

Socio economic impact of IRDP programme on dairy farmers

R. VELUSAMY AND R. NETAJI SEETHARAMAN

Dept. of Agricultural Extension and Rural Sociology, Tamil Nadu Agrl. Univ., Coimbatore-641 003

Abstract : The study was conducted to know the impact of poverty alleviation programme on dairy farmers. The study revealed that slight changes were noticed in food habits, income, extent of employment and personal changes among the 16 socio-economic dimensions studied. There was not much impact in other dimensions studied.

Key words: Impact, Dairy farmers, Poverty alleviation programmes.

Introduction

India is the largest democracy and the second largest populous country in the world. As per 1991 census, out of 84.43 crore population, 62.71 crore live in rural areas covering 73.90 per cent. Several rural development and poverty alleviation programmes have been formulated and implemented since the beginning of the five-year plans in the country. Despite the enormous efforts taken with regard to removing poverty and unemployment not much progress could be made. The absolute number of rural poor people has been increasing every year at an alarming pace. Periodical evaluation of any programme would bring valuable data which could be used in modifying the on going development programmes. Keeping this in view the study was taken with the following objective:

“To assess the socioeconomic changes occurred among the beneficiaries of IRDP due to poverty alleviation programmes”

Materials and Methods

The study was conducted with 90 milch animal rearing IRDP beneficiaries in Namakkal and Sivaganga districts of Tamil Nadu. The socio-economic changes were studied in 16 socio-economic dimensions.

The respondents were asked to indicate the level at which they were prior to participation in poverty alleviation programmes and the level at which they stand at present. The difference between the then level and the present level was taken as quantum of change due to participation. Percentage analysis and cumulative frequency were used to categorize the beneficiaries according to socio-economic changes.

Results and Discussion

The results related to 16 dimensions of socio economic changes of beneficiaries are presented in Table-1.

I. Food Habits

The results from the Table 1 revealed that 48.89 per cent of beneficiaries had changed their type of food from cumbu/cholam and rice combination to rice food alone. Regarding number of times food taken/day no change was noticed as all the beneficiaries reported they were taking 3 times food a day even before participation in poverty alleviation programmes. There was no change in frequency of meat taken. The prevailing high cost of meat may be the factor restricting the changes in meat eating behaviour. Majority of the beneficiaries were in the habit of taking tea or coffee more than two times a day. Regarding consumption of eggs, nearly 54 per cent of the beneficiaries reported that they not at all eat eggs.

II. Dressing Pattern

Regarding dressing pattern, cent per cent of beneficiaries have used both cotton and synthetic type of cloth both before and after participation in the programmes. Regarding the use of ready-made dress were only 1.11 per cent prior to their participation and the percentage has increased to 79.11 after the participation. The availability of numerous designs and styles in the readymade dress at comparatively cheaper rate would have influenced to the increased use of readymade dresses.

It could be observed from the Table that considerable change had taken place regarding expenditure on dress. The expenditure on dresses

was found to range from Rs. 1,500/- to 4,000/- with more than 55 per cent of the beneficiaries after their participation.

This findings support from the findings of Balasubramanian (1981), Surendran (1981) and Joseph (1987). They reported that considerable percentage of beneficiaries had changed their dressing pattern.

III. Housing

The results show that cent per cent of beneficiaries continued to live in their own houses then and now. Regarding type of house owned there were only marginal changes in the case of mud walled plus tiled house. The beneficiaries were also not able to improve the type of floor from mud floor to cement or mosaic floor. Regarding the use of electricity, 97.78 per cent have reported that they were using it for a long time even before participation in the poverty alleviation programmes. This finding contradicts that of Verma (1986), who noticed that 18 per cent of IRDP beneficiaries did not own any house.

IV. Health care

As could be seen from the Table that all the beneficiaries were found to practice self-medication for minor health problems. Fifty two per cent of the beneficiaries reported that they used to take treatment with medically unqualified persons available locally both before and after their participation in poverty alleviation programmes. Above findings clearly indicate that the rural people have not changed their health care behaviour due to their participation.

V. Education to children

It could be seen from the Table that nearly one fifth of the beneficiaries were sending their children to school outside the village after participating in the poverty alleviation programmes. It was also noticed that only one beneficiary has sent one of his children to college.

VI. Occupation and Employment

On the whole, six different occupational types were considered. Changes were not noticed in farming + wage earners, and farming. Slight changes were noticed in wage earners, business and services.

