reasons for dissatisfaction.

SUGGESTIONS FROM USERS

- Need to improve quality of teaching
- Provision of mid-day meals should be mandatory
- Separate toilets for boys and girls

The Barefoot Crusader

"A King is worshiped in his province but the learned is worshiped everywhere". Probably with the above adage in mind, the villagers of *Suti – Ambe* (*Kanke Range*) village send their children to the only primary school. There are cases of drop outs but the encouraging factor is the presence of a lady voluntary teacher who plays a positive role in educating the children and even conducting schools of alternate education for students out of school for mainstreaming. The voluntary teacher is Ms. Meeta Munda, a committed educator who has been teaching since the last 2 years in the village. Being an educated resident of the village, Meeta has played an important role in increasing the enrolment rate in the village. Meeta is highly enthusiastic about her venture of reducing the drop outs and a short discussion with her revealed that she wants to teach as long as she lives. The aim of her life is to fulfil the unmet desire of the parents to see their child educated in the coming years.

3.4 RURAL CREDIT

■ *Accessibility to credit facilities*

➲ While 17 % of the sample villages reported the presence of a Bank, 29% of the sample villages had at least one Self Help Group (SHG).

■ *Requirement of Credit*

➲ This survey found only 16 % of the respondents who reported accessing both formal and informal institutions for credit. The subsistence nature of the livelihoods and the absence of any major commercial activities perhaps explain this low level of demand.

■ *Reasons for Credit Requirement*

➲ The major reason mentioned by the respondents for the requirement of credit was construction and repair of houses.

Table 20
Reasons for Credit Requirement

(All figures in percentages)

Reasons	Total	Dense ranges	Non dense ranges
Repaying old debts	2	7	-
Repair House	10	29	4
Purchase household equipments	7		8
For Marriage	5	7	4
To Purchase capital Assets	8		10
For Harvesting Purposes	9		13
To purchase forest produce	1		2
Others	58	57	59
Total	N=56	N=13	N=43

Base: Those who have taken a credit

■ *Sources of Credit*

➲ Only 9 % of the respondents had taken loans from formal institutions like bank or an SHG. Around 2 % had taken a credit from the local money lender while only 3% approached their relatives for the loan. The rest of them did not take loans from any of these sources. In the non dense areas, availing a loan from formal institutions was double than the dense areas.

Table 21
Source of the Loan

(All figures in percentages)

Source	Total	Dense ranges	Non dense ranges
Local money lender	31.0	43.0	27.0
Banks/SHGs	50.0	29.0	56.0
Relatives Friend	19.0	28.0	17.0
Total	N=56	N=13	N=43

Base: Those who have taken a credit

- ***Reasons for not using a formal credit facility***

➲ Reasons like "Minimum collateral required", "source close to me", "source known to me", "Loan processing was much quicker" were the major reasons of not availing a formal source like Banks or SHGs

- ***Collaterals kept at the time of disbursement***

➲ Most of the respondents (45 %) who had taken a loan from any source mentioned that that they had to keep the land deed as the collateral. Other collaterals kept were Gold Ornaments (5 %) and other durables (30 %). Significant differences were not observed between the dense and non dense areas

- ***Reliability of the Service***

➲ Those who have taken a loan from a formal source were asked that whether they had to pay any speed money to ensure the release of the loan. The proportion of respondents who had to pay a bribe was 26 %. Differences were not observed between the ranges

- ***Level of Satisfaction***

➲ About 78 % of the users of formal credit mentioned that they were satisfied with the overall facilities given to them. Differences were not present.

SUGGESTIONS FROM USERS

⏭ More sources for credit needed at the village level
⏭ Need for flexible repayment options

3.5 FORESTRY SERVICES

Access to Forest Products

The sample households depend on forest for timber, fuel wood, fodder, tendu/kendu leaves and non timber forest products. The members of the households may have to travel different distances for collection of different forest products. The ease of access to the forest products for the households is analysed by two distance norms viz., availability within 1 km and within 3 kms. The analysis on access parameters shows the following findings:

- In general, ease of access for fodder is comparatively better than other products. Fodder is available within 1 km for about 45 per cent of the households in both dense and non-dense regions.
- Most of the households have to travel between 1 km and 3 kms to collect forest products. Fuel wood and fodder is available within 3 kms for about 80 per cent of households both in dense and non-dense regions.
- Timber is available within 3 kms for about 60 per cent of the households both in dense and non-dense regions.
- However, for the collection of tendu/kendu leaves, NTFP and bamboo, access is much better for households in dense regions as compared to those in non-dense regions.
- Bamboo is available within 3 kms for all households who collect bamboo in dense regions and 85 per cent of households in non-dense regions.
- NTFP is available within 3 kms for 72 per cent of households in dense regions and 65 per cent households in non-dense regions.
- Among the forest products, the households have to travel longer distances for collecting tendu/kendu leaves. About 50 per cent of households in dense region and 65 per cent of households in non-dense regions have to travel more than 3 kms to collect tendu/kendu leaves.

Table 22

Household's Access to Forest Products

(All figures in percentages)

Produce	Within 1 km			Within 3 kms		
	Dense	Non-dense	Total	Dense	Non-dense	Total
Timber	27	27	27	62	66	65
Fuel wood	25	30	29	88	82	84
Fodder	45	43	44	82	81	81
Tendu/kendu	15	9	11	50	35	40
NTFP	26	17	19	72	65	67
Bamboo	43	22	27	100	85	89
Total	N = 85	N = 243	N = 328	N = 85	N = 243	N = 328

Base: Those who depend on Forest Produce

Usage of Forest Products

There are differences in the dependency on forest for various products. The maximum dependency of the households on forest is for fuel wood, followed by fodder, NTFP, tendu/kendu, timber and bamboo.

- Almost all the households collect fuel wood (98%).
- Collection of fodder is more in dense regions than in non-dense regions. 75 per cent of households in dense regions and 66 per cent of households in non-dense regions collect fodder.
- 44 per cent of households collect NTFP, one third collect timber and 17 per cent collecting bamboo.
- Households collecting tendu/kendu leaves account for 45 per cent in dense regions and 30 per cent in non-dense regions.
- In all, the pattern of dependency for forest products appears to be the same for the households in dense and non-dense regions except for fodder and tendu/kendu leaves; higher percentage of households in dense regions is engaged in collecting these products.

Table 23
Households Involved in Collection & Selling of Forest Products

(All figures in percentages)

Produce	Dense		Non-dense		Total	
	Collecting	Selling	Collecting	Selling	Collecting	Selling
Timber	32	2	32	4	32	3
Fuel wood	99	22	98	14	98	16
Fodder	75	3	66	3	68	3
Tendu/kendu	45	41	30	28	34	31
NTFP	46	13	43	14	44	14
Bamboo	17	0	17	5	17	3
Total	N = 85		N = 243		N = 328	

Base: Those who depend on Forest Produce

Purpose of Collecting Forest Products

- Most of the households use timber, fodder and bamboo for their personal use. Only about 3 per cent of the households are marketing these produces.
- Tendu/kendu leaves are collected by the households for marketing.
- 40 per cent of households are selling tendu/kendu leaves to private contractors, 29 per cent in the nearby markets, 20 per cent to traders/middlemen within the village and only 10 per cent are selling to Forest Development Corporation.
- Fuel wood and NTFP are collected by the households both for personal use as well as for marketing. Fuel wood and NTFP is sold by 16 and 14 per cent of households respectively. Fuel wood is sold by higher percentage of households (22%) in dense regions than in non-dense (14%) regions.

Income from Sale of Forest Products

Among the households who are collecting forest produces, 39 per cent of households are selling a product or the other. Higher percentage households in dense regions (54.1%) are selling forest products than households in non-dense regions (37%). The imputed value of the forest products used by the households for personal consumption is not taken in the valuation of forest products.

- It is interesting to observe that those households whose income from main activity is relatively less are selling forest produce and supplementing their income (***Table 24***).

- The average income obtained by households from the sale of forest produce is relatively more in dense regions than in non-dense regions.
- In the total income of the households who are selling forest produce, the income from the sale of forest produces constitutes about 13 per cent in dense regions and 9.6 per cent in non-dense regions.
- In the total income of the households who are collecting forest produce, the sale proceeds from the forest produces account for 7 per cent in dense regions and 3.4 per cent in non-dense regions.
- The low share of income from forest produces show that these households are not commercially exploiting the forests and their dependence is only for subsistence.
- In the total sale proceeds of forest produces tendu/kendu account for 44.3 per cent, fuel wood 19.5 per cent, NTFP 18.1 per cent, timber 11.5 per cent, bamboo 3.8 per cent and fodder 2.7 per cent.

