

Determinants of availment of benefits by integrated rural development programme beneficiaries

P.R. DESHMUKH AND N.D. DESHMUKH

See end of the article for authors' affiliations

Correspondence to:

P.R. DESHMUKH

Department of
Extension Education,
Marathwada
Agricultural University,
PARBHANI (M.S.)
INDIA

ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted in Parbhani district of Maharashtra state to find out the determinants of IRDP benefits. Twenty five villages from Gangakhed, Pathri, Selu, Purna and Parbhani talukas were selected on the basis of highest recovery under IRDP. Findings of the study showed that all the characteristics of IRDP beneficiaries formed non-significant relationship with the availment of benefit.

INTRODUCTION

Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP) is an outcome of long evolutionary process in India. A beginning was made with the community development programme, which was launched in October 1952 with main objectives of improving the rural areas. Integrated Rural Development Programme was conceived and covered of the 350 million (29.90 %) people below the poverty line in the country out of which around 300 millions were from small and marginal farmers, rural artisans and other workers. The implementation of IRDP was effectively made in Maharashtra since its inception *i.e.* 1978. Parbhani district is having 77.49 % rural population and 257469 below poverty line families which were selected for implementing IRDP at initial stage. In the present study attempt was made to assess the relationship between characteristics of beneficiaries with the availment of benefit from IRDP.

METHODOLOGY

The present study was undertaken in Parbhani district as it has highest number of below poverty line families (67.75 %) in Marathwada *i.e.* 2,57,464 families. Five talukas from the district namely, Gangakhed, Pathri, Selu, Purna and Parbhani were selected for study after consulting DRDA officials and Panchayat Samiti reports and blockwise

records. Out of 130 villages from selected blocks where maximum recovery was made under IRDP scheme, 25 villages were selected randomly by following lottery method. From selected 25 villages the list of beneficiaries was obtained from Panchayat Samiti. Out of 796 beneficiaries, 25.12 % (*i.e.* 200) beneficiaries were selected randomly, which formed the study sample. The data were collected from the IRDP beneficiaries with the help of personal interview method at their homesteads or on their farm and carefully edited and processed with the help of frequency, percentage, correlation and simple regression test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of the present study as well as relevant discussion have been presented under following heads:

Profile of IRDP beneficiaries:

Most of the IRDP beneficiaries were young, able to read and write only, belonged to special backward class caste, having small family size and engaged in occupation of cultivation. Majority of them had annual income from rupees 4001 to 6000, land in between 1.1 to 2.00 ha., high use of sources of information and low level of social participation (Table 2).

Key words : :
Integrated rural
development
programme
benefits,
Correlation,
Beneficiaries.

Accepted :
March, 2010

Relationship between characteristics of beneficiaries and IRDP benefit availment:

It is observed from Table 1 of correlation and regression analysis that the independent variables did not exhibits any significant influence on the availment of

benefit of IRDP scheme. This may be due to various problems encountered by the IRDP beneficiaries.

An attempt has been made to find out the relationship of each of the socio-personal and economic characteristics under study with availment of benefit of

| Sr. No. | Independent variables | Correlation coefficient | Regression coefficient | S.E. | 't' value |
|---------|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-------|-----------|
| 1. | Age | 0.098* | 0.021* | 0.059 | 1.342 |
| 2. | Education | 0.001* | 0.041* | 0.118 | 0.349 |
| 3. | Caste | 0.020* | 0.002* | 0.115 | 0.025 |
| 4. | Family size | 0.021* | 0.041* | 0.380 | 0.108 |
| 5. | Occupation | 0.040* | 0.126* | 0.166 | 0.759 |
| 6. | Annual income | 0.035* | 0.056* | 0.184 | 0.309 |
| 7. | Land holding | 0.049* | 0.128* | 0.183 | 0.701 |
| 8. | Sources of information | 0.011* | 0.035* | 0.186 | 0.188 |
| 9. | Social participation | 0.036* | 0.021* | 0.214 | 0.100 |

*Non significant

t value at 5% -1.96 t value at 1% - 2.58

| Sr. No. | Characteristic | Category | Mean | S.E. | F. value |
|---------|------------------------|------------------------|-------|-------|----------|
| 1. | Age | Young age | 10.40 | 0.256 | 0.4567* |
| | | Middle age | 11.60 | 1.14 | |
| | | Old age | 9.76 | 0.481 | |
| 2. | Caste | Scheduled caste | 10.02 | 0.404 | 0.2511* |
| | | Scheduled tribe | 10.63 | 0.526 | |
| | | Denotified tribes | 10.26 | 0.354 | |
| | | Nomadic tribes | 9.82 | 0.451 | |
| | | Special backward class | 10.12 | 0.292 | |
| | | Others | | | |
| 3. | Size of family | Small family | 10.16 | 0.225 | 0.0072* |
| | | Large family | 10.19 | 0.262 | |
| 4. | Occupation | Labour | 10.24 | 0.524 | 0.4943* |
| | | Caste occupation | 9.77 | 0.352 | |
| | | Business | 10.04 | 0.352 | |
| | | Cultivation | 10.33 | 0.278 | |
| | | Service | 9.00 | 0.999 | |
| 5. | Annual income | Up to 4000 | 10.08 | 0.311 | 0.9798* |
| | | 4001 to 6000 | 10.43 | 0.288 | |
| | | 6001 to 8500 | 9.59 | 0.374 | |
| | | 8501 and above | 10.04 | 0.516 | |
| 6. | Land holding | Landless labour | 10.62 | 0.451 | 1.157* |
| | | UP to 1 ha. | 10.14 | 0.309 | |
| | | 1.1 to 2.0 ha | 9.71 | 0.287 | |
| | | 2.1 and above | 10.20 | 0.383 | |
| 7. | Sources of information | Low | 10.19 | 0.323 | 0.585* |
| | | Medium | 10.22 | 0.337 | |
| | | High | 9.89 | 0.293 | |
| 8. | Social participation | Low | 10.26 | 0.273 | 0.3071* |
| | | Medium | 9.95 | 0.327 | |
| | | High | 10.09 | 0.314 | |

IRDP. This exercise was done with the help of unequal complete randomized design *i.e.* unequal C.R.D.