Regarding changes in the extent of employment due to involvement in poverty alleviation programmes, there were slight changes in number of days of employment per month. The percentage of changes in extent of employment was 1.11. The finding derives support from the findings of Malyadri (1985) and Singh (1988). They reported that the beneficiaries of IRDP had changed in their occupation and days of employment.

VII. Income and Savings

Most important item in socio economic changes is increasing income due to involvement in poverty alleviation programmes. It could be observed from the Table that the monthly income of the beneficiaries prior to their participation was ranging from Rs. 500 to 1,000 per month. Their income level has gone up to Rs. 2,000 per month. It was also noticed that 11.11 per cent of beneficiaries have cleared the debts.

It could also be observed from the Table that 1.11 per cent of beneficiaries saved Rs.15,000 after participation in poverty alleviation programmes. This finding is in line with the findings of Damodarsharma (1989), who reported that the assets provided for IRDP beneficiaries had helped in the generation of more income.

VIII. Personal changes

It could be seen from the Table that cent per cent and 97.78 per cent beneficiaries got changes in outside contact and opportunity to know on going development programmes respectively due to involvement in poverty alleviation programmes. This may due to the necessity to meet the development officials in nearby town or city. In the case of respect from family members, respect from others, expenditure on ceremonies, festivals and children's education much changes were not noticed.

IX. Economic changes

The economic changes of beneficiaries was assessed in the dimensions of changes in farm status, farm power status and material status. It could be seen from the Table that there was no changes in farm status and 12.22 per cent of them had got high-level changed in farm power status. About 3 per cent of the beneficiaries were found to have increased the material status at high level.

Table 1. Distribution of beneficiaries according to their socio-economic changes (n=90).

Sl.No.	Contents	Before	Now	Sl.No.	Contents	Before	Now
I.	Food Habits			F.	Meat (days interval)		
A.	Type of food			1.	5-10	30 (33.33)	30 (33.33)
1.	Cumbu, Cholan	-	-	2.	10-15	18 (20.00)	18 (20.00)
2.	Cumbu, Cholan & rice	65 (72.22)	21 (23.33)	3.	15-20	34 (37.78)	34 (37.78)
3.	Rice alone	25 (27.98)	68 (75.56)	4.	20-25	8 (8.89)	8 (8.89)
4.	Rice and Wheat	-	1 (1.11)				
B.	Number of times food taken			G.	Tea and Coffee		
1.	Three times	90 (100)	90 (100)	1.	NIL	35 (38.99)	31 (34.44)
2.	Two times	-	-	2.	Two times	54 (60.00)	57 (63.34)
C.	Milk/day			3.	More than two times	1 (1.11)	2 (2.22)
1.	NIL	25 (27.78)	16 (17.78)	II.	Dressing pattern		
2.	1/2 lit	41	50	A.	Type of dress		
3.	1 lit	19 (21.11)	17 (18.89)	1.	Cotton	-	-
4.	1 1/2 lit	4 (4.44)	6 (6.66)	2.	Cotton & synthetic	90 (100.00)	90 (100.00)
5.	2 lit	1 (1.11)	1 (1.11)	B.	Ready made dress used	1 (1.11)	79 (87.78)
D.	Vegetables			C.	No.of dress possessed/ Individual		
1.	One	-	-	1.	1-2 No	2 (2.22)	-
2.	Two	50 (55.56)	29 (32.22)	2.	3-4 No	86 (95.56)	28 (31.11)
3.	Three	35 (38.89)	56 (62.23)	3.	5-6 No	2 (2.22)	60 (66.67)
4.	Four	5 (5.55)	5 (5.55)	4.	7-8 No	-	2 (2.22)
E.	Egg (No/month)			D.	Expenditure on dress (Rs./Yr)		
1.	NIL	54 (60.00)	54 (60.00)	1.	500-1000	30 (33.33)	2 (2.22)
2.	0-5	7 (7.78)	4 (4.44)	2.	1000-1500	31 (34.45)	25 (27.78)
3.	5-10	25 (27.78)	25 (27.78)	3.	1500-2000	19 (21.11)	32 (35.56)
4.	10-15	-	1 (1.11)				
5.	35-40	3 (3.33)	5 (5.56)				
6.	60	1 (1.11)	1 (1.11)				