Table 24

Average income of households by main activity and sale from forest produces

(All figures in Indian Rupees)

Type of Forest	Involved in selling (N=128)			Not involved in selling (N=200)
	Main activity	Sale of forest produce	Total	Main activity
Dense regions	10050	1472	11522	11410
Non-dense regions	13447	1381	14391	14444

Household Participation in Collecting Forest Products

Information was collected from the households about the participation of household members (male, female or children) in collecting the forest produces.

- Male participation is high in timber (83.3%) and fodder (53.9%) collection, where as female participation is high in fuel wood (66.2%) and tendu/kendu (63.3%) leaves collection.
- Children participation is high in NTFP collection (12.8%) and low in tendu/kendu collection (2.7%).

Table 25

Household Participation in the Collection of Forest Products

(All figures in percentages)

Produces	Male	Female	Children
Timber (N=104)	83.3	12.5	4.2
Fuel wood (N=320)	28.9	66.2	4.8
Fodder (N=223)	53.9	40.3	5.7
Tendu/kendu (N=110)	33.9	63.3	2.7
NTFP (N=143)	41.1	46.1	12.8

Base: Those households who collects the Produce [5]

- **Employment generation in forest sector**

Forest sector in the process of maintenance and rejuvenation of forests generate employment to the people living in the neighbourhood. The activities that generate employment are planting, harvesting, logging, nursery and other activities.

- 21 per cent of sample households reported that they have worked in forest sector activities during the last two years.
- The share of each activity in forest sector in generation of employment to the sample households is given below. Plantation and nursery activities appear to be the major employment generation activities. The break-up of major employment activities is: Planting-44.5%; Harvesting-9.7%; Logging-13.8%; Nursery-30.0% and Others-2.4%
- More number of days of employment was reported by the households who were employed by the forest sector in non-dense regions (99 days) than in dense regions (68 days).

- **Existence of VFPMC and interaction with forest guards**

In the sample villages, 25 % of villages have VFMPC. The villages having VFMPC are more in non-dense (30%) regions than in dense (10%) regions.

- The enrolment of members in the VFMPC is impressive. 93 per cent of households in VFMPC villages reported membership. The membership is higher in non-dense villages (98%) than in dense villages (77%).

[5] This percentage figures is arrived at by aggregating respondent information on which household member was the main collector of the forest produce

- Higher percentage of households (38.5%) reported visit of forest guard during the last one month in VFMPC villages than households in non-VFMPC villages (28.3%).
- Similarly, higher percentage of household (34.3%) in non-dense regions reported visit of forest guard than households in dense regions (17%).
- The pattern observed in the visit of forest guards is also observed in the interaction of the households with forest guards. Higher percentage of households in VFMPC villages (37.6%), non-dense regions (22.9%) reported interaction with forest guard during last month than households in non-VFMPC villages (16.9%) and dense regions (10.6%).

Table 26
Interaction with forest guards

(All figures in percentages)

Type of Village/Forest Range	Visit of forest guard during the last one months	Interaction with forest guard during last one month
VFPMC villages (N=101)	38.5	37.6
Non-VFPMC villages (N=219)	28.3	16.9
Dense (N=85)	17.0	10.6
Non-dense (N=243)	34.3	22.9
Total	31.7	20.0

The forest officials appear to have a good rapport with the households who depend on forest produces.

- 9 per cent of households reported making payments to forest officials for collection of forest products. Relatively higher percentage of households reported payment to forest officials in dense regions (11%) than in non-dense regions (8%).
- Clear cases of bribes were reported by 6 per cent of households. Relatively higher percentage of households reported demand of bribe in dense regions (9.4%) than in non dense regions (4.9%).
- Harassment by forest officials is reported by about 16 per cent of households. Similar to the earlier two indicators, the households in dense regions reported higher percentage of harassment (16.5%) than in non dense regions.

Table 27
Payments & Bribes

(All figures in percentages)

	Payment for collection	Demanded bribe	Harassment
Dense (N=85)	11	9.4	16.5
Non-dense (N=243)	8	4.9	15.6
Landless (N=96)	13	12.3	19.4
Total (N=328)	9	6.1	15.9

- Landless households appear to be more vulnerable in the hands of forest officials. Among the different categories of households, higher percentage of landless households reported payment for collection, demand of bribe and harassment.

Livelihood Support Systems

Households in dense forest regions appear to cope up better in times of scarcity compared to the households in non dense regions.

- About 10 per cent of households reported that they went without food for few days during the last one year; comparative feedback from non dense and landless categories were 13% and 19% respectively.
- During times of unemployment 17 per cent households in dense regions depend on forest produces compared to 10 per cent in non dense regions

Satisfaction with Forestry Services

Earlier it is observed that households in dense regions and members of VFMPC members have better contact with forest officials and these contacts might have helped in solving their problems to some extent. The outcomes are reflected in the satisfaction rating (***Table 28***).

Table 28
Satisfaction with Forestry Services

(All figures in percentages)

Category	Dense	Non dense	VFMPC	Non VFMPC	Total
Regulating entry	59	72	72	67	69
Collecting payments	42	50	55	44	48
Providing employment	21	35	40	27	31
Protection from wild life	27	40	46	32	36
Preservation	49	68	68	60	63
Overall	***40***	***60***	***58***	***53***	***55***
Total (N)	***N=85***	***N=243***	***N=101***	***N=219***	***N=328***

Several interesting pointers emerge:

- While the regulatory functions and efforts at preserving the forest cover are rated very high, the forest department's efforts at providing employment, collecting payments for forest products and protecting livelihoods from wildlife were found wanting.
- Satisfaction for respondents in the dense ranges is significantly lower than that for communities in non dense ranges.
- Interestingly, respondents belonging to VFMPCs have given a much better rating on satisfaction counts for all the parameters compared to non members.

Future Expectations

All respondents were queried on their future expectations on critical livelihood parameters like education for their children, food security and increase of forest cover

Table 29
The Hope Index - Future Expectations

(All figures in percentages)

Category	Dense	Non dense	VFPMC	Non VFPMC	Total
Children will be educated and earn	61	61	68	63	61
No food shortage	32	31	42	26	31
Increase of forest cover	41	45	55	32	44
	N=98	N=302	N=101	N=299	N=400

N=400

VFMPCs Make a Difference

Villagers of *Dhangada* (Pakur Damin *Range*) face several problems but they are united on one front i.e. the protection and proper maintenance of the forest. The Village Forest Protection and Maintenance Committee (VFMPC) was formed 2 years back and since then has been functioning with great efficiency. '*Jangal Katoge to Pastaoge*'…. *'If you cut trees you will repent'* was the slogan of the villagers created by VFPMC. With a current strength of 125 members, VFMPC has created various innovative ideas for protection and maintenance of the forest. They have developed a team of 4 villagers to guard the forest at 4 different locations throughout the day. This team prevents unauthorized cutting of trees in the forest. The motivation to protect the forest has geared up to a considerable limit and the villagers now claim that the VFPMC is effectively maintaining the forest cover around the village. The committee allots the quota for collection of fuel wood & timber per household within the village. Each and every member of the VFPMC has to attend their duties of guarding the forest on a rotation basis. The absence from duty without proper notice imposes a fine of Rs 5/-. per day.

Rajesh Munda, a leading member of the VFMPC in Dhangada mentioned that several years back there were incidences of stealing timber and fuel wood from the forest. Even though the villagers complained to the forestry officials about stealing of fuel wood and timber, it took some time for the VFMPC to be formed but now every villager understands the importance of protecting the forest cover. They have now started to understand the importance of forest cover in maintaining the ecological balance. Thus they are united and try to protect the forest to the maximum possible extent.

