

Availment of benefits of integrated rural development programme by 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. Twenty five villages were selected on the basis of highest recovery under IRDP. 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. Most of the IRDP beneficiaries availed medium benefits from IRDP. Cent per cent IRDP beneficiaries faced the constraint of delay in getting the benefits.

INTRODUCTION

In developing countries like India, the level and rate of national development is directly determined by the rural development as most of the population lives in villages. Therefore, many efforts have been made so far, for development of rural sector. But the results of these efforts are not satisfactory. Unless the weaker sections which form large proportion of the farming community are developed, the impact of overall development in agriculture will not be appreciable. Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP) was conceived and covered of 350 million (29.90 per cent) 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 per cent rural population and 257469 below poverty line families which were selected for implementing IRDP at initial stage. In the present study, attempt has been made to study the personal and socio- economic characteristics of IRDP beneficiaries, to assess the availment of benefits from IRDP by beneficiaries and to study the problems encountered by them in availment of benefits.

METHODOLOGY

The present investigation was conducted in Parbhani district as it has highest number of below poverty line families (67.75 per cent) in Marathwada *i.e.* 2, 57,464 families. Five blocks from the district namely, Gangakhed, Pathri, Sailu, 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 per cent (*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 statistically analysed the data with the help of frequency, percentage mean and standard deviation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of the present study have been discussed under following sub heads:

Key words :

Integrated rural development programme, Benefit availment, Beneficiaries

Accepted :
June, 2010

Profile of IRDP beneficiaries:**Age:**

It is observed from Table 1 that most of the IRDP beneficiaries were from young (45.50 per cent) and middle age category (38.50 per cent) and only 16.00 per cent were from old age category.

Sr. No.	Characteristic	Category	Frequency	Per cent
1.	Age	Young age	91	45.50
		Middle age	77	38.50
		Old age	32	16.00
2.	Education	Illiterate	25	12.50
		Can read only	36	18.00
		Can read and write only	50	25.00
		Primary School	37	18.00
		Middle School	27	13.50
		High School	23	11.50
		College	02	01.00
3.	Caste	Scheduled caste	44	22.00
		Scheduled tribe	11	05.50
		Denotified tribes	42	21.00
		Nomadic tribes	23	11.50
		Special backward class	80	40.00
		Others	00	00.00
4.	Size of family	Small family	128	64.0
		Large family	72	36.00
5.	Occupation	Labour Casta	33	16.50
		Occupation	45	22.50
		Business	43	21.50
		Cultivation	78	39.00
		Service	01	00.50
6.	Annual income (Rs.)	Up to 4000	66	33.00
		4001 to 6000	74	37.00
		6001 to 8500	37	18.50
		8501 and above	23	11.50
7.	Land holding	Landless labour	41	20.50
		UP to 1 ha.	56	28.00
		1.1 to 2.0 ha	60	30.00
		2.1 ha and above	43	21.50
8.	Sources of information	Low	46	23.00
		Medium	52	26.00
		High	102	51.00
9.	Social participation	Low	96	48.00
		Medium	50	25.00
		High	54	27.00

Education:

Most of the IRDP beneficiaries belonged to 'can read and write category' (25.00 per cent). Same portion of the sample *i.e.* 18.00 per cent were from 'can read only' and Primary School category. The 13.50 and 12.50 per cent beneficiaries belonged to Middle School and illiterate category respectively. Only 11.50 per cent beneficiaries possessed education upto High School level. Very few (01.00 per cent) beneficiaries had the College level education (Table 1).

Caste:

Forty per cent of the IRDP beneficiaries were from Special Backward class. Twenty two and 21.00 per cent beneficiaries belonged to Scheduled caste and Denotified Tribes, respectively, 11.50 per cent beneficiaries were from Nomadic Tribes. Only 05.50 per cent beneficiaries belonged to scheduled tribe (Table 1).

Size of family:

In respect of family, great majority of IRDP beneficiaries (64.00 per cent) belonged to small family while 36.00 per cent were from large family (Table 1).

Occupation:

From the total sample, 39.00 per cent of the IRDP beneficiaries were engaged in cultivation where as 22.50 per cent IRDP beneficiaries were engaged in caste occupation, 16.50 per cent IRDP beneficiaries were engaged as agricultural labour and 21.50 per cent IRDP beneficiaries were engaged in business and negligible beneficiaries (00.50 per cent) were found to be busy in service (Table 1).

