



IMPACT OF "SPECIAL PACKAGE" TOWARDS HOPE GENERATION AND DISASTER MANAGEMENT TO IMPROVE SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF DISTRESSED FARMERS

Dr. G. U. Kaluse, SMS (AHDS) Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Hivara Gondia

Dr. D. R. Ambulkar, Head, Professor, PGIVAS, Akola

G. R. Khedikar, Lab Technician, Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Hivara Gondia

Received: 03/07/2017

Edited: 13/07/2017

Accepted: 22/07/2017

Abstract: In Maharashtra state, increasing incidence of farmers suicides was an issue of great concern because Maharashtra has recorded the highest number i.e 4453 farmers suicides in the country. During last five years period the incidences of suicides of farmers have increased tremendously. Since, from January 2001 to July 2008 (www.vnssmission.gov.in). The percentage of suicides of farmers is more in six districts of Vidarbha region as compared to other districts of Maharashtra state. These districts are Yeotmal, Amravati, Buldana, Akola, Washim and Wardha hence, special package has been implemented in six distressed districts of Vidarbha region. Milch crossbreds and buffaloes are supplied in Wardha district through various SHGs in distressed villages of central zone of Vidarbha.

The single most striking fact in the whole issue that the overwhelming majority of those committing suicide is of cotton farmers. Other reasons for suicides were indebtedness 93%, economic downfall 74%, conflict in family 55%, crop failure 41%, dent in social status 36%, daughters/sisters marriage 34%, addiction 28%, health problems 21%, and most of the suicides were because of combination of more than one factor, included economic distress, crop failure, alcoholism, marital and domestic discard, drug addiction, etc. (Gill Anita and Singh, 2006).

Key words: Vidarbha, Farmers, Suicides, Package etc.

In Maharashtra state, increasing incidence of farmers suicides was an issue of great concern because maharashtra has recorded the heightst number i. e 4453 farmers suicides in the country. during last five years period the incidences of suicides of farmers have increased tremendously. Since, from January 2001 to July 2008 (www.vnssmission.gov.in). The percentage of suicides of farmers is more in six districts of Vidarbha region as compared to other districts of Maharashtra state. These districts are Yeotmal, Amravati, Buldana, Akola, Washim and Wardha.

Farmers suicides have been receiving a lot of social public and political attention, particularly in states of Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Punjab and Maharashtra. The reasons for suicides were indebtedness 93%, economic downfall 74%, conflict in family 55%, crop failure 41%, dent in social status 36%, daughters/sisters marriage 34%, addiction

28%, health problems 21%, and most of the suicides were because of combination of more than one factor, included economic distress, crop failure, alcoholism, marital and domestic discard, drug addiction, etc. (Gill Anita and Singh, 2006).

Responding to farmers suicides Prime Minister visited to distressed districts. He announced a "Special Package" of Rs. 3750 crore including a write off Rs. 712 crore over due interest for drought hit Vidarbha that witnessed a spate of suicides by debt ridden farmers. The package also includes rescheduling of Rs. 1,296 crore agricultural credit over a period of 3-5 years with one year moratorium in the six drought affected districts of Vidarbha. The package was also be supplemented by Rs. 225 crore for the National Horticulture Mission and Rs. 135 crore subsidiary income through livestock, Cattle and fodder. The package had also provided Rs. 240 crore for water harvesting and construction of check dams

in these districts. Package also allocated Rs. 2,177 crore from the Centre Government for completion of major medium and minor irrigation projects in the affected six districts of Vidarbha. The Prime Minister said a cell would be set up of monitor implementation for the package and the government would take an overall view of such problems in country observing that the rural indebtedness was a countrywide problem, he said the proposed group would go into the matter and come with a concrete solutions.

Material and Methods:

The chapter deals with the detail of research method and procedure followed by the researcher while conducting the present study entitled "Impact of special package towards Hope Generation and Disaster Management in central zone of Vidarbha with special reference to animal husbandry practices. While conducting the present study. This chapter is presented in following parts.

1.1 Area of study

Wardha district from the central zone of Vidarbha is selected for the present study.

1.1.1 Topography

a) Wardha

The wardha district is located on the north - eastern side of maharashtra state. The district formed

part of nagpur district till 1962; subsequently it was made a separate district. Wardha district lies between 20° - 18' north and 21° - 21' North latitudes and 78° - 4' east to 79° - 15' East latitudes. It is bounded on west and north by Amravati district. On south, by Yeotmal district, on the south east by Chandrapur district and on the east by nagpur district.