4. SUMMARY & KEY POINTERS

Relevance of the Pilot CRC

- Major findings from this exercise were disseminated to various stakeholders at a workshop organised in Ranchi on September 28, 2004. The feedback from this interaction confirms that the CRC can be applied to initiate focussed efforts to improve public services in the forest fringes in Jharkhand.
- In terms of planning for a scale-up of this exercise, the following points were stressed:
- Methodological issues: The need to ensure proper representation in the sample spread was emphasised. It was also emphasised that areas under insurgency should not be left out because of security concerns. It was suggested that a collaborative approach between the forest department and local citizen's (including tribal) groups be utilized to expand the coverage of the survey in the areas characterized by unrest.
- Selection of sectors/services: While it would be unrealistic to include all public services, there is a need to better prioritize the sectors selected for the study. Focus Group Discussions involving service delivery agencies was suggested as an approach towards such prioritization. It was suggested that the issue of food security be examined in more detail including the efficiency of the PDS. Follow-up work will need to develop the relevant modules in the questionnaire for the other sectors, including their pre-testing.
- Supplementary information: There is a need to supplement the CRC with qualitative & descriptive information like case studies, field notes, etc.

Drinking Water Sector

- Common public sources like community hand pumps and community wells are the most used facilities for drinking water. A fairly large proportion depends on unprotected surface water sources like rivers and streams. Lack of alternatives and ease of access to sources determine most household's choice of the source.
- Scarcity of drinking water affects a large number of households; this proportion is significantly higher in dense ranges. The majority of the users of community wells experience scarcity while users of private wells are the least affected. Community hand pumps and surface water emerge as the key support sources for drinking water during times of scarcity. The

transition to other sources during scarcity is not easy – many households are forced to travel longer distances to fetch drinking water.

- During both normal and scarcity times, it is adult women who fetch water for the house; this proportion goes up significantly during times of scarcity.
- Reliability of public water sources is a matter of concern; frequent breakdowns and sources drying up are reported in many cases.
- Community involvement in maintaining public water sources is reported to be very high; a good part of the involvement comes in the form of financial contributions.
- Households have expressed relatively higher satisfaction with the quality of water as compared to adequacy measures. Hand pumps are rated the most satisfactory source across all quality and adequacy parameters.
- While a little over a third of the respondents reported willingness to pay for the operating costs if piped water supply is made available for them, almost half of the respondents expressed willingness to cover maintenance costs.

Health Services

- Overall, about 1 in 2 respondents reported cases of Malaria in the family during the last one year.
- Only 1 in 5 villages had government health facilities while private doctors were reported in almost half of the villages.
- Usage of government health facilities is quite low with only 1 in 5 of those who sought treatment during the last one year reporting in the affirmative.
- Proximity to facilities and quality of treatment come across as key reasons for choosing a particular facility. Poor quality of service was reported as the main reason by respondents for not using a government facility even when it is available.
- The presence of doctors in government facilities at the time of visit was reported on a very high scale; however, similar feedback on the availability of para-medics was reported on a comparatively lower scale.
- Less than half of the users of government facilities reported availability of medicines at the facility; this proportion was much lower for users in the dense forest ranges with less than one-third reporting on the affirmative.
- In general, satisfaction with the services provided in government health facilities was reported to be quite high. However, poor ratings were given by in-patients to selected indicators like cleanliness of rooms & quality of food.

Primary Education

- High enrolments have been reported from families having children in the primary school going age.
- Availability of government primary schools is very good, with 85% of villages reporting in the affirmative.
- The dependence on government primary schools is reported to be of a very high order. Also, access to these institutions is very good.
- Feedback on qualitative parameters indicates a mixed trend; while the quality of school building is rated to be quite good by most parents, parents have expressed a clear concern for lack of proper seating arrangements and toilets.
- Regularity of teachers was also reported to be quite good and most parents have expressed satisfaction with certain visible outcomes like ability to read and write alphabets and count numbers.

Rural Credit

- Due to the subsistence nature of the livelihoods the survey has found very few cases of usage of rural credit facilities.
- Major requirement of credit was reported for construction and repair of houses.

Forestry Services

- Dependence of households on forests is found to be very critical and high.
- The majority of forest products collected is used by households for subsistence and personal purposes. Market interfaces are reported for Tendu leaf collection and NTFP. A higher proportion of households in the dense forest ranges sell forest products compared to those in non dense ranges.
- Household participation in the collection of forest products shows interesting patterns. While male participation is found to be higher in timber and fodder collection, women participation is higher for fuel wood and Tendu leaf collection. However, it may be pertinent to keep in

perspective the fact that access to Fuel wood and Tendu Leaf is difficult compared to timber and fodder.

- One in five respondents reported that they got employed in forest sector activities during the last year; this proportion is found to be higher for non dense ranges compared to the dense areas.

- Probes on the existence and functioning of VFMPCs offer some salient pointers. One fourth of the sample villages reported the existence of VFMPCs; this proportion was on the higher side in the dense ranges. However, membership of respondents in VFMPCs (wherever they are available) is higher in villages in the non dense areas. Households in villages where there are VFMPCs report better interactions with the forest guards.

- Very few cases of harassments have been reported. However, across different socio-economic classes, landless households come out more vulnerable in their interactions with forest guards.

- Instances of extreme food scarcity have been reported by 10% of the respondents. More worryingly, 1 in 5 landless households reported instances of starvation during the last one year.

- A little over half of the respondents expressed satisfaction with the various services provided by the DoF. There is a marked increase in satisfaction ratings provided by respondents who are members of the VFMPCs. Similarly, households who are members of VFMPCs have a more positive outlook on the future on a variety of critical livelihood indicators.

How Do the Sectors Measure Up?
Comparisons across key indicators

This pilot CRC has highlighted an interesting spectrum of findings across five basic public services in the forest fringes of Jharkhand. In this section, an attempt is made to compare the four services (Rural Credit is excluded from this analysis as the users were very few) with respect to ***availability*** of***/access*** to public facilities, ***usage*** of public services, ***quality/reliability*** of public services and ***total satisfaction*** with selected qualitative and quantitative dimensions of service delivery.

I. AVAILABILITY OF / ACCESS TO FACILITIES

Availability of basic public infrastructure and access to services provides a major indicator of the effectiveness of the spread of public service facilities. For the purpose of this study, availability/access parameters selected for each of the four services were:

- Drinking Water – *Proportion of users reporting access to public sources within 1 km from their residence*
- Health Services – *Proportion of villages having a PHC or a Sub Centre*
- Primary Education – *Proportion of villages having a Government Primary School*
- Forestry Services – *Proportion of respondents sourcing Tendu leaves (main commercial product) within 3 kms from their residence.*

II. USAGE OF PUBLIC FACILITIES

Usage profiles of the various public services would, on the one hand reflect the dependency of the citizens on these provisions and also on the other, reflect a map of alternate service providers in the arena. The following usage profiles were used for analysis:

- Drinking Water – *Actual usage (%) of public water sources (Community Hand Pumps, Community Wells & Common Public Taps)*
- Health Services – *Actual usage (%) of government health facilities*
- Primary Education – *Actual usage (%) of government primary schools*
- Forestry Services – *Proportion of households who depend on forests for any product*

III. QUALITY / RELIABILITY OF PUBLIC FACILITIES

Quality and/or reliability of public service delivery is often measured in terms of well established technical parameters like the Nitrate test to check for the level of chlorination in ground water sources or the Learner's Achievement Test to test the aptitude of primary school going children. Seldom does one find any evaluation on quality/reliability parameters from the end-user's perspective. For most users, reliability is a key dimension of the quality of service. The following quality/reliability dimensions were used for the purpose of this analysis:

- Drinking Water – *Proportion of households who were able to manage with existing water sources during scarcity*
- Health Services – *Proportion of households who reported the presence of doctors and para medics at the time of visit and also availability of medicines at the facility visited*
- Primary Education – *Proportion of households reporting regularity of teachers, Proportion of households timely supply of textbooks and Proportion of households reporting provision of mid day meals.*
- Forestry Services – *Proportion of households reporting monthly visits of forest guards, Proportion of households reporting total dependency on forests during times of unemployment and Proportion of households reporting provision of any sort of employment by the forest department.*

IV. SATISFACTION WITH PUBLIC FACILITIES

Satisfaction represents the user's assessment of the performance of a service. Though the present study explored grades of summative satisfaction scores that respondents assigned to various services, as a conscious strategy to focus on the quality of services, only scores on complete satisfaction were used for analysis.

Table 30
The Comparative Matrix

(All figures in percentages)

Public Services / Facilities	Indicators				
	Availability/ Access	*Usage*	*Reliability/ Quality*	*Complete Satisfaction*	*Relative Ranking*[6]
Drinking Water Sources	97	42	30	34	**02**
Forestry	40	82	25	55	**03**
Health	20	28	71	28	**04**
Primary Education	85	85	64	47	**01**

[6] Rankings are based on all the indicators except usage.

