



P-ISSN: 2349-8528

E-ISSN: 2321-4902

IJCS 2018; 6(3): 3322-3325

© 2018 IJCS

Received: 22-03-2018

Accepted: 26-04-2018

AG Angaitkar

Ph.D. Scholer, Post Graduate
Institute, Dr. Panjabrao
Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth,
Akola, India

PP Bhople

Associate Proff, Post Graduate
Institute, Dr. Panjabrao
Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth,
Akola, Maharashtra, India

RW Bijagare

District manager, Post Graduate
Institute, Dr. Panjabrao
Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth,
Akola, Maharashtra, India

Correspondence

AG Angaitkar

Ph.D. Scholer, Post Graduate
Institute, Dr. Panjabrao
Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth,
Akola, Maharashtra, India

Impact of convergence of agricultural interventions in Maharashtra programme on beneficiaries of self help group in distress prone district

AG Angaitkar, PP Bhople and RW Bijagare

Abstract

The study was carried out on impact of beneficiaries of self help group of Convergence of Agricultural Interventions in Maharashtra programme during the year 2017-2018. Data of 100 respondent's from 12 villages were collected and the interpretation and analysis was done. The findings of the study revealed that, the majority of the beneficiaries were of middle age group having up to high school level of education and small size of land holding with agriculture as a major occupation. However, the observation also shows most of the respondents were having annual income Rs.50,000 to 1,00,000 and medium size of family. It was also studied that, most of the beneficiaries have above 10 years farming experience and they use well as a source of irrigation. Majority of the beneficiaries had medium extension contact, economic motivation and medium innovativeness with low scientific orientation. Also the beneficiaries are medium duration training receiver and have highly favourable attitude towards CAIM programme. From the correlation analysis the significant was tested at 0.01 and 0.05 level of significance and revealed that, 13 out of 14 variables were significant, remaining variables are non-significant. The significant variable includes Age, Education, Land holding, Occupation, Annual income, Farming experience, Source of irrigation, Extension contact, Economic motivation, Scientific orientation, Innovativeness, Attitude and Training received. Only Size of family is non-significant variable includes and It was found during multiple regression analysis that, these selected variables have 78.50 per cent contribution in impact on beneficiaries.

Keywords: agricultural interventions, Maharashtra programme, self help group

Introduction

Now a day, due to climatic condition, agrarian distress in Vidarbha region of Maharashtra for the last decade has been the key reason for farmer's suicide and various other issues. The Government of Maharashtra initiated a programme "Convergence of Agriculture Interventions In Maharashtra" (CAIM) with the support of IFAD (International Fund for Agriculture Development) and Sir Ratan Tata Trust, The Government of India and Maharashtra Government had asked IFAD to intervene in region, where agricultural distress and farmer suicides are pressing issues. IFAD undertook a detailed analysis of situation and come up with a comprehensive approach for working in the region. This programme is unique in the sense that, it looks for convergence of various government programmes going on in the region. The CAIM programme is a joint partnership between the Government of Maharashtra, IFAD and Sir Ratan Tata Trust towards overcoming the agrarian distress in Vidarbha. The programme titled Convergence of Agriculture Interventions in Maharashtra (CAIM) was developed with the given goals and objectives to empower women through micro-finance and micro-enterprises.

Women empowerment is one of the key spheres of activity of CAIM. To achieve this goal SHG components is being implemented by the project. They had undertaken formation 12370 SHGs, Bank linkage was achieved for 9324 SHGs, benefiting 59842 members for various income generation activities like goatry, poultry, dairy, grocery shop.

Project has taken initiative developing infrastructure viz. common facility centres, Agro-service centres for collective input purchase, fodder development as enterprise-CMRC will take government/community land on lease and will start fodder production.

SARC units-project is now focusing on incorporation of innovative machineries like cotton thresher which will render the solution to the current problems and now there are reached to breakeven point. This all initiatives leads to sustainability of the rural women communities engaged in activities to build up self-sustainable business module in this initiation.