The average annual rainfall in the district 1090.3 mm, out of which 87% is receiving during June to September.

1.1.2 Climate

a) Wardha

The general climate of wardha district is hot summer and general dryness through the year except during the south east monsoon when the humidity is above 60%. During the May hottest month of year, the average maximum temperature has been recorded at 42°C and the average minimum at 28°C. December is the coldest month with average maximum temperature of 28°C and average minimum of 15°C.

1.2 Method of sampling and selection of SHG's

Present study was conducted on wardha districts in central zone of Vidarbha. Ten SHG's from different tehsils of wardha districts were selected for above study. Total ten SHG's were selected and presented as follows,

Selection of villages and SHG's

Sr. No.	Name of SHG's	Village	Tahasil	District
1.	Mahatma Phule Shetkari Bachat Gat	Nandora	Wardha	Wardha
2.	Niranjan Maharaj Shetkari Bachat Gat	Umri (meghe)	Wardha	Wardha
3.	Rashtrasanta Tukdoji Maharaj Bachat Gat	Mahakal	Wardha	Wardha
4.	Swavyalambi Shetkari Bachat Gat	Sirasgaon	Wardha	Wardha
5.	Jai Shivaji Shetkari Bachat Gat	Chinchala	Deoli	Wardha
6.	Chintamani Shetkari Bachat Gat	Deoli	Deoli	Wardha
7.	Sadbhavana Shetkari Bachat Gat	Nachangaon	Deoli	Wardha
8.	Shivaji Maharaj swayam Sahayata Bachat Gat	Antargaon	Seloo	Wardha
9.	Kamdhenu Shetkari Bachat Gat	Ghorad	Seloo	Wardha
10.	Ekta Shetkari swayam Sahayata Bachat Gat.	Wahitpur	Seloo	Wardha

The crossbreds were supplied to above selected SHG's as well as buffaloes were also supplied to same SHG's through special package.

Non-beneficiaries were selected from the same village's as a control group and number of beneficiaries and number of crossbreds and buffaloes supplied under special package presented as follows,

Number of beneficiaries and crossbred and buffaloes supplied under special package

No. of SHG's	No. of beneficiaries	Crossbred supplied	Buffalo supplied	Total
1	10	1 = 10	1 = 10	20
2	10	1 = 10	1 = 10	20
3	10	1 = 10	1 = 10	20
4	10	2 = 20	-	20
5	10	2 = 20	-	20
6	10	1 = 10	1 = 10	20
7	10	1 = 10	1 = 10	20
8	10	1 = 10	1 = 10	20
9	10	1 = 10	1 = 10	20
10	10	2 = 20	-	20
Total	100	130	70	200

1.3 Parameters studied

The following parameters were studied during research work.

1.3.1 Socio economic status of beneficiaries and non beneficiaries

The socio-economic status has been operationally defined as the position of an individual farmers with reference to prevailing average standard of living or cultural position, effective income, material possession and participation in group activities of community. Socio-economic status of beneficiaries and non beneficiaries was studied considering following variables.

i) Education

The education refers to the number of years of schooling undergone by the beneficiaries and non beneficiaries and the standard passed by them. The education of beneficiaries and non beneficiaries was recorded on direct questioning and categorized as under.

Category	Educational level
1) Illiterate	No Schooling
2) Primary	Upto 4 th Std.
3) Secondary	5 th Std. to 10 th Std.
4) Higher secondary	11 th St. to 12 th Std.
5) College level (UG/PG)	Graduation and above

ii) Family size

The family size refers to the total numbers of family members of beneficiaries and non beneficiaries living together. The responses were recorded by direct questioning and categorized as under.

Category	Family members
1) Small	1 - 3 members
2) Medium	4 - 6 members
3) Large	Above 6 members

iii) Family type

The family type refers to the type of family of beneficiaries and non beneficiaries living together or separately.

The responses were recorded by direct questioning and categorized as under.

Category	Family Type
1) Joint	Living together
2) Nuclear	Living seperately

iv) Land holding

It refers to the total cultivable land area owned by the beneficiaries and non beneficiaries measured in acres. The responses were measured on direct questioning and categorized as follows.