ANNEXURE –1

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Schedule No: | | | | |

Start Time

End Time

QUESTIONNAIRE

Namaskar, I am from a research agency. We are currently trying to understand your experience with important public services such as water, education, health etc. Your views, experiences and suggestions will help improve the quality of these services. We would also like to know about your feedback on the dependency on the forest produce and the obstacles faced by you in accessing and using the forests. May I now please talk to any adult member of the family, in this regard? Would you like to co-operate?

SECTION A: IDENTIFICATION

INSTRUCTION: SPEAK TO ANY ADULT (18 YEARS OR OLDER)

A1	Respondent Name	_____
A2	Name of the hamlet/ village/ sub-beat (To be noted separately by the supervisor)	a. Hamlet b. Village c. Sub –Beat d. Beat e. Range
A3	Quality of Forest accessed and used by the community (To be noted separately by the supervisor)	Dense 1 Medium 2 Sparse 3
A4	What is the distance of the hamlet from the nearest transport facility (like buses/ vans etc)?	Less than 3 Km 1 4 to 8 km 2 8 km to 12 Km 3 More than 12 Km (Specify) _____ 4
A4a	What approximate time would you take to reach the above transport facility by walking?	

A4b	What is the mode of transport you use to reach the nearest transport facility?	Walking 1 Cycle 2 Motor cycle 3 Scooter 4 Moped 5 Others (Specify) 6		
A5	Religion	Hinduism 1 Islam 2 Christianity 3 Sarna 4 Others (Specify) 5		
A6	Who is the Chief Wage Earner? (Indicate relationship with the respondent)			
A7	Occupation of the Chief Wage Earner (Refer Code list)	Main	Seasonal	
A8	Occupation of the Respondent	Main	Seasonal	
A9	Sex ☐	Male 1 Female 2		
A10	Caste of the Respondent ☐	SC 1 ST (Specify) 2 OBC 3 General 4		
A11	Completed Age of the Respondent	_____Years		
A12	Total members in the family	Adult: Non Adults:		
A13	Any disabled member in the family? How many?			
A13a	Out of these disabled members how many of them earn?			
A14	Total annual income of the family from all sources	Less than 10000 1 10001 to 20000 2 20001 to 30000 3 30001 to 50000 4 Above 50000 5		
A15	Type of House (Interviewer to note) ☐	Kuccha 1 Pacca 2 Semi Pucca 3		
A15a	Do you have an electricity connection in your house?	Yes 1 No 2		
A16	Ownership of Assests	Land in Accers	Cattle in No.	No.
			Cow	
			Buffalo	

			Bullock	
			Goat	
			Sheep	
			Others	
A16a	Interviewed by	_____		
A17	Supervisor	_____		
A18	Date of Interview	☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐		
A19	Spot Checked ☐ By:_____	Yes No	1 2	
A20	Back Checked ☐ By:_____	Yes No	1 2	
A21	Scrutinised By:_____			

Occupation Codes

Occupation	Code	Occupation	Code
Agriculture	01	Agricultural Labour	02
Construction/Kiln	03	Hunting	04
Carpentry	05	Petty Business	06
School Teacher	07	Govt. Worker	08
Private Employee	09	Housewife	10
Retired/Old	11	Sick/Disabled	12
Labour provided by Forest Department	13	Cattle Grazing	14
		Others	15

SECTION B: PROFILE

I now have some questions regarding your family and some essential services you use.
Instruction: Read out each and every question carefully and give explanations if required.

B1	Do you have any Child who studies in a Primary School in the age group of 6 to 10 years?	Yes No	1 2	
B2	Have you taken any loan from a formal or non formal Institution in the last two years?	Yes No Application under process Applied, but applicaiton rejected	1 2 3 4	
B 3	Have you have been to any hospital/Clinic/Private Doctor for treatment for yourself or someone in your family in the last 2 years?	Yes No	1 2	

SERVICE 1 - WATER SUPPLY

A: USAGE PATTERN

1.1a Usually what is your main source of drinking/domestic water? (Refer Codes Below) Single Response	Usual times Domestic	
	Drinking	

1.1b Is there any scarcity period for the main source of drinking/domestic water? Yes = 1 No =2 Go to 1.1f	1.1b(i) Can you tell me during which months of the year do you experience scarcity most? _____

1.1c	If yes in 1.1b, what is the source of drinking/domestic water during scarcity period? Single Response	Scarcity time / ladV ds le; esa Domestic	
		Drinking	

1.1d What is the reason for water scarcity? (Maximum 3 response)

Codes for Questions 1.1a & 1.1c above
Private Hand pump …01
Private well¡ ……...02
Community Handpump …….03
Household pipeconnection (government) …04
Common Public Tap ……. ….……05
Community Well¡ ……..06
Surface water (lake/dam/river/stream) ……07
Covered rainwater catchments ……..08
Other (Specify) ---------09
If coded 05 or 03, record when was this installed.

Year Of Installation Community Hand Pump
Year Of Installation of Comon Public Tap

1.1e	Has there been any instance during the last 2 years when you were forced to buy water during times of scarcity?	Yes 1 No 2 Go to 1.1f	
1.1e(i)	How many such instances can you recall in the last two year period?		
1.1e(ii)	In the last two years how much money on an average did you spend in buying water?		

1.1f Why do you use the above mentioned (main) source? Circle in the code where appropriate	Drinking	Domestic
Recently installed	01	01
Easily accessible	02	02
More reliable	03	03
Quality is better	04	04
Able to get more quantity	05	05
Free availability	06	06
Only source available	07	07
Other source available only during certain seasons / time in a year	08	08
Source specified for our community	09	09
Other Specify	10	10

1.1g	Are there any government supplied drinking water sources in the hamlet like public taps/public hand-pumps which are currently not operational/used?	¡ Yes 1 No 2 (Go to 1.1h)	
1.1g(i)	Why are they not functioning?	Source dried up 1 Pump handle broke down 2 Quality of water not good 3 Others (specify) 4	

1.1h If the source is outside the house:

What is the distance you have to cover for fetching water? Usual times Scarcity times

Less than 100 meters ……1
100 - 300 meters ……..…..…..…….2
300 - 500 meters ……...…….3
500meters - I Km ……..…….4
1Km - 2 Km ……..……..5
2 Km - 3 Km …….6
3Km - 5Km ……..……7
> 5 Km ……..8

Normal times

1.1h (i) What is the time taken to walk to that location/ source? Hours Minutes

Scarcity times

1.1i Who are the people involved regularly in fetching water?

(Multiple Responses)

Circle in the code where appropriate	CODE	
	Normal	Scarcity
Adult Males	01	07
Adult Females	02	08
Boys	03	09
Girls	04	10
Hired labour	05	11
Others (specify)	06	12

1.1j How many trips are made and what is the time spent on each trip on the day of fetching water? Normal Scarcity

(taking into account travel, waiting time at the source and back home)	No. of Trips

1.2 Is your household presently involved in maintenance of the public water sources?
Yes ¡ = 1 1.2a If Ans = Yes: How Labour ….. 1 No = 2 Go to 1.2b Financial…. 2 Both…… ...3
1.2b If no who maintains?
1.2c Is the piped water supply reliable? Yes = 1 , No = 2

1.3 During the last 2 years, has the forest department been providing any support for better access to water sources? Yes =1 ☐ No = 2 ☐
1.3a If Ans = Yes: How. Digging new wells… 1 Building check dams … . 2 Irrigation facilities like canals 3 Others……. 4

B: QUALITY OF SERVICES

1B.1 Are you satisfied with the main water sources in your hamlet?						
	A		B		Codes	
	Satisfied		Level of Satisfaction			
	Quality	Adequacy	Quality	Adequacy	A.	Yes = 1 , No = 2 Don't Know/Can't say.. 3 (Go to 1 B3)
					B.	Strongly Satisfied 1 Satisfied 2 Dissatisfied 3 Strongly Dissatisfied 4

1B.2	Please give the reasons for your satisfaction/ dissatisfaction?	_____ _____	

1B3	What suggestions do you have for improving the quality of drinking water services? (Note down a maximum of 3 suggestions)	_____ _____ _____ _____
1B4	Are you willing to pay for piped water supply (Operating costs)?	Yes - 1 No - 2 Skip to 1B6
1B5	If yes to what extent per month are you willing to pay?	

