

IMPACT OF NHM ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF FARMERS OF DHENKANAL DIST. OF ODISHA

D.MEHENA, B.S.BEHERA

Abstract: Study on “Impact of NHM on Socio-economic development of farmers of Odisha” was conducted in 12 villages covering 4 Blocks of Dhenkanal District namely kamakhyanagar, DhenkanalSadar, Hindol& Kankadahad 120 responded were chosen for the study from 4 Blocks. The objectives of the study are to study about the socio-economic characteristics of farmers with specific reference to horticulture enterprise, assessment of knowledge and skill development of farmers after availing the benefit of NHM, Assessment of effectiveness of NHM for improvement of socio-economic condition of farmers, study on the constraints faced by the farmers in operation of NHM programme and presentation of some case study in implication of NHM Programme. The identified NHM beneficiaries were interviewed with the help of a structure scheduled. The statistical majors used for analysis and presentation of data were percentage, mean score, rank order, standard deviation and CR value. 70% of benefiting respondent families have better socio- economic development. All the above farm families are coming under joint family system, which justifies that the technology adoption is more in case of joint family system. Respondents have opined that economic benefit, higher production, gathering up to date knowledge and skill enhancement are the key factors for the success of the programme. The constraints observed and opined by the responded are inadequate time period of the project staffs and fear on adverse effect of technology. Further among the constraints the organizational constraints with average mean score 3.30, constraints in planning with average mean score 3.34, constraints in programme implication with average mean score 3.55 and constraints in funding with average mean score 3.87 were assessed through the study. Finding of this study will help the planner and executers during implementation of rural development programme.

Introduction: Agriculture is an important sector of Indian economy as it contributes about 13.7% to the total GDP in 2012-13 and provides employment to over 60% of the population. Indian agriculture has registered impressive growth over last few decades. Now-a-days Horticulture has emerged as an important sector for diversification from agriculture. Horticulture is perhaps the most profitable venture of all farming activities as it provides ample employment opportunities and scope to raise the income & socio-economic condition of the farming community. It also has tremendous potential to push the overall agriculture growth to more than the targeted 4 percent.

The climatic conditions prevailing in India are favourable for a large number of horticulture crops such as fruits, vegetables, roots and tuber crops, ornamental, medicinal and aromatic plants. Production of horticultural crops has witnessed a significant improvement over the years, of the 11 per cent of the total cropped area, horticulture accounts for about 30 percent of agriculture GDP in India. India ranks second in the global production of fruits and vegetables next to China. Its share in the World fruit and vegetable production is about 9.2 per cent and 9.24 per cent respectively. India is the largest producer of mango, banana, sapota and acid lime and has the highest productivity of grapes per unit area in

the World. Despite this, India's share in fruits and vegetables trade in the World is very low.

Though the Government has taken many initiatives to boost horticulture sector in the country. These include National Horticulture Mission (NHM), National Horticulture Board, Technology Mission As warehouses and cold storages etc.

Research Methodology: Keeping in view the objective of the study more of qualitative and behavioral attributes are needed to be included in the study. For the study, survey research was considered most appropriate to gather data. Multiphase sampling technique was adopted to select the districts, blocks, villages and respondents.

Result and Discussion:

Study of the socio-economic impact of NHM project through different interventions:

Socio-economic impact of NHM: The objective deals with the training & its impact on skill of the beneficiary farmers. The nature and content of the training have been evaluated separately keeping in mind the basic concept behind the NHM activities & the principles of training. The magnitude of change in the skill of beneficiary farmers have been attempted to measure reaction of farmers on the nature of training.

I. Impact on living condition because of NHM interventions:

SI No	Classes	Percentage
1	Further deteriorated	0
2	Remains as before	10
3	Just improved	60
4	Improved very much	30

From the above table it can be inferred that 8 percent of the respondents told their condition remain as before. This may be due to the inactive participation in the training programme. 90 percent of respondents state their condition improved after becoming NHM beneficiary. Out of these 60 percent respondents told that their condition just improved after becoming

NHM beneficiary and 30 percent had enhanced their income very much. It is due to their change in skill & knowledge about the agricultural practices by attending the training programme. None of the respondents had stated that their condition has deteriorated after being enrolled in NHM activities

2. Comparative study of average annual income:

SI No	Particulars	Before implementation of NHM	After implementation of NHM	Difference percentage	CR Value
1	<25,000/-	25	0	25	Significant
2	25,001/--50,000/-	50	35	15	Significant
3	50,001/--1 lakh	25	55	30	Significant
4	>1 lakh	0	10	10	

There was decrease in number of respondents having average annual income less than Rs.25,000 after became a NHM beneficiary. There was 30 percent decrease in number of respondents having average annual income from Rs.25,001 to Rs50,000. There was

120 percent increase in number of respondents having average annual income 50,001/- to 1 lakh. There was 10% increase in number of respondents of more than 1 lakh average annual income. This is due to their socio-economic development by NHM activities.

3. Reasons for increased income:

SI No	Items	Percentage
1	High yield from crop	60
2	Combination of crop cultivation and animal husbandry	15
3	Any other	25

It can be inferred from the table that 60 percent of respondents increased their income due to high yield from different crops. This is due to beneficiaries had got the timely & proper information about the plant protection, chemicals, proper fertilizer dose & improved technology assistance from NHM personnel. 15 percent of the beneficiaries increased

their income through farming system activities by combining the activities like crop production and animal husbandry. 25 percent of the respondents had increased their income through small enterprises like mushroom cultivation, vermicomposting, Honey beerearing, etc.