Sl.No.	Contents	Before	Now	Sl.No.	Contents	Before	Now
4.	2000-2500	9 (10.0)	19 (21.11)	2.	Local treatment		
5.	2500-3000	1 (1.11)	11 (12.22)	a.	Unqualified person	52 (57.78)	52 (57.78)
6.	3000-3500	-	1 (1.11)	b.	Qualified person	90 (100)	90 (100)
III.	Housing			3.	Outside treatment		
A.	House			a.	Government Hospital	43 (47.78)	43 (47.78)
1.	Own house	90 (100)	90 (100)	b.	Private Hospital	82 (91.1)	82 (91.1)
2.	Rented house	-	-	V.	Education to children		
3.	Landlards, farm, sheds	-	-	1.	Children sent to local school	78 (86.67)	74 (82.22)
B.	House Type			2.	Children sent to school outside the village	3 (3.33)	20 (22.22)
1.	Mudwalled + Thatched house	15 (16.67)	15 (16.67)	3.	Children sent to college	1 (1.11)	1 (1.11)
2.	Mudwalled + Tiled house	23 (25.56)	21 (23.33)	VI.	Occupation		
3.	Brickwalled + Tiled house	44 (48.89)	45 (50)	1.	Wage earners	48 (53.33)	46 (51.11)
4.	Brickwalled + Concrete roof	8 (8.88)	9 (10)	2.	Farming+ Wage earners	12 (13.33)	12 (13.33)
C.	Floor			3.	Farming	28 (31.12)	28 (31.12)
1.	Mud floor	14 (15.56)	14 (15.56)	4.	Business	2 (2.22)	3 (3.33)
2.	Cement floor	74 (82.22)	74 (82.22)	5.	Services	- (1.11)	1
3.	Mosaic floor	2 (2.22)	2 (2.22)	6.	Farming + business	-	-
D.	Electricity			Employment days/month			
1.	Electrified house	88 (97.78)	88 (97.78)	1.	0-5	32 (35.56)	32 (35.56)
2.	Unelectrified house	2 (2.22)	2 (2.22)	2.	5-10	-	-
E.	Latrine facility			3.	10-15	23 (25.56)	23 (25.56)
1.	House with Latrine facility	-	-	4.	15-20	20 (22.22)	19 (21.11)
2.	House without latrine facility	90 (100)	90 (100)	5.	20-25	12 (13.33)	13 (14.44)
IV.	Health care			6.	25-30	3 (3.33)	3 (3.33)
1.	Self medication	90 (100)	90 (100)				

Sl.No.	Contents	Before	Now	Sl.No.	Contents	Before	Now
VII.	Income and savings			10.	Visit to temple and other tourist places	81 (90)	81 (90)
A.	Income (Rs. per month)			11.	Purchased household articles	3 (3.33)	31 (34.44)
1.	Upto 500	19 (21.11)	1 (1.11)	12.	Vehicles purchased	-	5 (5.56)
2.	500-1000	71 (78.89)	76 (84.45)	13.	Narcotics and beverages	71 (78.89)	71 (78.89)
3.	1000-1500	-	12 (13.33)	IX.	Economic changes		
4.	1500-2000	-	1 (1.11)	A.	Farm status		
B.	Debts cleared			1.	Low	50 (55.56)	50 (55.56)
1.	Upto 5000	-	7 (7.77)	2.	Medium	21 (23.33)	21 (23.33)
2.	5000-10000	-	3 (3.33)	3.	High	19 (21.11)	19 (21.11)
C.	Savings			B.	Farm power status		
1.	5000	-	1 (1.11)	1.	Low	59 (65.56)	48 (53.34)
2.	10000	1 (1.11)	2 (2.22)	2.	Medium	21 (23.33)	21 (23.33)
3.	15000	-	1 (1.11)	3.	High	10 (11.11)	21 (23.33)
VIII	Personal changes			C.	Material status		
1.	Outside contact	-	90 (100)	1.	Low	35 (38.89)	32 (35.56)
2.	Social participation	38 (42.22)	82 (91.11)	2.	Medium	40 (44.44)	40 (44.44)
3.	Respect from family members	90 (100)	90 (100)	3.	High	15 (16.67)	17 (20)
4.	Respect from others	86 (95.56)	90 (100)	X.	Involvement and contribution for community activities		
5.	Opportunity to know more about ongoing devpmt. programme	2 (2.22)	90 (100)	1.	Low	90 (100)	90 (100)
6.	Expenditure on ceremonies	90 (100)	90 (100)	2.	Medium		
7.	Expenditure on festival	90 (100)	90 (100)	3.	High		
8.	Expenditure to children's education	87 (96.67)	88 (97.78)	XI.	Opinion about Government Programmes		
9.	Expenditure on recreation	5 (5.56)	17 (18.89)	1.	Positive	80 (88.89)	89 (98.89)
				2.	Negative	10 (11.11)	1 (1.11)