1B6	Are you willing to pay for maintenance costs of hand pumps ?	Yes - 1 No - 2 Skip to the next section
1B7	If yes to what extent per month is you willing to pay?	

SERVICE 2 – Health

Schedule No. ☐☐☐☐

THIS SECTION IS TO BE ADMINISTERED IF VISITED Any Health Facility IN THE LAST 2 YEAR.

You said you /your family have been to a health facility in the last 2-years. I would now like to know some details about your usage of this facility.

A: USAGE PATTERN

2A.1	What are the major health problems you or your family members faced in the last 2 years?	Diseases	Yes 1 No 2	Sought Treatment Yes 1 No 2
		Malaria		
		Cough, Cold, & Fever/		
		Snake/Scorpion Bites		
		Gynecological/Delivery related problems		
		Others/ vU;		
2A.1 a	Which are the types of health facilities you used during the last 1 year? Multiple Response possible (Maximum all Responses)	Govt 1 Missionary/Charity/ 2 PrivateHospital 3 Traditional 4 Private Doctors 5 Others 6		

2A.2	Which was the medical facility you used during the most recent illness? single Response.	Govt 1 Missionary/Charity/ 2 PrivateHospital/ 3 Traditional 4 Private Doctors 5 Others 6	
2A.2 a	For the incident you mentioned above, how far did you travel & how much did you spend on transport for taking the patient to the facility?	_____ kms _____ Rs	
2A.2 b	For the incident you mentioned above, approximately how much did you spend on treatment & medicines	Doctor's Fees _____ Medicines _____	
2A3	Why do you not usually go to a Govt. Hospital? Multiple Response possible (Maximum 3 Responses)	Service Not Satisfactory 1 I do not know the timings 2 Doctors are not available 3 I do not know anybody there 4 Long distance 5 It is difficult to cross the forest and go 6 Treatment is costly 7 Others (Specify) 8	Ask only those who have coded any answer except 1 in 2A2
2A.4	Why did you choose the hospital mentioned in 2A2? Multiple Response possible (Maximum 4 Responses)	Because it is near my house: 1 Because it is inexpensive: 2 It was recommended to me: 3 I know the staff there: 4 Because the treatment is better: 5 Any others (specify) 6 _____ _____	
2A.5	Did you visit the hospital (last time) as an	In-patient : 1 Out-patient : 2	

IF ONLY VISTED A TRADITIONAL HEALER SKIP TO SECTION D

B. SERVICE

2B.1	Were the following personnel available at the time of visit?	Doctor : Yes 1 No 2 Paramedic: Yes 1 No 2	
2B.2	Were medicines provided at the hospital/clinic?	Yes 1 No 2	
2B.3	Were medicines provided free?	Yes 1 No 2	
2B.4 a	If No (coded 2) were you asked to buy medicines from outside?	Yes 1 No 2 NA 3	
2B.4 b	If Yes (coded 1), did you;	a. buy the prescribed medicine 1 b. did not buy the medicine 2 c. went to see another doctor 3 d. sought alternate treatment 4	
2B.5	Was the patient cured after taking the treatment at the hospital?	Yes 1 No 2	
2B.6	Was bread and milk given regularly ? Only for in – patients/	Yes 1 No 2 NA 3	
2B.7	Are you satisfied with the quality of the services provided at the hospital? TO BE ASKED FOR THOSE USING PUBLIC OR PRIVATE HOSPITALS	Fill the grid Below	
2B. 8	To what extent are you satisfied	Fill the grid below	

	2B7 Satisfied	2B8 Extent of Satisfaction/dissatisfaction

	Yes	No	Completely	Partly
a. Time taken to attend to you	1	2	1	2
b. Overall behaviour of staff /doctors with you	1	2	1	2
c. Helpfulness of staff	1	2	1	2
d. Cleanliness of Rooms (Only for Inpatient)	1	2	1	2
e. Behaviour of Nurses (Only for Inpatient)	1	2	1	2
f. Quality of food (Only for Inpatient)	1	2	1	2

C. INTERACTIONS(Ask all)

2C1	Do you get any support from the forest department in usage of these health services	Yes 1 No 2 →	Go to 2C3 2C3a
2C2	If Yes, What are the types of support you receive from them?	Provide vehicles for patients 1 Help in admission 2 Provide letter to the Medical Officer 3 Make a phone Call 4 Others (Specify) 5	
2C3	Do you face any problems from forest officials in accessing these facilities?	Yes 1 No 2 →	Go to 2C5 2C5a
2C4	If Yes, What are they?		

2C5	During any medical emergency, who do you usually get in touch with?	Local NGO 1 Local Political Leader 2 CCL 3 Local Leader 4 None 5 Others (Specify) 6 _____ _____	Go to 2C7
2C6	What are the types of support they provide?		
2C7	During the last 1 year, did any of your children below 5 years age get vaccinated?	Yes 1 No 2	Go to Sec D
2C7a	If yes, for what purpose?	Polio… 1 TB…. 2 Tetanus… 3 Cholera… .4 Smallpox… 5 Others… 6	

D. SPEED MONEY (Ask only those who used Govt. facilities)

2D 1	During the last 2 years, was there any instance when you had to pay anything extra/ as a bribe to get health services?	Yes 1 Continue No 2 Go to Section Esa	

2D 2	For what purpose did you pay extra money?	To get admission into the hospital 1 To get medicines 2 Others specify --- 3		
2D 3	Did someone in the hospital demand the money, or did you pay it on your own?	It was demanded by someone 1 I paid on my own 2		
2D 4	How much did you pay?	Rs _____		

E: SUGGESTIONS

2E.1	Taking everything into consideration, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the quality of health service you are receiving from the service provider?	Satisfied: 1 Dissatisfied 2	Go to 2 E 3
2E.2	To what extent are you satisfied? INS. ASK ONLY IF CODED 1 in 2E1	Completely: 1 Partly 2	
2E.3	Please give the reasons for your satisfaction/ dissatisfaction? (Note down a maximum of 3 reasons)	_____ _____ _____ _____	
2E.4	What suggestions do you have for improving the quality of health services currently available to you? (Note down a maximum of 3 suggestions)	_____ _____ _____ _____	

SERVICE 3– PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Schedule No. | | | | |

THIS SECTION IS TO BE ADMINISTERED IF CHILD HAS ATTENDED PRIMARY SCHOOL IN THE LAST TWO YEAR – If more than one child in primary school tell parent to choose the school in which the eldest child goes.
You said a child in your household has attended primary school in the last 2 years. I would now like to know your opinions on the school.

Record age & gender of the eldest child . Age _____ Gender _____

A: USAGE PATTERN

3A.1	How many children in your household are attending primary school?	Boys _____ Girls _____ Total _____		
3A.2	What is the type of primary school your child is attending? From 3A.2 to 3A.5, ask for the eldest primary child	Govt. School 1 Private school 2 Charity/NGOs 3 Others 4		
3A.3	What is the medium of instruction?	English 1 Hindi 2 Urdu 3 Others(Specify) 4		
3A.4	How far is the school from your hamlet?	---------- kms		
3A.4a	How long does it take to reach the school, from your house, by walking?	---------- Minutes		
3A.5	Is your child's school within the village or outside?	Within locality: 1 Outside 2		
3A.6	How many children in your household are NOT attending school in the age group of 6 to 10 years?	Boys _____ Girls _____ Total _____	If Nil go to Sec B	

3A7a	What is the reason for not attending boys? ☐	a. needed for farm labour b. needed for other work c. not interested in studies d. did not feel any need to send		
3A7B	What is the reason for not attending ? ☐	a. needed for farm labour b. needed for other work c. not interested in studies d. did not feel any need to send		
3A8	How many children in your family work? (any work which involves not attending school)		Seasonal / Full Time	
		Boys		
		Girls		
3A9	During the last 1year, how many children missed classes for a week at a stretch or more due to illness?	Boys _____ Girls _____		

B. SERVICE (INS : QUESTIONS TO FOCUS ON THE SCHOOL USED BY THE ELDEST PRIMARY SCHOOL GOING CHILD

3B.1	Does the school have a proper safe building?	Yes 1 No 2	
3B.2	What are seating arrangement for your child ?	Floor 1 Only Bench 2 Bench & Desk 3 Others 4	
3B.3	What sanitation facilities does your child have in school?	Toilets are available & functional…1 Toilets are available but not functional…2 No toilets – children use open space..3	