Category	Land size
1) Landless	No land
2) Marginal	1 - 5 acre
3) Small farmers	Above 5 acre

v) Type of land

The land type refers to the land whether irrigation facilities available or not.

The responses were measured on direct questioning and categorization was done as follows.

Category	Land type
1) Irrigated	With irrigation
2) Non-irrigated	No irrigation

vi) Herd size

It refers to total number of animals belonging to beneficiaries of SHG's as well as non-beneficiaries. The categorization was done as under.

Category	Standards (animals)
1) Small Herd size	1 to 3
2) Medium Herd size	4 to 7
3) Large Herd size	8 and above

vii) Annual income

The total annual income refers to the total income of beneficiaries as well as non beneficiaries in rupees derived from main occupation and sub occupation and dairy occupation within a year. The total annual income was calculated on the basis of income derived from agriculture, dairy farming, business and others on the basis of information provided by farmers. The categorization was done as under.

Category	Total annual income (Rs.)
1) Low	Upto 10,000
2) Medium	10,001 to 25,000
3) High	25,001 and above

1.4 Tabulation and statistical analysis of data

After the data collection, the data was carefully tabulated. The data collected from beneficiaries and non beneficiaries was transformed firstly into primary tables and subsequently into secondary tables, each schedule was examined carefully, classified and grouped under the broad heads and their total number and percentage with

knowledge and adoption of managerial practices were worked out for the interpretation.

Statistical analysis was carried out by Chi square (X^2) and Factorial Completely Randomized Design (FCRD) as described by Snedecor and Cochran (1994).

Results and Discussion:

The data was collected by adopting the procedure presented earlier in methodology, it was subjected to statistical analysis in accordance with the study objectives. The results so obtained from analysis of data along with discussion thereon have been presented in this chapter, under the following heads.

2.1 Socio-economic status of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries

2.2 Impact of special package on socio-economic status, and hope generation and disaster management

2.1 Socio-economic status of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries

The study of socio-economic status was made with reference to education, family size, family type, land holding, land type, herd size and annual income. The data in this regard have been presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Socio-economic status of beneficiaries and non beneficiaries

Sr. No.	Category Particular	Beneficiaries		Non-Beneficiaries		X ² values
		Number	%	Number	%	
1)	Education					17.768**
	Illiterate	2	2	18	18	
	Primary	28	28	34	34	
	Secondary	56	56	38	38	
	Higher Sec. College level	10 4	10 4	8 2	8 2	
2)	Family size					1.936 ^{NS}
	Small (1 to 3 members)	12	12	19	19	
	Medium (4 to 6 members) Large (6 and above)	56 32	56 32	50 31	50 31	
3)	Family type					9.408*
	Joint Nuclear	73 27	73 27	52 48	52 48	
4)	Land type					0.462 ^{NS}
	Irrigated Non irrigated	18 82	18 82	12 72	12 72	
5)	Land holding					15.599*
	Landless	4	4	17	17	
	Marginal (1 to 5 acre)	52	52	29	29	
	Small farmers (above 5 acres)	44	44	54	54	

6)	Herd size					
	Small (1 to 3)	13	13	42	42	21.130*
	Medium (4 to 7)	76	76	50	50	
Large (8 and above)	11	11	8	8		
7)	Annual income					
	Low (upto 10,000)	9	9	20	20	19.385*
	Medium (10,001 to 25,000)	23	23	43	43	
High (25,001 and above)	68	68	37	37		

** Significant at 1% level

NS = Non-significant

2.1.1 Education

It is observed from Table 1 and Fig. 1, that about 98% of farmers from beneficiaries were literate, and less than five per cent of farmers were illiterate a very few farmers from both the groups had attended college level education (less than 4%).

There was significant difference among beneficiaries and non beneficiaries regarding the educational standard of farmers.

The above findings are not comparable with the findings of Rajendra Kumar *et al.* (1999) reported that intermediate (33.89%), (22%) upto secondary school level, and graduation and above (16.67%) of the remaining only 5.55 per cent had studied upto primary level.

2.1.2 Family size

The majority of beneficiaries and non beneficiaries had medium family size (4 to 6 members) more than 80 per cent had medium size families. Only 5 per cent of families from both groups had large family size. There was non significant difference among beneficiaries and non beneficiaries, with respect to family size.