4. Improvement in socio-economic condition:

SI No	Items	Percentage
1	Change in food habit	90
2	Housing	75
3	Clothing	70
4	Household amenities	60
5	Children education	85

After becoming NHM beneficiary, there is a great improvement in socio-economic condition. 90 percent of beneficiary improved their food habit. 75 percent of the beneficiaries improved their housing condition. 70

percent of the beneficiaries improved their clothing style. 60 percent of the beneficiaries improved in household amenities. 85 percent of the beneficiaries improved their children education.

5. Types of residence:

Items	Before NHM implementation	After NHM implementation	Difference percentage	CR Value
Kuchha	45	15	30	Significant
Semi pucca	35	50	15	Significant
Pucca	20	35	5	Non-Significant

From the table it is evident that before becoming NHM beneficiary 45 percent have kuchha residence while only 15 percent left after becoming NHM beneficiary. 35 percent have semi pucca type residents before NHM which is increased to 50 percent after

being NHM beneficiary. 20 percent of the respondents have pucca type residence before NHM beneficiary which is increased to 35 percent after being NHM beneficiary.

6. Material possession:

S.No	Category	Before NHM implementation	After NHM implementation
1	Low	70	27.5
2	Medium	20	30
3	High	10	42.5

From the table it is evident that before becoming NHM beneficiary 70 percent have low material possession while only 27.5 percent left after becoming NHM beneficiary. 20 percent have medium material possession before NHM which is increased to 30

percent after being NHM beneficiary. 10 percent of the respondents have high material possession before NHM beneficiary which is increased to 42.5 percent after being NHM beneficiary.

7. Livestock possession:

S.No	Category	Before NHM implementation	After NHM implementation
1	Low	50	17
2	Medium	40	70
3	High	10	13

From the table it is evident that before becoming NHM beneficiary 50 percent have low Livestock possession while only 17 percent left after becoming NHM beneficiary. 40 percent have medium Livestock possession before NHM which is increased to 70

percent after being NHM beneficiary. 10 percent of the respondents have high Livestock possession before NHM beneficiary which is increased to 13 percent after being NHM beneficiary.

8. Savings by beneficiaries:

SI No	Items	Percentage
1	Bank	75
2	Post office	5
3	Purchase of land	5
4	Purchase of ornament	10
5	Co-operative society	30
6	Any other	5

The table reveals that most of the respondents have savings in bank, because banks provide different saving schemes for farmers and also provide different crop loan. 30 percent of the respondents had savings in co-operative society. 10 percent of the individuals saved their income by purchasing ornaments. 5 percent beneficiaries had accounts in post office. 5 percent beneficiaries purchased land to save their

income. 5 percent of beneficiaries saved their money in giving lend & earning interest like activities.

Conclusion: The findings of this investigation can help the planners and top executives working for upliftment of rural mass. The scholars and research workers in the field of behavioural science deserve possible help and guidance in designing their research studies for finding the impact of National horticulture mission Project.

References:

1. The beneficiaries prioritized the social development in the following order i.e. Increase in social status, Increase in decision making ability, Improvement in health, education & entertainment, Increase in respect for each other, Good linkage established with official.
2. The beneficiaries prioritized the economic development in the following order i.e. degraded land are better used, natural resource conserved.
3. The beneficiaries prioritized the cultural development in the following order i.e. Increase in the recreational facilities, Better co-ordinate among people, Increase in the dedication & religiousness.
4. The beneficiaries prioritized the development of aspiration in the following order i.e. higher education for children, Increase in possession, Secondary occupation for increasing total income, Purchasing of land.
5. BIBLIOGRAPHY
6. Ahemd, M.S. (1992). Attitude and adoption behavior of farmers towards the recommended agricultural practices of NWDPRA in Cuddapah district of Andhrapradesh. Unpub. MSc (Ag) thesis, OUAT, Bhubaneswar.
7. Ahemd, S. and Ahemd, J. (1994) An impact study of the Mangala watershed management project.
8. Ahire, R. D., Lambat, A. H., Kalaskar, A.P., Choudury, A. A & Bansal, R.S (2002): Adoption of cotton cultivation practices in Umari watershed development project, Journal of soil and crops, 2002, 12:1, pp62-65.
9. Akhileshkumar Dubey and J. P. Srivastava (2007). Effect of training programme on knowledge & adoption behaviour of farmers on wheat production technologies Indian Research Journal extension education 7 (2&3), May & September 2007.
10. Anandraj Kumar, P. (1995). Voluntary organization in rural development.
11. Anchule, M.M. (2000), critical analysis of technological gap in use of pulse production technology, ph.d. Thesis, MAU, Parabhani (M.S).
12. Arora, M. (2003). Integrated watershed development (Hill-II) project, employment news, pp12-18 April 2003
13. Ayoade, A.R; Ogunwale, A.B; Adewale, J.G (2011) Impact of national special programme for food security on poverty alleviation among women in Oyo State, Nigeria. International-Journal-of-Agriculture-Environment-and Biotechnology. 2011; 4(2): pp- 139-151
14. xiv. Ayoola, J.B; Dangbegnon, C; Daudu, C.K; Mando, A; Kudi, T.M; Amapu, I.Y; Adeosun, J.O; Ezui, K.S (2011) Socio-economic factors influencing rice production among male and female farmers in Northern Guinea Savanna Nigeria: lessons for promoting gender equity in action research.

Bibhu Santosh Behera/Phd Research Scholar/OUAT/Bhubaneswar/
D.Mehena/Instructor In Govt. Agro Poly Technic/Deogarh