3B.4	Are there separate toilets for boys and girls? (if coded 1 above½	Yes 1 No 2	
3B.5	Is drinking water available in the school for your child?	Yes 1 No 2	
3B.6	Is there a playground in the school?	Yes 1 No 2	
3B.7	Is your child provided with mid day meals in the school?	Yes 1 No 2	
3B.8	Does your child receive any foodgrains under mid-day meal scheme from the school	Yes 1 No 2	
3B.9	Are free books, notebooks and uniforms given?	Yes 1 No 2 Books 1 2 Note Books 1 2 Uniforms 1 2	If coded 1ask else go to B11
3B10	Are they given on time?	On Time Delayed Books 1 2 Note Books 1 2 Uniforms 1 2	
3B11	Is your child eligible / entitled for any stipends/financial incentives?	Yes 1 No 2 Go to B12	

3B11a	How much is the eligible amount?		
3B11b	Does your child receive this amount fully?	Yes 1 No 2	
3B12	During the last 1 year, have there been instances (excluding vacations) when the school has remained closed for a long time?	Yes 1 Go to 3B12a No 2	
3B12a	How long did it remain closed?		
3B12b	Why did it remain closed	a. bad weather ..1 b. teacher did not turn up…2 c. students did not turn up..3 d. others…4	
3B13	How regular are the teachers?	Teachers are present on most days…….1 Teachers are present only on some days…2 Teachers are rarely present……3	
3B14	Can your child do the following?	Yes --1 No..2 Count numbers 1 2 Write all alphabets 1 2 Read simple words 1 2	

C: INTERACTION

3C. 1	Have you visited your child's school in the last one-year?	Yes 1 →	Continue
		No 2 →	Go to Da
3C. 2	Why did you go there? (All Responses are possible)	To pick up child	1
		To pay fees	2
		To attend PTA meeting	3
		For some other routine work	4
		To get a problem solved	5

D: SUGGESTIONS

3D 1	Taking everything into consideration, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the education provided to your child?	FILL THE GRID BELOW	
3D.2	To what extent are you satisfied?	FILL THE GRID BELOW	

SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT	Satisfied		Extent of Satisfaction/dissatisfaction /	
	Yes	No	Completely	Partly
a. Quality of teaching	1	2	1	2
b. School Building	1	2	1	2
c. Toilets	1	2	1	2
d. Behaviour of Teachers	1	2	1	2
e. Overall Satisfaction	1	2	1	2

3D.3	Please give the reasons for your satisfaction/ dissatisfaction? (Note down a maximum of 3 reasons)	_____ _____ _____ _____	
3D.4	What suggestions do you have for improving the quality of service provided by Schools? (Note down a maximum of 3 suggestions)	_____ _____ _____ _____	

SERVICE 4– RURAL CREDIT

Schedule No. | | | | |

THIS SECTION IS TO BE ADMINISTERED IF A FAMILY HAS TAKEN A CREDIT IN THE LAST TWO YEARS.

You said that you have taken a loan in the last two years. I would now like to know some details.

A: USAGE PATTERN

4A.1	Did you are any member in the family required a loan or a credit during the last 2 years?	Yes 1 No. 2 (GO TO THE NEXT SECTION)
4A.2	What was the purpose of taking the loan?	To repay old debts 1 To construct/repair house 2 To purchase household equipments 3 To Purchase capital Assets 4 For pre-harvest purposes 5 To purchase forest produce 6 Any Others (Specify) 7

4A.3	Whom did you approach?	Local Money lender 1 Bank (Mention the name of the Bank) 2 Relatives/Friend 3 SHGs 4 Others 5	
4A.3a	Why did you approach this source?	Easy to get a loan 1 Low rate of interest 2 Minimum collateral required 3 Source closely known to me 4 Source known to me 5 Loan Processed Quickly 6 Others 7	
4A.4	Did you get the loan?	Yes 1 (GO TO 4A.5) No 2	
4A.4a	Why did you not get the loan ?	Could not provide collaterals 1 Officials demanded bribes 2 Reasons were not given 3 Others 4	
4A.5	What are the collaterals you required to keep at the time of disbursement of the loan?	Land Deed 1 House Deed 2 Gold Ornaments 3 Any House Durables – 4 Others (Specify) – 5	
4A.5a	During the last 2 years, have your collaterals ever been seized?	Yes 1 No 2	

IF LOAN TAKEN FROM RELATIVE THEN GO TO THE NEXT SECTION

B. <u>SERVICE (ASK FOR THE RECENT LOAN & THOSE USING FORMAL SOURCES)</u>

4B.1	Are you satisfied by the terms provided by your source of credit?	Yes 1 → No 2	Go to Section C

4B.3	What are the reasons for your dis-satisfaction?		

C: SPEED MONEY (ASK ONLY FOR THOSE USING FORMAL INSTITUTION)

4C.1	Did you have to pay anything extra to get the loan?	Yes 1 → Contunue No 2 → Go to section D	
4C.2	For what purpose did you pay any extra money?	To quick sanction 1 To avail lesser interest rate 2 Others (Specify) 3	
4C.3	Did someone demand the money or did you pay it on your own?	It was demanded by someone 1 I paid on my own / 2	
4C.4	How much did you pay?	Rs _____	

D: SUGGESTIONS / lq>ko

4D 1	Taking everything into consideration, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the quality of credit facilities available for you?	Satisfied Yes 1 No 2	
4D.2	To what extent are you satisfied? INS. ASK ONLY IF CODED 1 in 4D1	Level of Satisfaction Complete % 1 Partial % 2	

4D.3	Please give the reasons for your satisfaction/ dissatisfaction? (Note down a maximum of 3 reasons)	_____ _____ _____ _____	
4D.4	What suggestions do you have for improving the quality of credit services available to you? (Note down a maximum of 3 suggestions)	_____ _____ _____ _____	

SERVICE 5– FOREST PRODUCE

Schedule No. | | | | |

A: USAGE PATTERN

5A.1	Why do you/your family use the forests?	For personal use 1 For commercial use 2 For Cattle grazing 3 Limited use 4 Others (Specify) 5	
5A.2	What are the major forest produce you collect from the forest? Multiple Response	Timber 1 Fuel Wood 2 Fodder for Stall Feeding 3 Tendu/Kendu leaves 4 Teak leaves 5 NTFP (Specify) 6 Bamboo 7 Others (Specify) 8	
5A.2 a	How far you need to travel to collect the forest produce? (in KM)	Timber	
		Fuel Wood	
		NTFP	
		Fodder pkjk	
		Tendu/Kendu Leaves	
		Others	

5A.3. Now I am going to ask some questions regarding the use of different forest produces

Produce	Usage	Whether collected free	Type of payment	Who collects payment
Timber	Personal use 1 Sell it outside 2 Prepare products & sell outside 3	Yes 1 (Go to 5A4) No …2	In cash…1 In kind….2	Forest official..1 Others 2 (specify)
Fuel wood	Personal use 1 Sell it outside 2 Prepare products & sell outside 3	Yes 1 (Go to 5A4) No …2	In cash…1 In kind….2	Forest official..1 Others 2 (specify)

NTFP (specify)	Personal use 1 Sell it outside 2 Prepare products & sell outside 3	Yes 1 (Go to 5A4) No …2	In cash…1 In kind….2	Forest official..1 Others 2 (specify)
Fodder	Stall feeding 1 Sell it outside 2 Others 3	Yes 1 (Go to 5A4) No 2	In cash…1 In kind….2	Forest official..1 Others 2 (specify)
Tendu /Kendu leaves	Personal use 1 Sell it outside 2 Prepare products & sell outside 3	Yes 1 (Go to 5A4) No …2	In cash…1 In kind….2	Forest official..1 Others 2 (specify)
Others (specify)	Personal use 1 Sell it outside 2 Prepare products & sell outside 3	Yes 1 (Go to 5A4) No …2	In cash…1 In kind….2a	Forest official..1 Others 2 (specify)

5A4	Who usually collects the forest Produce? Men – 1 Women – 2 Girl Child – 3 Boy Child – 4 Others(Specify) 5 Single Response	Produce	Collector (Use Codes)		
		Timber			
		Fuel Wood			
		NTFP			
		Fodder			
		Tendu /Kendu leaves			
5A5	Which are the forest produces that are sold and are sold to whom? USE FOLLOWING CODES Local households within the village .1 Traders/middlemen within the village ..2 Nearby markets outside the village ...3 Private contractors outside the village …..4	Produce mRikn	Sold to whom	Av. Amount Received annually /	
		Timber			
		Fuel Wood			
		NTFP			
		Fodder			
		Tendu /Kendu leaves			