Above findings are in accordance to findings of Bangar (1982) observed that 65 per cent of member farmers of dairy co-operative society were from the category of 6 and above. The above findings are comparable to findings of Raut *et al.* (1985) reported percentage of small and large size i.e. 23.33 per cent and 32.78 per cent and medium size more than 43.89.

2.1.3 Family type

It is observed from Table 1 and Fig. 1 that majority of farmers from beneficiaries as well as non

beneficiaries group had joint type families however there was significant difference among beneficiaries and non beneficiaries in this regards.

Above findings are contradictory to findings of Muthaya *et al.* (1983) and Bhanja and Venkaladari (1987) both found majority of families were of nuclear type.

2.1.4 Land holding

Maximum number of farmers from beneficiaries as well as non beneficiaries group were having less than 5 acres of land (50 to 61%) followed by small farmers having 5 to 10 acres of land and only 7 to 8 per cent farmers were landless labourers.

The above findings are in accordance to findings of Sawant (1994) observed majority of the respondents are land holding upto 1 to 2 hectares.

2.1.5 Land type

It is observed from Table 1 and Fig. 1 that there was no significant difference as far as irrigation facilities to farmers is concern, majority of farmers from both groups i.e. beneficiaries as well as non beneficiaries were having non irrigated type of land (51.88% and 61% respectively).

Above observation are in accordance to findings of Singh (1993) who found majority of dairy farmers had rainfed and 27 per cent irrigated type of land.

2.1.6 Herd size

It is observed from Table 1 and Fig. 1, that 76 per cent of farmers from beneficiaries group a 50 per cent of farmers form non beneficiaries group were having medium herd size and very few beneficiaries (6.60 per cent) had small herd. However more number of non beneficiaries were having small

herd size, there was highly significant difference ($P < 0.01$) with respect to herd size among beneficiaries and non beneficiaries.

The above findings are comparable to findings of Aware (1987). He observed that majority of respondents were having medium size, more than 76 per cent.

2.1.7 Annual income

It is observed from Table 1 and Fig. 1 maximum numbers of beneficiaries were having medium to high annual income however the non beneficiaries were having medium to low income. There was highly significant difference ($P < 0.01$) among beneficiaries and non beneficiaries with respect to annual income. Higher annual income recorded in beneficiaries group might be due to income generated through supply of milch crossbreds through the SHG's.

The above findings were comparable to findings of Sant (1998) revealed that majority of dairy farmers had total annual income Rs. 25, 001 to Rs. 50, 000.

2.2 Impact of special package on socio-economic status, hope generation and disaster management

The Government had launched “special package” to provide immediate assistance to the families of distress farmers through supply of dairy animals, through various SHG's to improve milk production and it to improve socio-economic status of distress families in six districts. Through this special package crossbred animals were distributed to distress farmers through SHG's. The beneficiaries of SHG's were contacted personally to record their opinions regarding impact of this special package in central zone of Vidarbha i.e. Amravati and Yeotmal districts. There views are summarized and presented in Table 2 and Fig. 10. It was observed that maximum numbers of beneficiaries were influenced by the special package and there was substantial improvement in their socio-economic status and building of confidence among the farmers for livelihood security. The A.H. package was also useful to motivate the other farmers to adopt animal husbandry enterprises as a supplementary/ complimentary option for livelihood security and sustainable rural development.

Table 2: Impact of special package on socio-economic status, hope generation and disaster management

Sr. No.	Type of impact	Category	Beneficiaries	
			Number	Per cent
1)	Improvement in economic status of farmers/ beneficiaries		60	40
2)	Improvement in social status		62	38
3)	Building of confidence in farmers		68	32
4)	Motivation of other farmers to adoption A.H. enterprises		65	35
5)	Ray of hope for sustainable development		80	20

Above finding are in consonance to findings of Kore (2005), who studied the economic impact of SHG's on it members, and Shinde *et al.* (1997), who

reported that impact of dairy development programme on socio-economic status of respondents was positive and significant.

References:

Aware (1987) observed that, 43 per cent of the respondents had upto 7, while 31 per cent had 8 to 11 numbers of head of livestock. More than one fourth (26%) of them had 12 and above number of heads of livestock on an average, the respondents had ten number of animals.