Annual income:

Majority of IRDP beneficiaries (37.00 per cent) had annual income of Rs. 4001 to 6000 followed by 33.00 per cent IRDP beneficiaries having income up to Rs. 4000. Whereas, 18.50 per cent and 11.50 per cent of the IRDP beneficiaries had annual income from Rs. 6001 to 8500 and above Rs.8501, respectively (Table 1).

Land holding:

Thirty per cent of the IRDP beneficiaries had 1.1 to 2.0 ha. land, 28.00 per cent IRDP beneficiaries had land up to 1.0 ha, whereas 21.50 per cent IRDP beneficiaries were having 2.1 ha. and above land while 20.50 per cent IRDP beneficiaries were landless labour. Thus, almost all IRDP beneficiaries were small and marginal farmers (Table 1).

Table 2: Distribution of IRDP beneficiaries according to availment of benefits. (n=200)

Sr. No	Category	Gangakhed	Pathri	Selu	Purna	Parbhani	Total
1.	Low	11 (39.28)	10 (50.00)	16 (45.17)	21 (44.68)	30 (42.85)	52 (26.00)
2.	Medium	05 (17.85)	07 (35.00)	03 (8.57)	07 (14.89)	13 (18.57)	90 (45.00)
3.	High	12 (42.85)	03 (15.00)	16 (45.71)	19 (40.42)	27 (38.57)	58 (29.00)

* Figures in parenthesis indicate percentage

Sources of information:

Most of the IRDP beneficiaries (51.00 per cent) used high level of sources of information while 26.00 and 23.00 per cent of them used sources of information to the medium and low level, respectively (Table 1).

Social participation:

Majority of the IRDP beneficiaries (48.00 per cent) had low social participation, whereas 27.00 per cent and 25.00 per cent of the IRDP beneficiaries had high and medium social participation, respectively (Table 1).

Availment of benefits by IRDP beneficiaries:

From Table 2 it is observed that there was no variation in case of low availment of benefit of IRDP in each block, while in medium group, comparatively less beneficiaries (8.57 per cent) of Selu block belonged to this group and there was wide variation in Pathri block which belonged to a per cent of 35.00 while 45.71 per cent of IRDP beneficiaries of Selu block belonged to high availment of benefits. Only 15.00 per cent of Pathri block had high availment of benefits.

Overall 45.00 per cent of the IRDP beneficiaries were categorized into medium level of IRDP benefit availment. Near about 29.00 per cent were from high IRDP benefit availment category and 26.00 per cent belonged to low category of IRDP benefit availment. Similar findings were quoted by Padmanabhan (1990), Gajre (1992), Chouvan (1993) and Kaushik (1993).

Constraints faced by IRDP beneficiaries:

It could be observed from Table 3 that all the IRDP beneficiaries (100.00 per cent) have expressed delay in getting the benefit as a major constraint followed by non cooperative attitude of the officers experienced by 94.00 per cent IRDP beneficiaries. The 74.50 per cent IRDP beneficiaries noticed that high cost was required for getting the benefits while 55.00 per cent of them mentioned the inadequacy of supply of benefits sanctioned. Near about half of the respondents (51.00 per cent) suffered from the complex procedure involved in getting certificates and 21.50 per cent IRDP beneficiaries had reported the

Table 3 : Distribution of IRDP beneficiaries according to constraints faced by them in availment of benefits (n=200)

Sr. No.	Characteristics	Frequency	Per cent
1.	Delay in getting the benefit	200	100.00
2.	High cost of getting the benefit	149	74.50
3.	Complex procedure involved in getting certificates	102	51.00
4.	Inadequacy of technical guidance	27	13.50
5.	Inadequacy of supply of benefit sanctioned	110	55.00
6.	Non-cooperative attitude of officers	188	94.00
7.	Favoritism in the distribution of the benefit	43	21.50

favoritism in the distribution of benefits. Only 13.50 per cent IRDP beneficiaries faced constraint of inadequacy of technical guidance.

Authors' affiliations

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

REFERENCES

Chouvan, A.S. (1993). Credit utilization pattern among small and big farmers. *Indian J. Extn. Edu.*, **14**(1&2): 50-52.

Gajre, S.S. (1992). Evaluation of IRDP in Parbhani district. Ph.D. Thesis, Marathwada Agricultural University, Parbhani. (M.S.)

Kaushik, Amar Chand (1993). Income generating effect of rural credit. A case study of IRDP in Haryana J. Rural Development, **12** (1): 89-120.

Padmanabhan, M. (1990). Income generation process under IRDP. *J. Rural Development*, **9** (1): 181-183.