Impact of socio-personal and economic characteristics on benefit derived by IRDP beneficiaries:

Age:

Table 2 shows that the average score of availment of benefit for young age, middle age and old age were 10.40, 11.06 and 9.76, respectively the oneway analysis of variance of the scores revealed non-significant differences in case of availment of benefit. It means each age category harness the benefit of IRDP schemes, there is no wider differences in age in availing the benefit from IRDP.

Caste:

Caste has no impact on availment of benefit, because every caste gets the nearly equal benefit. Score of various IRDP schemes inconcomitant with the availment of benefit score of Scheduled caste, Scheduled Tribe, Denotified Tribes, Nomadic Tribes and Special Backward Class were 10.02, 10.63, 10.16, 9.82 and 10.12, respectively (Table 2).

Size of family:

Size of family has the average score of availment of benefit for these variables which were 10.16 and 10.19 respectively. The one-way analysis of variance of these scores revealed non-significant difference incase of availment of benefit. Hence there was no difference between large and small families in respect of IRDP benefit availment (Table 2).

Occupation:

The average score of availment of benefit for occupation labour, caste occupation, business, cultivation and service were 10.24, 9.77, 10.04, 10.33 and 9.00, respectively. These scores revealed non-significant difference in availing the benefit *i.e.* each beneficiary from the occupation category has shown equal opportunity to avail the benefit from IRDP (Table 2).

Annual income:

The average scores of availment of benefit for annual income up to 4000, 4001 to 6000, 6001 to 8500 and 8501 and above were 10.08, 10.43, 9.59 and 10.04, respectively. The analysis of variance of these scores revealed non-significant *i.e.* annual income had not shown any effect on availment on benefit. Each category of the annual income group showed the same availment of benefit of

programme (Table 2).

Land holding:

The mean score of availment of benefit for land holding, landless labour, up to 1 ha, 1.1 to 2.0 ha and 2.1 and above were 10.62, 10.14, 9.71 and 10.20, respectively. The oneway analysis of variance expressed non-significant *i.e.* each beneficiary in land holding category availed the equal benefit from IRDP (Table 2).

Sources of information:

The average scores of sources of information low, medium and high categories with availment of benefit were 10.19, 10.22 and 9.89, respectively. The oneway analysis of variance of these scores revealed non-significant difference in case of availment of benefit *i.e.* every source of information under study was found to be equally useful for providing knowledge about IRDP among the beneficiaries (Table 2).

Social participation:

The average score of low, medium and high categories of social participation with availment of benefit were 10.26, 9.95 and 10.09, respectively. Social participation has no impact on availment of benefit, because every member of the social institution got nearly equal benefit score of various IRDP schemes, hence the impact of the variable social participation on achieving the benefit was not significant differential (Table 2).

Impact of education on IRDP benefits availment.

Table 3 reveals that, the availment of benefit for the education Illiterate, Can read only, Can read and write only, Primary School, Middle School, High School and College were 9.6, 10.40, 9.89, 11.37, 10.75, 47.50 and 11.55, respectively. The oneway analysis of variance of these scores showed non-significant difference in case of availment of benefit, means any special category of education did not show much impact of availing the

Table 3: Impact of education on IRDP benefits availment

| Sr. No. | Category | Mean | C.D. | Difference | F. value |
|---------|-------------------------|-------|------|------------|----------|
| 1. | Illiterate | 9.6 | - | - | |
| 2. | Can read only | 10.40 | - | 0.80 | |
| 3. | Can read and write only | 9.89 | 2.48 | 0.29 | |
| 4. | Primary School | 11.37 | 2.39 | 1.77 | 2.9136* |
| 5. | Middle School | 10.75 | 2.43 | 1.15 | |
| 6. | High School | 47.50 | 2.68 | 2.1 | |
| 7. | College | 11.55 | 2.39 | 1.95 | |

benefit. These findings resemble with that of Durajswami (1980), Naik (1981) and Madhumohan (1983).

Authors' affiliations:

N.D.DESHMUKH, Department of Extension Education, Marathwada Agricultural University, PARBHANI (M.S.) INDIA

REFERENCES

Durajswami, K. (1980). Integrated rural development programme. A beneficiary analysis. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis. University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore (Karnataka).

Madhumohan, A. (1983). Study of awareness and attitude of beneficiaries towards IRDP in Chittoor district of A.P. M.Sc.(Ag.) Thesis, Department of Extension Education, S. V. Agricultural College, Andhra Pradesh Agricultural University, Tirupati (A.P.)

Naik, M. Balram (1981). Awareness and attitude of farmers and extension workers towards Intensive Agricultural extension system (T&V) in Andhra Pradesh. M.Sc.(Ag.) Thesis, Department of Extension Education, S. V. Agricultural College, Andhra Pradesh Agricultural University, Tirupati (A.P.)

