

A Study on Perception of Beneficiaries and Non-Beneficiaries towards WYTEP Programme in Dharwad District

The main aim of the Government of India is to achieve social justice and economical growth. In this context, GOI has been planning and implementing number of rural development programmes. WYTEP (Women and Youth Training Extension Project) was implemented in Karnataka with the assistance from DANIDA since 1982. The objective of the programme is to secure the utilization of women's potential in agricultural production and thereby improve the productivity of farm holding for the betterment and quality life of rural family. The study was conducted in the year 2002-03 in Dharwad district. Four taluks viz., Hubli, Dharwad, Kalaghatgi and Navalgund were selected based on the training offered for three consecutive years. Villages having more than five beneficiaries were considered as sample for the study. Then finally, 75 beneficiaries and 75 non-beneficiaries were selected. Dharwad district of Karnataka was purposively selected keeping in view the availability of time, resources and convenience of researcher and also the number of beneficiaries and number of trainings conducted.

The data presented in table 1 brought into sharp focus that the level of perception of beneficiaries is better than that of non-beneficiaries in all the three categories of perception. It is

noticed that 53.33 per cent of beneficiaries had obtained 60.825 mean perception scores. Correspondingly, 60.00 per cent of non-beneficiaries had obtained 31.80 below mean perception score. However, it is interesting to note that majority of beneficiaries were found in high perception category and majority of non-beneficiaries were found in low perception category. On the other hand, 46.67 per cent of beneficiaries and 40.00 per cent of non-beneficiaries belonged to medium perception level category. The above results indicated that the level of perception of beneficiaries about WYTEP was better than that of non-beneficiaries in all the three perception categories. The findings are in accordance with the findings of Nayak and Shah (1993) and Nimbalkar and Pawar (1990). The possible reasons that could be attributed for better perception among beneficiaries may be that they were aware of those activities of the WYTEP programme which were conducted regularly by the AAO (farm women) at the grass root level. Another reason that could be given is that, all the beneficiaries have undergone training on various aspects of agriculture and allied subjects that could have enhanced their knowledge level and awareness about WYTEP programme. This would have helped them to develop better

Table 1. Distribution of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries on their perception about WYTEP programme

| Categories | Range score | Beneficiaries (n=75) | | Non-beneficiaries (n=75) | | Mean perception score |
|----------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------|--------------------------|----|-----------------------|
| | | F | p | F | P | |
| Low (\leq mean — 1 SD) | ≤ 33 | - | - | 45 | 60 | 31.8 |
| Medium (mean \pm 1 SD) | 34 - 58.52 | 35 | 46.67 | 30 | 40 | 46.15 |
| High (\geq mean + 1 SD) | 58.53 | 40 | 53.33 | | | 60.825 |

F - Frequency

P - Percentage

Table 2. Difference between perception of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries about WYTEP programme

| Categories | Mean perception score | Difference | 't' value |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Beneficiaries (n=75) | 58.22 | 25.94 | 56.77** |
| Non-beneficiaries (n=75) | 32.58 | | |
| Significant at 0.05 level | | | |

perception and hence, the perception of beneficiaries is better than that of non-beneficiaries. A considerable number of beneficiaries had medium perception because they might have participated in most of the programmes or trainings conducted by the AAO (farm women). The training areas included organic farming, bio-pesticides, bio-fertilizers and income generating activities. So, the training provided would have offered greater opportunity to the beneficiaries to learn about the essential skills and inturn they might have communicated non-beneficiaries and because of this reason a considerable number of to non-beneficiaries also had medium perception. The findings are in agreement with the findings of Digarskar *et al.* (1993).

The reason that could be attributed for low perception may be that the attitude of the rural families may not be favourable towards the government programmes because of poor education and poverty. In general, it is quite natural that a section of the society would be conservative and reluctant to change their attitude towards a programme. The other reason may be that, they might not have attended the training programme because of the limited number of selection made by the AAO (farm women). Hence, the perception level of majority of non-beneficiaries may be low. The data in table 2 indicated a significant difference between overall perception level of beneficiaries and non-

beneficiaries. The overall mean perception score of beneficiaries was 58.22, while it was 32.58 for non-beneficiaries. The possible reasons might be that, their hight mass media participation, social participation, achievement motivation, innovativeness, risk orientation and economic motivation might have influenced the perception of beneficiaries. Further, the frequent visits made by AAO (farm women) and the training given on agriculture and related aspects might have had positive impact on the perception level of beneficiaries.

The data in the table 3 shows that, most of the beneficiaries had answered 'yes' response to the perception statements compared to 'yes' response given by non-beneficiaries. If we compare the answers in frequency and percentage, most of the responses given by beneficiaries for each statement was higher. The response given by the non-beneficiaries were 'No' for each statement. The reasons that could be attributed for high percentage and high frequency for each perception statement given by beneficiaries may be that, regular trainings might have increased their awareness towards WYTEP programme and resulting in high perception among the beneficiaries. The possible reason for low perception level of non-beneficiaries may be due to low education, less number of trainings, less exposure to mass media, low extension contact *etc.*