- Bangar (1982) observed that 65 per cent of the member farmers of dairy co-operative society were from the category of 6 members and above, while 35 per cent belonged to family size of 5 members only.
- Bhamare (2006) reported that, 35.83 per cent SHG members were educated upto secondary school level, while 28.33 per cent respondents were illiterate, followed by 25.00 per cent the respondents were educated upto primary school level. About 8.00 per cent of the respondents were able to read and write only. Very negligible percentage of SHG members (2.51 %) were educated upto higher secondary school level and no any SHG member was educated upto graduate or post graduate level.
- Bhanja and Venkatadari (1987) conducted a study on profile of dairy cattle beneficiaries under IRDP in Orissa and Hariyana states. They reported that 77.25 per cent of the beneficiaries belonged to nuclear family.
- Bhokare (2000) reported that, 20, 45 and 25.5 per cent members of dairy co-operative had rainfed, rainfed + irrigated and irrigated of agricultural land, while it was 25.33, 45.34 and 11.33 per cent for non-members of dairy co-operative respectively.
- Deshpande (1996) revealed that, majority of the respondents rural women (48.42%) had medium income, followed by 26.31 per cent and 25.26 per cent of the respondents who had low and high income groups, respectively.
- Dongonkar *et al.* (1986) found that majority (50.00%) of the respondents had i.e. medium level of socio-economic status followed by high and low level of socio-economic status i.e. 40.00 per cent and 10.00 per cent respectively.
- Gajare (1992) observed that dairy unit is the most profitable scheme for adopting secondary occupation and raising the income level of beneficiaries and also observed that majority of respondents were from low socio-economic status category.
- Khandare (2002) observed that, 35.00 per cent of respondents were educated upto middle school level education while 24.7 per cent were educated upto to high school level where as 15.00 per cent upto college level of education and very less (8.33%) were illiterate.
- Kingaokar (1989) reported that, 60.00 per cent and 53.33 per cent beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries were from large families. The small families were observed in case of 40 per cent beneficiaries and 46 per cent non-beneficiaries.
- Kumbhar (2003) reported that, 39.17 per cent of the respondents were educated upto primary school level while 28.33 per cent of the respondents were educated upto middle school level and by 15.00 per cent of the respondents were illiterate.
- Mahipal and Kherde (1988) reported that socio-economic status was found to be positive and significant relationship with the adoption of breeding and management practices of landless farm laborers.
- Muthaya *et al.* (1983) observed that, most of respondents i.e. 85.00 per cent belonged to nuclear family.
- Raut *et al.* (1985) in his study reported that, the percentage of member farmers in the category of medium size family was observed to be more (43.89%) than the percentage of small and large size families i.e. 23.33 per cent and 32.78 per cent respectively.
- Rupendrakumar *et al.* (1999) reported that, most of the respondent happened to be either small, medium farmers as percentage of both the categories of respondents happened to be the same i.e. 33.33 per cent. Around one-sixth of them i.e. 16.67 per cent were large farmers, while 13.89 per cent of them happened to be the marginal farmers. However, 2.87 per cent of them were observed to be landless. That means there was no significant difference between the respondents in terms of land holding.
- Rupendrakumar *et al.* (1999) studied socio-economics of dairy farmer associated with village dairy co-operatives they reported that about 22 per cent of the respondents had studied upto high school level

of above. The exact break up bring high school (22.22%), intermediate (38.89%) and graduation and above (16.67%) of the remaining one only 5.55 per cent had studied upto primary levels and fortunately none of the respondents were found to be illiterate.

Sahani (1993) reported that, 25 per cent had no land, 66 per cent were small and marginal farmers owing less than 4 hectares of land only.

Sant (1998) revealed that there was positive and significant relationship between socio-economic status and adoption of animal husbandry management practices by dairy farmers.

Sant (1998) revealed that, annual income of dairy farmer was positively significantly correlated with adoption of animal husbandry management practices, majority had total annual income Rs. 25,001 to Rs. 50,000 by dairy farmers.

Sawant (1994) observed that, majority of the respondents were having land upto 1 to 2 hectares.

Shreeshailaja and Verbhadra (1993) reported that majority (67%) of the dairy farm women were owing two crossbred cows followed by three crossbred cows (28%) and four crossbred (5%).

Singh (1993) found that majority i.e. 45 per cent of dairy farmers were having rainfed area and 27 per cent farmers possess irrigated type of land.

Yadav and Jain (1984) revealed that higher socio-economic status of farmers; greater was the tendency towards adoption of hybrid cattle in Western Madhya Pradesh.