	Forest development corporation……..5 Others (Specify) …6	Fuel Wood			
		Others			
5A6	What are the different types of Employment you or other family members get nearby? MULTIPLE RESPONSES	Agricultural Labour 1 Labour for forest department 2 Construction Labour Private 3 Construction Labour Govt. 4 Kendu Leave Collection for Contractors 5 Working in Brick Manufacturing units – 6 Others (Specify) 7			
5A7	Which time of the year do you get these employments?	Employment	Month (Use English)		
		Agricultural Labour			
		Labour for forest department			
		Construction Labour Private			
		Construction Labour Govt.			
		Kendu Leave Collection for Contractors			
		Working in Brick Manufacturing units			
		Others			
5A7a	During the last two years did you or any family member got employed for the following works carried out by the Forest Department	Type of work	No. of months		
		Nursery			
		Planting			
		Harvesting			
		Logging			
		Others (Specify)			

5A14	How do you sustain your family during the times of unemployment?	Depend totally on forest produces for food 1 Use from the Stored food grains / 2 Selling Timber from Stock / 3 Others (Specify) 4	
5 A 15	Did your family have to live without food for a few days in the last one year?	Yes 1 5A 17 No 2	
5 A 16	How long was the duration?	_____ Days	
5A 17	Has any member of your family migrated out of the village?	Yes 1 No 2	
5A 18	Where have they migrated?		
5A 19	For what work do they go there?		

B. SERVICE

5B1	Have you faced any problems related to safety & protection? (Multiple Response)	Harassed due to collection of forest produce 1 Asked for Bribes for collecting produces 2 Harassed when engaged in agricultural activities 3 Harassed due to cattle grazing 4 Others (Specify) 5 Not harassed at all (Go to 5B3) 6	
5B2 a	Has the problem reduced to some extent in the recent years?	Yes 1 No 2 →	Go to 5B3
5B2 b	What are the reasons?		
5 B 3	Have you ever incurred any loss in property , cattle, agricultural produce, family members caused by wild life during the last 5 years?	Yes 1 No 2 →	Go to Section C

5 B 4	What was the loss?	Property 1 Agricultural Produce 2 Cattle 3 Family Members 4 Others (Specify) 5	
5 B 5	How many times did you incur such type of losses, during the last 5 years?	_____ ____	
5 B6	What amount of compensation did you receive?	_____ (in Rs) Nothing - 99	

C: INTERACTION (ALL QUESTIONS TO B ASKED FOR ALL RESPONDENTS)

5C1	When did the forest guard last visit the village?	A week ago 1 2 weeks ago 2 A month ago 3 3 months ago 4 6 months ago 5 A year ago 6 More than 1 year 7 Others (Specify) 8	
5C. 2	How frequently do you interact with the Forest Guards/rangers?	Weekly 1 Fortnightly 2 Monthly 3 Annually 4 Never 5 Others 6	
5C. 3	For what purpose do you interact?		
5C4	Is there any Village Forest Protection & Management Committee existing in your habitation?	Yes 1 No 2	

5C4 a	When was it set up?	1 year back 1 1-3 years back 2 More than 3 years back 3
5C5	Are you a member of VFPMC?	Yes 1 No 2 Don't know 3
5C6	How you ever attended a VFPMC meeting?	Yes 1 No 2
5C7	What is your experience about the VFPMC?	Effective & functional 1 Functional but not effective 2 Cannot comment 3
5C8	Can you recollect any one good thing the VFPMC have done for your village?	
5C9	Are there any committees like SHG, Mahila Mandals etc in your village?	Yes 1 No 2 Don't know 3

D: SUGGESTIONS

5D 1	Taking everything into consideration, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the quality of service provided by the Forest Department?	FILL THE GRID BELOW	
5D.2	To what extent are you satisfied?	FILL THE GRID BELOW	

SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE FOREST DEPARTMENT	Satisfied		Extent of Satisfaction/dissatisfaction	
	Yes	No	Completely	Partly
a. Regulating entry into forests	1	2	1	2
b. Collecting payments for forest produce	1	2	1	2
c. Providing employment opportunities	1	2	1	2
d. Protection from wild animals	1	2	1	2
e. Preservation of forests	1	2	1	2
f. Overall Satisfaction	1	2	1	2

5D.3	Please give the reasons for your satisfaction/ dissatisfaction? (Note down a maximum of 3 suggestions)	_____ _____ _____ _____	
5 D 4	Do you get any support from the forest officials in usage of other Govt services	Yes 1 No 2 Go to 5D6	
5 D 5	If Yes, What are the types of support you receive from them?		
5 D 6	Do the forest people provide any sort of hindrances in accessing these facilities?	Yes 1 No 2	

5 D 7	If Yes, What are they?		
5D.8	What suggestions do you have for improving the quality of service provided by the forest Officials? (Note down a maximum of 3 suggestions)	_____ _____ _____ _____	

Now let me ask you one final question

In your life-time you would have experienced many changes happening around you. You would also agree with me that more changes are likely to happen in the near future. Can you now think 10-15 years ahead and tell me whether the following events are likely to happen

	Yes	No	Cannot say/not sure
My children will be educated and will earn well			
My family will not face any food shortage			
The forest cover around the village will remain the same or would have increased			

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

ANNEXURE –2

DETAILS OF SAMPLE STATISTICAL TESTS CARRIED OUT

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Accesibility of Fuel Wood * Type of Forest	328	100.00%	0	0.00%	328	100.00%

Accesibility of Fuel Wood * Type of Forest Crosstabulation

			Type of Forest		Total
			Dense	Others	
Accesibility of Fuel Wood	Travel Less than or equal to 1 KM	Count	21	68	89
		% within Type of Forest	24.70%	28.00%	27.10%
		% of Total	6.40%	20.70%	27.10%
	Travel from 1 to 3 KM	Count	49	123	172
		% within Type of Forest	57.60%	50.60%	52.40%
		% of Total	14.90%	37.50%	52.40%
	Travel More than 3 KM	Count	15	52	67
		% within Type of Forest	17.60%	21.40%	20.40%
		% of Total	4.60%	15.90%	20.40%
Total		Count	85	243	328
		% within Type of Forest	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	25.90%	74.10%	100.00%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.277(a)	2	0.528
Likelihood Ratio	1.284	2	0.526
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.003	1	0.956
N of Valid Cases	328		
a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.36.			

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Whether sell * Type of Forest	328	100.00%	0	0.00%	328	100.00%

Whether sell * Type of Forest Crosstabulation

			Type of Forest		Total
			Dense	Others	
Whether sell	**Yes**	**Count**	43	85	128
		% within Type of Forest	50.60%	35.00%	39.00%
		% of Total	13.10%	25.90%	39.00%
	No	**Count**	42	158	200
		% within Type of Forest	49.40%	65.00%	61.00%
		% of Total	12.80%	48.20%	61.00%
Total		**Count**	85	243	328
		% within Type of Forest	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	25.90%	74.10%	100.00%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.448(b)	1	0.011		
Continuity Correction(a)	5.808	1	0.016		
Likelihood Ratio	6.35	1	0.012		
Fisher's Exact Test				0.014	0.008
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.428	1	0.011		
N of Valid Cases	328				
a Computed only for a 2x2 table					
b 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 33.17.					

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Status of VFPMC * Type of Forest	328	100.00%	0	0.00%	328	100.00%

Status of VFPMC * Type of Forest Crosstabulation

			Type of Forest		Total
			Dense	Others	
Status of VFPMC	VFPMC Exisits and households are members	Count	13	88	101
		% within Type of Forest	15.30%	36.20%	30.80%
		% of Total	4.00%	26.80%	30.80%
	VFPMC Exists but Households are not members	Count		8	8
		% within Type of Forest		3.30%	2.40%
		% of Total		2.40%	2.40%
	Non VFPMC Villages	Count	72	147	219
		% within Type of Forest	84.70%	60.50%	66.80%
		% of Total	22.00%	44.80%	66.80%
Total		Count	85	243	328
		% within Type of Forest	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	25.90%	74.10%	100.00%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.277(a)	2	0
Likelihood Ratio	20.398	2	0
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.112	1	0
N of Valid Cases	328		

a 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.07.