Table 3. Perception of beneficiaries and beneficiaries about WYTEP

| Sl. No. | Statements | Beneficiaries (n=75) | | | | | | Non-beneficiaries (n=75) | | | | | |
|---------|--|----------------------|-------|----|-------|----|-------|--------------------------|----|----|-------|---|---|
| | | Yes | | | No | | | Yes | | | No | | |
| | | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| 1. | Do you feel that WYTEP is a good programme for development of farm Women? | 75 | 100 | - | - | - | - | 30 | 40 | 45 | 60 | - | - |
| 2. | Do you feel that farm women beneficiary selected in the age group of 18-50 is correct? | 24 | 32 | 51 | 68 | - | - | - | - | 75 | 100 | - | - |
| 3. | Does WYTEP programme provide supplementary income? | 60 | 80 | 15 | 20 | - | - | - | - | 75 | 100 | - | - |
| 4. | Was the training programme useful? | 75 | 100 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 75 | 100 | - | - |
| 5. | Was the season of organizing training programme appropriate? | 45 | 60 | 30 | 40 | - | - | - | - | 75 | 100 | - | - |
| 6. | Was the duration of training adequate? | 40 | 53.33 | 35 | 46.67 | - | - | - | - | 75 | 100 | - | - |
| 7. | Was the training provided on field crops adequate? | 75 | 100 | - | - | 21 | 28 | - | - | 54 | 72 | - | - |
| 8. | Was the training provided on horticultural crops adequate? | 75 | 100 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 75 | 100 | - | - |
| 9. | Was the training provided on plantation crops adequate? | 73 | 97.33 | 2 | 2.67 | - | - | - | - | 75 | 100 | - | - |
| 10. | Was the training provided on fruit/vegetable crops adequate? | 73 | 97.33 | 2 | 2.67 | - | - | - | - | 75 | 100 | - | - |
| 11. | Was the training provided on animal husbandry like dairy, poultry adequate? | 75 | 100 | - | - | 13 | 17.33 | - | - | 62 | 82.67 | - | - |
| 12. | Was the training provided on medicinal/ornamental plants adequate? | 44 | 58.67 | 31 | 41.33 | - | - | - | - | 75 | 100 | - | - |
| 13. | Was the training provided on irrigation methods adequate? | 73 | 97.33 | 2 | 2.67 | - | - | - | - | 75 | 100 | - | - |
| 14. | Was the training provided on chemical fertilizer adequate? | 75 | 100 | - | - | 11 | 14.67 | - | - | 64 | 85.33 | - | - |
| 15. | Was the training provided on bio-fertilizer adequate? | 73 | 97.33 | 2 | 2.67 | - | - | - | - | 75 | 100 | - | - |

Continued.....

| Sl. | Statements | Beneficiaries (n=75) | | | | | | Non-beneficiaries (n=75) | | | | | |
|-----|---|----------------------|-------|----|-------|----|----|--------------------------|---|---|----|----|-----|
| | | Yes | | | No | | | Yes | | | No | | |
| | | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| No. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16. | Was the training provided on organic farming adequate? | 74 | 98.67 | 1 | 1.33 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 75 | 100 |
| 17. | Was the training provided on bio-pesticides adequate? | 70 | 93.33 | 5 | 6.67 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 75 | 100 |
| 18. | Was the training provided on post-harvest technology adequate? | 75 | 100 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 75 | 100 |
| 19. | Was the field visit organized useful? | 74 | 98.67 | 1 | 1.33 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 75 | 100 |
| 20. | Whether the field days conducted useful? | 74 | 98.67 | 1 | 1.33 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 75 | 100 |
| 21. | Whether the WYTEP programme provides skill oriented training to beneficiaries? | 73 | 97.33 | 2 | 2.67 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 75 | 100 |
| 22. | Whether the training provided by WYTEP developed skills to practice the enterprise undertaken by them? | 73 | 97.33 | 2 | 2.67 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 75 | 100 |
| 23. | Whether the WYTEP training created employment opportunities for farm women? | 58 | 77.43 | 17 | 22.67 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 75 | 100 |
| 24. | Whether the WYTEP programme helped the beneficiaries to get additional income? | 63 | 84.1 | 12 | 16 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 75 | 100 |
| 25. | Whether the training organized on income generating activity were beneficial? | 71 | 94.67 | 4 | 5.33 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 75 | 100 |
| 26. | Does the training provided ensure effective participation of training group in WYTEP programme | 74 | 98.67 | 1 | 1.33 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 75 | 100 |
| 27. | Whether the training given by progressive farmers of the locality is better than institutional sources provided by WYTEP? | 62 | 82.67 | 13 | 17.33 | 42 | 56 | - | - | - | - | 33 | 44 |
| 28. | Do you think teaching methods used for a training under WYTEP were appropriate? | 73 | 97.33 | 2 | 2.67 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 75 | 100 |
| 29. | Was financial assistance for forming a self-help group adequate? | 31 | 41.33 | 44 | 58.67 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 75 | 100 |
| 30. | Do you feel boarding, lodging and classroom facilities were satisfactory? | 75 | 100 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 75 | 100 |
| 31. | Do you feel to contact AAO (FW) for additional information? | 74 | 98.67 | 1 | 1.33 | 21 | 28 | - | - | - | - | 54 | 72 |

A Study on Perception.....

Department of Ag. Extension Education,
College of Agriculture,
Dharwad - 580 005.

M. P. DEEPAK
K. V. NATIKAR
L. MANJUNATH

(Received : May, 2004)

References

DIGARSKAR, R. K.. WANGIKAR, S. D. AND MAIRAL, V. K.,
1992, A study on the utility perception of biogas
plant. *Maharashtra Journal of Extension
Education*, **11**(1): 239-244.

NAYAK, H. S. AND SHAH. M. M., 1993, Perception
behaviour of rural viewers towards selected

farm programme. *Maharashtra Journal of
Extension Education*. **12**(1): 389-390.

NIMBALKAR, S. D. AND PAWAR, R. S., 1990, Perception of
viewers towards farm programmes.
Maharashtra Journal of Extension Education,
9(1): 157 -160.