Methodology

Distress prone district from Vidarbha region viz; Akola and Amravati districts were selected purposively for the study. The study was conducted in two taluka of Aklola and two taluka of Amravati district. Beneficiary respondents in 12 villages were contacted at their places of residence and data were collected by personal interview. From 12 villages 100 beneficiaries of self-help group were selected randomly. The

interview schedule was constructed by formulating relevant questions in accordance with objectives of the study. The schedule included questions pertaining to age, education, land holding, occupation, annual income, size of family, farming experience, source of irrigation, extension contact, economic motivation, scientific orientation, innovativeness, attitude and training received as independent variables and socio economic status as dependent variable.

The information from respondents was collected by personal interview methods and their responses were considered for the purpose of the present study. Data related to the study was analysed by using correlation coefficient, multiple regression and 't' test as statistical tools.

Result and Discussion

Table 1: Distribution of beneficiaries of self help group according to their selected characteristics.

| Sr. No. | Independent variables | Frequency (n=100) | Percentage |
|---------|-----------------------------|-------------------|------------|
| 1 | Age | | |
| | Young | 05 | 05.00 |
| | Middle | 49 | 49.00 |
| | Old | 46 | 46.00 |
| 2 | Education | | |
| | Illiterate | 02 | 02.00 |
| | Can read and Write | 02 | 02.00 |
| | Primary school | 13 | 13.00 |
| | Middle school | 21 | 21.00 |
| | High school | 32 | 32.00 |
| | College | 30 | 30.00 |
| 3 | Land holding | | |
| | Marginal | 33 | 33.00 |
| | Small | 49 | 49.00 |
| | Semi medium | 14 | 14.00 |
| | Medium | 04 | 04.00 |
| 4 | Occupation | | |
| | Agri.+Labour | 12 | 12.00 |
| | Agriculture | 52 | 52.00 |
| | Agri+Allied occupation | 25 | 25.00 |
| | Agri.+Bussiness | 10 | 10.00 |
| | Agri+Service | 01 | 01.00 |
| 5 | Annual income | | |
| | Up to 50,000 | 08 | 08.00 |
| | 50,001-1,00,000 | 62 | 62.00 |
| | 1,00,001-1,50,000 | 11 | 11.00 |
| | 1,50,001 - 2,00,000 | 16 | 16.00 |
| 6 | Family size | | |
| | above 2,00,000 | 03 | 03.00 |
| | Small | 21 | 21.00 |
| | Medium | 63 | 63.00 |
| 7 | Farming experience | | |
| | High | 16 | 16.00 |
| | Low | 00 | 00.00 |
| | Medium | 15 | 15.00 |
| 8 | Source of irrigation | | |
| | High | 85 | 85.00 |
| | No facility | 45 | 45.00 |
| | River | 00 | 00.00 |
| | Well | 55 | 55.00 |
| 9 | Extension contact | | |
| | Canal | 00 | 00.00 |
| | Low | 23 | 23.00 |
| | Medium | 46 | 46.00 |
| 10 | Economic motivation | | |
| | High | 31 | 31.00 |
| | Low | 30 | 30.00 |
| | Medium | 44 | 44.00 |

| | | | |
|----|-------------------------------|----|-------|
| | High | 26 | 26.00 |
| 11 | Scientific orientation | | |
| | Low | 56 | 56.00 |
| | Medium | 41 | 41.00 |
| | High | 03 | 03.00 |
| 12 | Innovativeness | | |
| | Low | 36 | 36.00 |
| | Medium | 42 | 42.00 |
| | High | 22 | 22.00 |
| 13 | Attitude index | | |
| | Unfavourable | 00 | 00.00 |
| | Favourable | 16 | 16.00 |
| | Highly favourable | 84 | 84.00 |
| 14 | Training received | | |
| | Low | 19 | 19.00 |
| | Medium | 57 | 57.00 |
| | High | 24 | 24.00 |

The above table 1 revealed that, maximum 49.00 per cent respondents were of old age group i.e. above 50 years and 32.00 per cent respondents educated up to high school level. 49.00 per cent respondents have small land holding and 52.00 per cent have agriculture as a major occupation and 62 per cent respondents have Rs. 50,000 to 1,00,000 annual income. Also, it was observed that most of the beneficiaries (63.00%) have medium size family and majority (85.00%) have above 10 years farming experience. 55.00 per cent respondents use well as source of irrigation, 46.00 per cent and 44.00 per cent have medium extension contact, economic motivation respectively and also (56.00 %) have low scientific orientation and (42.00%) medium innovativeness. Also it was observed (84.00%) beneficiaries had highly favourable attitude towards CAIM programme and they (57.00%) received medium duration trainings from functionaries of CAIM programme.