Sl.No. Contents	Before	Now	Sl.No. Contents	Before	Now
XII. Distance travelled			3. High	10 (11.11)	11 (12.22)
1. Short	90 (100)	90 (100)	XV. Media participation		
2. Medium	-	-	1. Low	20 (22.22)	19 (21.11)
3. Long	-	-	2. Medium	44 (48.89)	43 (47.78)
XIII. Contact with development personnel			3. High	26 (28.89)	28 (31.11)
1. Low	11 (12.22)	1 (1.11)	XVI. Socio economic status		
2. Medium	59 (65.56)	74 (82.22)	1. High SES	-	-
3. High	20 (22.22)	15 (16.67)	2. Upper middle SES	-	-
XIV. Social participation			3. Middle SES	15 (16.67)	18 (20)
1. Low	31 (34.44)	31 (34.44)	4. Lower middle SES	66 (73.33)	67 (74.44)
2. Medium	49 (54.45)	48 (53.34)	5. Low SES	9 (10)	5 (5.56)

X. Involvement and contribution for community activities

The involvement and contribution remained same at low level before and after their participation. This category of rural poor who formed the beneficiaries for this study almost belong to scheduled castes and scheduled tribes with no social participation.

XI. Opinion about government programmes

It could be seen from the Table that 10 per cent of the beneficiaries had changed their attitude from negative to positive towards poverty alleviation programmes after their participation.

XII. Distance travelled

The distance travelled by the beneficiaries in connection with their job was measured. It was found to be short for 100 per cent of beneficiaries both before and after their participation.

XIII. Contact with development personnel

In addition to impact on economic aspects, the impact on the item contact with development personnel was also assessed. It could be observed

from the Table that compared to their earlier level of contact with development personnel, the present level was marginally decreased in low and high categories.

XIV. Social participation

It could be observed from the Table that the beneficiaries had not changed much in their social participation prior to and after their involvement in the poverty alleviation programmes. This category of people that is the beneficiaries of IRDP are of the poor, they normally do not aspire for occupying positions in any village institutions like village panchayat, co-operative societies, etc.

XV. Media participation

It could be observed from the Table that there was a slight increase in low and high-level media participation, but there was a reduction among the medium level of media participation.

XVI. Socio-economic status

The standard of living is judged considering number of indicators which go to measure the socio-economic status. The scale developed by

Mansingh (1993) had 8 major components with number of sub item to measure the socio-economic status.

It could be seen from the Table that 1.11 and 3.33 per cent of beneficiaries from low socio-economic category have moved to lower middle and middle socio-economic status category respectively after their participation in poverty alleviation programme.

Conclusions

The study concluded that, out of 16 socio economic dimensions considered, slight changes were noticed in food habits, income, extent of employment and personal changes. Poverty alleviation programmes not created much changes in all other aspects of socio-economic dimensions, particularly in the socio economic status. The Government officials need to take necessary steps to modify the programmes to increase the chances for getting high income.

References

- Balasubramanian, U.A. (1981). An analysis of Socio-Technological gap in Lab to land programme. Res. Bulletin, TNAU, Coimbatore.
- Damodarsharma. (1989). Implementation of IRDP in Ganganagar District of Rajasthan. *J Rural Dev.* 8: 109-112.
- Joseph Revu. (1987). Impact of Lab to Land Programme on Tribal beneficiaries. Unpub. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, TNAU, Coimbatore.
- Malyadri, P. (1985). Teysem and self-employment in Rural Areas: The malady and remedy. *Rural India.* 48: 32-36.
- Mansingh, J. Paul. (1993). Construction and standardization of socio economic status scale. Unpub. Ph.D. Thesis, TNAU, Colmbatore.
- Singh, V.S. (1988). Poverty alleviation programmes in operation: An assessment. *Kurukshetra.* 37: 26-27.
- Surendran, R. (1981). Participation of Todas in Agricultural Development programme. Unpub. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, TNAU, Coimbatore.
- Verma, G.L. (1986). Women beneficiaries and IRDP. *J. Rural Dev.* 5: 437-479.

(Received : December 2000; Revised : June 2002)