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Whether Pays for any Produce * Type of Forest	328	100.00%	0	0.00%	328	100.00%

Whether Pays for any Produce * Type of Forest Crosstabulation

			Type of Forest		Total
			Dense	Others	
Whether Pays for any Produce	Yes	Count	9	20	29
		% within Type of Forest	10.60%	8.20%	8.80%
		% of Total	2.70%	6.10%	8.80%
	No	Count	76	223	299
		% within Type of Forest	89.40%	91.80%	91.20%
		% of Total	23.20%	68.00%	91.20%
Total		Count	85	243	328
		% within Type of Forest	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	25.90%	74.10%	100.00%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.434(b)	1	0.51		
Continuity Correction(a)	0.191	1	0.662		
Likelihood Ratio	0.419	1	0.517		
Fisher's Exact Test				0.51	0.323
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.433	1	0.511		
N of Valid Cases	328				
a Computed only for a 2x2 table					
b 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.52.					

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Satisfied or dissatisfied with the quality of service - Overall satisfaction * Status of VFPMC	328	100.00%	0	0.00%	328	100.00%

Satisfied or dissatisfied with the quality of service -Overall satisfaction * Status of VFPMC Crosstabulation

			Status of VFPMC			Total
			VFPMC Exisits and households are members	VFPMC Exists but Households are not members	Non VFPMC Villages	
Satisfied or dissatisfied with the quality of service - Overall satisfaction	Yes	Count	67	7	106	180
		% within Status of VFPMC	66.30%	87.50%	48.40%	54.90%
		% of Total	20.40%	2.10%	32.30%	54.90%
	No	Count	34	1	113	148
		% within Status of VFPMC	33.70%	12.50%	51.60%	45.10%
		% of Total	10.40%	0.30%	34.50%	45.10%
Total		Count	101	8	219	328
		% within Status of VFPMC	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	30.80%	2.40%	66.80%	100.00%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.503(a)	2	0.002
Likelihood Ratio	13.142	2	0.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.623	1	0.002
N of Valid Cases	328		

a 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.61.

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Satisfied or dissatisfied with the quality of service - Overall satisfaction * Type of Forest	328	100.00%	0	0.00%	328	100.00%

Satisfied or dissatisfied with the quality of service -Overall satisfaction * Type of Forest Crosstabulation

			Type of Forest		Total
			Dense	Others	
Satisfied or dissatisfied with the quality of service - Overall satisfaction	Yes	Count	34	146	180
		% within Type of Forest	40.00%	60.10%	54.90%
		% of Total	10.40%	44.50%	54.90%
	No	Count	51	97	148
		% within Type of Forest	60.00%	39.90%	45.10%
		% of Total	15.50%	29.60%	45.10%
Total		Count	85	243	328
		% within Type of Forest	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	25.90%	74.10%	100.00%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.256(b)	1	0.001		
Continuity Correction(a)	9.461	1	0.002		
Likelihood Ratio	10.245	1	0.001		
Fisher's Exact Test				0.002	0.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.225	1	0.001		
N of Valid Cases	328				
a Computed only for a 2x2 table					
b 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 38.35.					

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
To what extent you satisfied - Overall satisfaction * Type of Forest	220	100.00%	0	0.00%	220	100.00%

To what extent you satisfied - Overall satisfaction * Type of Forest Crosstabulation

			Type of Forest		Total
			Dense	Others	
To what extent you satisfied - Overall satisfaction	Completely	Count	28	79	107
		% within Type of Forest	46.70%	49.40%	48.60%
	Partly	Count	32	81	113
		% within Type of Forest	53.30%	50.60%	51.40%
Total		Count	60	160	220
		% within Type of Forest	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.128(b)	1	0.72		
Continuity Correction(a)	0.043	1	0.836		
Likelihood Ratio	0.128	1	0.72		
Fisher's Exact Test				0.763	0.418
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.128	1	0.721		
N of Valid Cases	220				

a Computed only for a 2x2 table

b 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 29.18.

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
What extent are satisfied * Type of Forest	400	100.00%	0	0.00%	400	100.00%

What extent are satisfied * Type of Forest Crosstabulation

			Type of Forest		Total
			Dense	Others	
What extent are satisfied	Completely Satisfied	Count	13	88	101
		% within Type of Forest	13.30%	29.10%	25.30%
	Partialy Satisfied	Count	33	77	110
		% within Type of Forest	33.70%	25.50%	27.50%
	Not Satisfied	Count	52	137	189
		% within Type of Forest	53.10%	45.40%	47.30%
Total		Count	98	302	400
		% within Type of Forest	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.110(a)	2	0.006
Likelihood Ratio	11.099	2	0.004
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.06	1	0.014
N of Valid Cases	400		
a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 24.75.			

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Main water source - Satisfied - Quality * Type of Forest	400	100.00%	0	0.00%	400	100.00%

Main water source - Satisfied - Quality * Type of Forest Crosstabulation

			Type of Forest		Total
			Dense	Others	
Main water source - Satisfied - Quality	Yes	Count	30	185	215
		% within Type of Forest	30.60%	61.30%	53.80%
	No	Count	50	71	121
		% within Type of Forest	51.00%	23.50%	30.30%
	DK/CS	Count	18	46	64
		% within Type of Forest	18.40%	15.20%	16.00%
Total		Count	98	302	400
		% within Type of Forest	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	31.895(a)	2	0
Likelihood Ratio	31.522	2	0
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.176	1	0
N of Valid Cases	400		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.68.

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Main water source - Satisfied - Adequacy * Type of Forest	400	100.00%	0	0.00%	400	100.00%

Land in Acres * Type of Forest Crosstabulation

			Type of Forest		Total
			Dense	Others	
Land in Acres	Landless	Count	15	37	52
		% within Type of Forest	15.30%	12.30%	13.00%
		% of Total	3.80%	9.30%	13.00%
	Less than 2.5 Acres	Count	63	148	211
		% within Type of Forest	64.30%	49.00%	52.80%
		% of Total	15.80%	37.00%	52.80%
	2.6 to 5 Acres	Count	13	77	90
		% within Type of Forest	13.30%	25.50%	22.50%
		% of Total	3.30%	19.30%	22.50%
	More than 5 Acres	Count	7	40	47
		% within			

		Forest			
		% of Total	1.80%	10.00%	11.80%
Total		**Count**	98	302	400
		% within Type of Forest	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	24.50%	75.50%	100.00%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	**df**	**Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)**
Pearson Chi-Square	11.070(a)	3	0.011
Likelihood Ratio	11.774	3	0.008
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.789	1	0.005
N of Valid Cases	400		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.52.

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		**Missing**		**Total**	
	N	**Percent**	**N**	**Percent**	**N**	**Percent**
Caste of the respondent * Type of Forest	400	100.00%	0	0.00%	400	100.00%

Caste of the respondent * Type of Forest Crosstabulation

			Type of Forest		Total
			Dense	Others	
Caste of the respondent	SC	Count	14	34	48
		% within Type of Forest	14.30%	11.30%	12.00%
		% of Total	3.50%	8.50%	12.00%
	ST	Count	52	153	205
		% within Type of Forest	53.10%	50.70%	51.30%
		% of Total	13.00%	38.30%	51.30%
	OBC	Count	20	98	118
		% within Type of Forest	20.40%	32.50%	29.50%
		% of Total	5.00%	24.50%	29.50%
	General	Count	12	17	29
		% within Type of Forest	12.20%	5.60%	7.30%
		% of Total	3.00%	4.30%	7.30%
Total		Count	98	302	400
		% within Type of Forest	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	24.50%	75.50%	100.00%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.752(a)	3	0.033
Likelihood Ratio	8.545	3	0.036
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.041	1	0.839
N of Valid Cases	400		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.11.

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Whether Experience Scarcity * Type of Forest	400	100.00%	0	0.00%	400	100.00%

Whether Experience Scarcity * Type of Forest Crosstabulation

			Type of Forest		Total
			Dense	Others	
Whether Experience Scarcity	**Yes**	**Count**	78	191	269
		% within Type of Forest	79.60%	63.20%	67.30%
		% of Total	19.50%	47.80%	67.30%
		Count	20	111	131
		% within Type of Forest	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	24.50%	75.50%	100.00%
Total		**Count**	98	302	400

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.977(b)	1	0.003		
Continuity Correction(a)	8.25	1	0.004		
Likelihood Ratio	9.524	1	0.002		
Fisher's Exact Test				0.003	0.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.955	1	0.003		
N of Valid Cases	400				

a Computed only for a 2x2 table

b 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 32.10.