Impact of self help group on beneficiaries

The impact of self-help group activity of CAIM programme on the beneficiaries has been studied in terms of socio economic status with its eight parameters viz; change in occupation, land holding, education, annual income, socio political participation, household and material possession. The data thus obtained have been furnished in above Table 02.

A cursory look at table, reveal that mean score of occupation (33.61), land holding (52.01), education (46.88), annual income (14.55), socio political participation (07.17), household (42.89), material possession (75.02) and other attributes (02.64) were higher than the mean score of beneficiaries before participation in SHG of CAIM programme for occupation (27.20), land holding (34.94), education (41.45), annual income (12.51), socio political participation (05.31), household (34.60), material possession (66.59) and other attributes (02.13) of beneficiary respondents in CAIM programme.

Table 2: Distribution of the beneficiaries of SHG's according to change in mean score of impact parameters and 'z' value for testing significance of mean value

| S. No | Impact parameters | Mean score | | | 'Z' value |
|-------|-------------------------------|----------------|---------------|----------|-----------|
| | | Before (n=100) | After (n=100) | % Change | |
| 1 | Occupation | 27.20 | 33.61 | 23.56 | 5.25* |
| 2 | Land Holding | 34.94 | 52.01 | 48.85 | 9.14* |
| 3 | Education | 41.45 | 46.88 | 13.10 | 12.72* |
| 4 | Annual Income | 12.51 | 14.55 | 16.30 | 13.29* |
| 5 | Socio political participation | 05.31 | 07.17 | 35.02 | 7.78* |
| 6 | House hold | 34.60 | 42.89 | 23.95 | 14.77* |
| 7 | Material possession | 66.59 | 75.02 | 12.65 | 17.10* |
| 8 | Other Attributes | 02.13 | 02.64 | 23.94 | 06.43* |
| Total | | | | | 24.67 |

%= Percentage

It was also found that, there was change in occupation, land holding, education, annual income, socio political participation, household, material possession and other attributes to the tune of 23.56, 48.85, 13.10, 16.30, 35.02, 23.95, 12.65 and 23.94 per cent over that before participation of respondents in CAIM programme.

When impact as whole was considered it is seen from the table, that there was impact of 24.67 per cent of SHG of CAIM programme on the respondents. It could, therefore there was definite positive impact of SHG of CAIM programme on the beneficiaries in terms of change in occupation, land holding, education, annual income, socio political participation, household, material possession and other attributes to the extent of 24.67 per cent over and above as a whole.

In order to test variability of mean of all eight parameters of socio economic status of beneficiaries of SHG of CAIM programme before and after participation in the programme, the data were subjected to 'z' test and the result thus obtained have been presented in above table.

The 'z' value of occupation (05.25), land holding (09.14), education (12.72), annual income (13.29), socio political participation (07.78), household (14.77), material possession (17.10) and other attributes (06.43) found to be significant at 0.05 level of probability.

It could be therefore be, inferred that the beneficiaries of self-help group activity of CAIM programme differs significantly after participation in the programme. It could, therefore, the explicitly stated that, there was definite change in socio

economic status of beneficiaries of SHG of CAIM programme.

By and large, it could definitely be inferred that, self help group activity of CAIM programme had significant impact on the beneficiaries.

Table 3: Coefficient of correlation between selected independent characteristics of beneficiaries of SHG's with dependent variable impact

| Sr. No. | Name of the variables | 'r' values |
|---------|------------------------|------------|
| 1 | Age | 0.2415** |
| 2 | Education | 0.1918* |
| 3 | Land holding | 0.2637** |
| 4 | Occupation | 0.3102** |
| 5 | Annual income | 0.3391** |
| 6 | Family size | 0.0679 |
| 7 | Farming experience | 0.1888* |
| 8 | Source of irrigation | 0.1715* |
| 9 | Extension contact | 0.2264** |
| 10 | Economic motivation | 0.2165** |
| 11 | Scientific orientation | 0.1850* |
| 12 | Innovativeness | 0.2017* |
| 13 | Attitude | 0.1738* |
| 14 | Training received | 0.1842* |

* : Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.

** : Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

It is revealed from Table 03 that, out of total variables age, land holding, occupation, annual income, extension contact and economic motivation shows highly significant and positive correlation with impact at 0.01 level of probability and rest of the variables such as education, farming experience, source of irrigation, innovativeness, attitude and training received also showed positive and significant correlation with impact at 0.05 level of probability.

Table 4: Multiple regression analysis of independent variables of beneficiaries of SHG's with impact.

| S. No. | Variables | Partial regression coefficient | S.E. 'b' | 't'-value |
|--------|------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| 1 | Age | 0.043 | 0.021 | 2.047* |
| 2 | Education | 1.127 | 0.499 | 2.258* |
| 3 | Land holding | 1.233 | 0.531 | 2.322* |
| 4 | Occupation | 1.734 | 0.362 | 4.790** |
| 5 | Annual income | 1.755 | 0.640 | 2.742** |
| 6 | Family size | 0.069 | 0.106 | 0.652 |
| 7 | Farming experience | 0.009 | 0.027 | 0.347 |
| 8 | Source of irrigation | 2.229 | 0.887 | 2.512* |
| 9 | Extension contact | 0.257 | 0.120 | 2.141* |
| 10 | Economic motivation | 0.437 | 0.214 | 2.042* |
| 11 | Scientific orientation | 0.163 | 0.105 | 1.552 |
| 12 | Innovativeness | 0.218 | 0.111 | 1.981* |
| 13 | Attitude index | 0.038 | 0.017 | 2.235* |
| 14 | Training received | 0.241 | 0.120 | 2.008* |

$R^2=0.785$ F Value = 31.669

** Significant of 0.01 level of probability

* Significant of 0.05 level of probability

The results of relational analysis were fitted in regression equation and regression analysis was undertaken. The result of regression analysis in Table 04 shows that, the coefficient of determination R^2 was 0.785, it means all the independent variables contribute 78.50 per cent of the total variation of the dependent variable.

Further it was observed from Table 04 that independent variables namely occupation and annual income were positive and highly significant at 0.05 level of probability, whereas remaining variables viz., age, education, land holding, source of irrigation, extension contact, economic motivation, innovativeness, attitude index were positive and significant at 0.05 level of probability.

Conclusion

The finding reveals that, Self Help Group activity of CAIM programme had 24.67 per cent impact on the beneficiaries were educated up to high school level and have medium extension contact, economic motivation, innovativeness and low scientific orientation. Beneficiaries received medium duration training and increased their annual income after participation in CAIM programme so they have highly favourable attitude towards CAIM programme. There was highly significant and positive relationship observed of 13 independent variables via; land holding, occupation, annual income, extension contact and economic motivation at 0.01 level probability and positive and significant relationship with education, farming experience, source of irrigation, scientific orientation, innovativeness, attitude and training received at 0.05 level of probability, except size of family which had non-significant relationship with impact and these selected variables had contributed 78.50 per cent in impact of beneficiaries.

References

1. Anonymous, Launch of CAIM – Sukhi Baliraja Initiative, 2010.
H:/caimsrft&nrtt_institutionalgrants_rurallivelihood.
2. Anonymous. A report on Krishi Samruddhi: CAIM distressed district programme. 2015, 1-33.
3. Kale NM, Mankar DM, Wankhade PP. Factors affecting agrarian distress proneness in vidarbha. RRC report, Dr. P.D.K.V., Akola. 2013, 36-59
4. Parshuramkar SG. Impact of MGNREGA on rural livelihood of eastern Vidarbha. Ph.D.(Ag) thesis (Unpub), Dr. PDKV, Akola, 2013.
5. Thakare UG. Impact of Centrally Sponsored Crop Development programmes on the beneficiaries. Ph.D. Thesis (unpub.) Dr. PDKV, Akola, 2004.
6. Waghmare VV, Kadam RP. Socio economic change among the beneficiary women of self-help group. Agriculture Update, 2011; 6(1):17-20